



DRAFT
CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
MAY 28, 2015

Present

Planning Commissioners:

Jennifer Gervais, *Chair*

Paul Woods

Jasmin Woodside

City Councilors

Barbara Bull

Frank Hann

Excused Absence:

Ron Sessions

Roan Hogg

Staff

Kevin Young, *Planning Division Manager*

Mark Shepard, *City Manager*

Mark Lindgren, *Recorder*

Visitors:

Nathan Davis

Stephen Naimoli

Trang Tran

Mai Nguyen

Dave Dodson, OSU

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force (PRTF) was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 6:01 p.m. in the Downtown Fire Station Meeting Room. Introductions were made.

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Nathan Davis, of OSU Policy Analysis Laboratory (OSUPAL), introduced Stephen Naimoli, also of OSUPAL, saying the group has focused on transportation issues affecting the City, the surrounding area and OSU.

Stephen Naimoli said an issue emerging in research is that it is often hard to get in and out of Corvallis without a car. A focus group found that many stated that they would be willing to take public transportation into Corvallis if it were accessible and convenient, but they felt that it was not. While there is a regional transportation system and connections, it is not always as convenient as it could be. For example, getting from Philomath to Adair Village (fifteen miles and 23 minutes by car) can take up to 2 ½ hours, involving multiple busses and long waits for transfer connections. Mr. Davis said this is true for both travel to get across town or between towns; it is either inconvenient or not easily accessible. The group's recommendation, as the City develops Transit Plans and the Comp Plan is to ensure consideration of both transit within the city as well as areas that Corvallis is connected to. This would help reduce some major traffic issues that have been seen.

Councilor Hann asked about constraints on transit delivery. Mr. Davis replied that in travelling to Portland or other destinations outside the city, there are price points, but it is simply much more convenient to take a car, than it is to take a bus to a train to the final destination.

Councilor Hann asked if research found that another city of comparable size was doing a better job. Mr. Davis said that a few comparable cities were able to structure the transit infrastructure to match the cultural characteristics of the town. For example, in Morgantown, West Virginia, an old coal car route was used to implement a personal rapid transit system, with an easily accessible car travelling around town all the time.

Mai Nyugen introduced Trang Tran from OSUPAL. Ms. Tran stated that she studied data from the OSU Capital Planning and Development Group's 2014 Transportation Choices Survey. She looked at data for both students and faculty, and learned the main incentives for their choices of transportation modes. Employee data showed the trend was that the further out they lived from campus, the more likely it was that they drove; student data showed a similar trend. Commissioner Gervais said it seemed that more students were using public transit than employees; Ms. Nguyen confirmed that was true, likely because they prioritized cost savings over convenience.

Incentives in choosing between types of transportation include having a flexible schedule, family obligations (such as dropping off kids), time saving and relative affordability. Recommendations based on responses include improving incentives for targeted modes of transportation (biking, walking, and public transit); providing accessible and secure bike storage (due to rampant bike theft on campus) and more bike racks on buses and on campus; safe walking routes (especially during construction); and more bus routes and more frequent shuttles.

Ms. Tran stated that in October, 2014 OSU implemented a zonal parking system, intended to address issues such as congestion in the campus core and overflow into surrounding neighborhoods. A 2014-2015 OSU parking utilization study survey found some positive impacts on reducing congestion in the campus core; however, parking overflow into neighborhoods has persisted. Given that, she looked at parking solutions implemented by various other universities throughout the US. They mostly seek to reduce use of single occupancy vehicles (SOV's) and use parking meters to reduce overflow into neighborhoods. Stanford University pays employees and faculty if they agree not to drive to campus. A main road through campus was changed into a bike/transit mall.

Many other universities impose a restriction on university student parking permits, often with a restriction on freshmen and sophomores buying parking permits. At Lewis and Clark College in Portland, where there is a shortage of affordable housing, the college leases houses for faculty, professionals or grad students who sign an agreement not to drive cars to campus. Boulder, Colorado installed parking meters in the area between campus areas and commercial or residential districts and created a residential parking zone, offering homeowners the chance to buy a low-cost parking permit for the area in front of their homes, and offering the public (including students) limited-time permits. Other universities have used portable parking meters, as well as offering refundable parking fees if they don't use their entire time period.

Councilor Hann said it appeared that research showed that a main incentive was cost, and the disincentive was making it more expensive. He was intrigued by the portable parking meters hanging from rear view mirrors and wanted to learn more. Chair Gervais asked them to submit a copy of their presentation to Manager Young. Councilor Bull said people could bike almost

anywhere in Corvallis. She said there will be a Transit Development Plan next fall which will be seeking feedback from students, and encouraged them to do so.

OSU Campus Planning Manager Dave Dodson said the university found it valuable to work with OSUPAL, as the group applied a critical eye to the survey instrument and developed useful questions that will be helpful in designing the next survey. Regarding the whole transportation picture, over the last decade, there is a high walking and biking rate to OSU; it has increased. This may be due to higher concentrations of students now living closer to the university, largely due to convenience.

However, the Transportation consultant found that in relation to comparator institutions, Corvallis is relatively low in transit utilization, which is especially striking, given the no-fare service. Given the current \$7,000 cost per surface space, the university needs to look at whether to encourage other modes of transportation instead. Once it identifies the best opportunities, it could promote alternatives, perhaps via subsidization of CTS for more frequency or better routing.

OSU does a bike parking survey every two years, and the one done in fall 2014 is now being compiled. Over 600 bike parking spaces have been added, primarily accompanying new construction. A Campus Planning Committee found that minimum parking requirements were grossly inadequate, so it is not uncommon to require two or three times the minimum number of spaces required by the Land Development Code. Another 150 spaces are being added due to increases in enrollment, but the number of bike parking spaces have not kept pace with increased enrollment over the last decade. Bike parking needs to be convenient for users.

Commissioner Woods asked about the rate of bike theft on campus; Mr. Dodson replied that he's heard from cyclists that other campuses provide more secure bike parking and storage areas. There is a waiting list for existing bike storage lockers. Mr. Dodson noted that other universities' residence halls often provide better bike security, such as in an enclosed, secure gated enclosure. Commissioner Woods asked for the cost per bike space; Mr. Dodson said covered bike parking was roughly ten times more expensive than uncovered, he thought it cost \$500 per space; he'll confirm that number. New covered bike parking uses a new design to double capacity, with better lighting.

Commissioner Woods agreed that security was a big deal. He asked about video surveillance; Mr. Dodson replied that cameras only cover about 25 well-travelled areas. Councilor Hann asked what the campus does to make the campus unfriendly to theft. Mr. Dodson replied that students are encouraged to register bikes with state police. He said there are often rashes of bike theft by thieves passing through.

Councilor Hann asked about the capacity of public transit. Mr. Dodson replied that students seem far more likely to consider alternative modes and live closer to campus, while employees have a high drive-alone rate, as they tend to live further out and drive in alone. Councilor Hann said figures showed about 10,000 people driving into Corvallis in single-occupancy vehicles. Mr. Dodson said we need to look at comparisons of what other similar communities are doing better than us. The OSU transit utilization is about 14% (this relates to how people get to and from the campus); while this isn't bad, the University of Oregon has higher transit utilization, about 31%.

Councilor Bull cautioned against designing policy around a single statistic. Councilor Bull asked about bike parking spaces in regards to internal requirements; Mr. Dodson replied that OSU meets the City's minimum standards with new construction, and sometimes more than two or three times that amount.

Commissioner Woods asked how a multimodal trip was counted; for example, if one drove in, and then parked to take a bus. Mr. Dodson replied that the most recent survey included that as a mode. Commissioner Woods asked about surface parking to accommodate people driving in from out of town- whether there was consideration of providing on-campus housing so that people wouldn't have to drive in from out of town. Mr. Dodson concurred that providing on-campus housing was best in reducing single-occupancy driving, and the next best is having housing in close proximity to campus. The further people live from campus, the lower their utilization of transit, since it is less convenient.

Councilor Hann cited the LDC provision in which if you provide additional bike parking, or are in proximity to a bus stop, then that can offset vehicle parking, and asked if that covered OSU. Mr. Dodson replied that in the campus master plan, parking triggers are based on parking utilization across campus as a whole. The new interim parking development agreement signed recently between the City and OSU has triggers for parking, but no provisions for reducing parking; it is simply set at 1.2 spaces for 1,000 square feet of additional building or no net loss, if removing existing parking.

III. REVIEW OF VERSION 3.0 DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FINDINGS AND POLICIES

Chair Gervais suggested postponing consideration of corrections so far, and beginning with consideration with Article 11.2.j.

Councilor Bull related that the issue is on the Council's agenda, and Councilors may provide feedback. City Manager Mark Shepard said Monday Council meeting would just have a verbal report and an opportunity for Council feedback. Councilor Hann asked for a summary to the council; Chair Gervais replied that the main message was that it was being worked on, and agreed to set aside time to draft a summary.

Regarding Article 11 .2.j, Proposed New Findings, Chair Gervais suggested adding “..distance, reliability, safety *and* comfort”. Commissioner Woodside said that today's testimony, which resembled a finding, was that students prioritize savings over convenience in choosing transportation modes. Councilor Bull added that that was the basis between the differences in choices between faculty, staff and students. Chair Gervais summarized a finding that “Students prioritize cost over convenience when choosing transportation modes, while employees tend to prioritize convenience over cost”. Commissioner Woodside said there were a number of reasons cited for why employees chose convenience. Chair Gervais said the final wording can be edited before and after public testimony. Manager Young suggested inserting the finding under 11.2, OSU Transportation Issues; Chair Gervais concurred.

Chair Gervais proposed adding a finding that “Public transit within the city and linking to other communities was not convenient, time-inefficient or not readily accessible” to General Findings. Councilor Hann said the variable was time- the disincentive to use transit. Commissioner Woods noted that the example given of travel from Philomath to Adair Village was not a common linkage. Councilor Hann suggested focusing on student usage (they are less likely to use the system if it doesn't have certain elements), rather than condemning the system. Manager Young suggested alternate language “Frequency of service and convenience of connections are factors that affects perceptions of transit”. Councilor Hann said existing language in 11.7.i was similar. Chair Gervais suggested “There is data to suggest the current system is not convenient or frequent enough to serve the needs of potential riders”; now we have the data to show that's true, we need to address it. Council Bull added that testimony noted that transit use was lower in Corvallis than elsewhere. Councilor Hann suggested “..data suggests that these are not optimal”. Commissioner Woodside

proposed “Surrounding communities outside the City offer few other convenient transportation options than the Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV).” There was consensus to include this wording. Chair Gervais added that transit within the city also needed to be addressed: “Frequency of service and convenience of connections within the city limit ridership”; there was consensus to include this wording.

Under Proposed New Policies, 11.2.16 and 11.2.17, there was consensus.

Regarding Auto Parking-Proposed New Findings, Manager Young got preliminary feedback from department directors on the work in progress. One comment on Finding 11.4.k was to add to it, “Many people like to park on the street adjacent to their residence *if onsite parking is limited or not available*”. The group agreed this should be added.

Regarding Findings 11.4.a, Councilor Hann said OSUPAL testimony cited the increased cost of parking increased the use of alternative modes of transportation; he asked whether the disincentive aspect should be included. Commissioner Gervais suggested including it in 11.4.0: “Students expressed through surveys that as the cost of parking goes up, there is a greater likelihood that they are more willing to consider alternative modes of transportation”. Manager Young noted that 11.4.10 states that “parking fees should be considered as an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improving livability”. There is some policy direction that suggests that fees can be a tool in changing behaviors; Councilor Hann noted that we still need a finding for that. Commissioner Gervais highlighted the first proposed finding above. Commissioner Woods added that students don’t so much use alternate transportation as park in different areas; Councilor Hann responded that the other communities have found that if there are parking meters in neighborhoods, then students will park elsewhere. Commissioner Woods said that if parking is controlled and the price goes up, and there’s not a place to park for free, then students may opt for alternative transportation. There is no monetary cost to students parking in areas around the university.

Chair Gervais proposed the draft “Students have been shown to be more sensitive to the cost of commuting than faculty or staff associated with OSU; the cost of parking is currently only imposed by OSU”. Councilor Bull suggested “Increasing the price of parking is a strategy for reducing the use of single occupancy vehicles”. Chair Gervais cited Commissioner Wood’s concern that raising the price of campus parking simply derives students to park in neighborhoods, since there’s no cost to doing so. Councilor Hann said the policy section leaves it open to various strategies, such as a local vehicle registration fee. Manager Young suggested “Data show that students are sensitive to parking pricing, which can alter student parking behavior”; there was consensus.

Regarding Proposed New Policies, Councilor Bull felt 11.4.8 was a little unclear about the term “temporary lots”. Chair Gervais replied that the creation of parking lots was becoming an issue in regards to space use and detracting from the pedestrian environment. Councilor Bull said that one idea was having parking lots for park and ride facilities; also, it could be useful for the City to be flexible on parking lot standards, but we lost that piece. Chair Gervais replied that “..uses shall be explored as a means of reducing costs and environmental effects associated with parking; demand is expected to fluctuate”. Manager Young suggested adding a temporary parking lots definition such as: “Temporary lots are parking lots which are not improved to full City standards”. The group agreed to this clarification. Commissioner Woodside asked that lots be clarified as being *parking* lots.

Regarding 11.4.10, Commissioners Gervais and Woods objected to the “shoulds” in the language. Commissioner Woods added that some may object to the parking fee idea, since we’ve already pooled our tax money to pay for streets, so it may be viewed as an extra fee.

Commissioner Gervais asked to change “should” to either “can” or “may”. She suggested modifying Item C to “Any parking fee system should be self-supporting and *can* provide *additional* resources for transit and transportation improvements”; also under Item D, “Parking fees *can* be considered..”. Item B was fine as-is. The group agreed to make these changes.

Councilor Bull said she expected concern about raising prices creating a hardship for low-income people; revenue can be used to mitigate that impact on affordability. Commissioner Woodside asked if the items were listed in order of importance; Commissioner Gervais thought not. Councilor Bull suggested language that we are aware that this could impose an economic hardship; Chair Gervais suggested placing language like that in 11.4.11.

Regarding 11.6, Pedestrian, Chair Gervais noted that most changes were simply factual updates that were not likely to raise concerns.

Regarding 11.7 Transit, Proposed New Findings, Commissioner Woods asked about the reference in 11.7.i to overcrowding. Chair Gervais stated that the following item, 11.7.8, addresses this. She said there had been previous testimony from students being turned away from full buses due to increased student housing in their area. She suggested replacing “causing” with “.. *contributing to overcrowding*”. The group agreed.

There was consensus that 11.7.8 was OK.

Regarding 11.12, Proposed New Finding, Chair Gervais suggested modifying 11.12.d to “Concerns have *been raised..*”. Chair Gervais suggested modifying the last sentence of 11.12.c: “The University and the City are working together by maintaining the free transit pass program, encouraging bicycle and pedestrian travel, and by developing and implementing a parking *plan*”. There was consensus on both changes.

Manager Young said the free transit pass program would remain as long as we can afford it. City Manager Shepard noted that the free transit system affects federal funding, since it affects ridership; if it was funded through fares, then likely revenue would drop.

Regarding Policies, from 11.12.1 to 11.12.5, there was agreement as written.

Regarding Proposed New Policies, 11.12.6 through 11.12.9, Councilor Bull expressed concern on 11.12.7 regarding “A feasibility study shall be conducted..”, noting it was not appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan, and suggested simply stating what the concern is. Chair Gervais also suggested modifying the item to “ Remote parking lot options *may* be assessed for the OSU campus, and a feasibility study may be conducted”. Councilor Bull said part of the concern was regarding runoff, and that should perhaps be incorporated; Chair Gervais replied that runoff was only one of a number of concerns. Manager Young said there’s nothing in the language that suggests we’re looking at a sub-standard improvement for this lot; the stormwater concerns come into play with water quality from temporary parking lots. Commissioner Woodside proposed striking 11.12.7, given that 11.12.8 addresses this as well; Chair Gervais suggested consideration of 11.12.8 to help resolve it.

Manager Young related staff concern regarding 11.12.8, since it seems to make the City and OSU equal partners in the need to provide the means of transportation, and there might be concern that financial and other expectations could accrue to the City, and it should not be interpreted that the City must pay for, or provide, shuttle buses. Councilor Bull said the City role might be allowing temporary parking that might not otherwise be allowed, and code for a temporary parking lot might be needed. Commissioner Woodside suggested “The City shall work with OSU in providing remote parking lot options”; Councilor Bull said it was unclear what

that means. Manager Young proposed “OSU shall work with the City and other community partners to explore remote parking options” to replace the existing 11.12.7 and scratch 11.12.8; there was consensus to do so.

Proposed New Policy 11.12.9 was OK as written.

Regarding Article 13, Special Areas of Concern, under 13.2 Findings, Commissioner Woodside highlighted the differences between versions 2.0 and 3.0. Manager Young noted some findings were already previously discussed and approved, but were moved from another section at the direction of the Task Force.

Under Proposed New Findings, 13.2.i through 13.2.o, Manager Young noted that bolded language and strikethrough reflects changes between version 2.0 and 3.0. He reported that he got feedback on 13.2.n, and proposed that it should read “According to 2013 American Community Survey (ACS) data, the population within the City of Corvallis between the ages of 20 and 29 comprises 31.2% of the total population, while the group comprises only 13.4% of the total population in Oregon. ACS estimates about 17,064 Corvallis residents in this age cohort from an estimated 2013 population of 54,691”. There was agreement that this used better data.

Under Policies, Chair Gervais highlighted the change in 13.2.5; Manager Young said the last sentence was struck out. Participants were OK with changes in 13.2.3 and 13.2.5.

Regarding 13.2.6, Manager Young said the last sentence was changed (“These monitoring programs can occur anywhere in the community”). Councilor Bull said the language raised questions for her; we should have available how all OSU land was zoned, especially at the City limits and the UGB. She wanted to know the development potential at 35th and Campus Way. Chair Gervais said that sounded like a new finding. Commissioner Woods said Councilor Bull was trying to get at campus land use actions: If the Campus Master Plan didn’t include all the land that affects the community, then maybe the District Plan should do so.

Councilor Bull said OSU land has impacts, but it’s not all being addressed in the Plan, and maybe this is the place to include that. Currently, the OSU Plan is a single zone; she’d like to see all OSU land represented in order to determine the development impacts on the city. Chair Gervais said she didn’t see how that impacted 13.2.6; this section is about monitoring perceived by the community as inadequate in terms of getting the data to understand community impacts, and this was written to narrowly address that. Councilor Hann said it’s confusing, since impacts are on both City and County; there’s a challenge in integrating City and County maps, and City zoning and County zoning. Councilor Bull suggested addressing it under the Open Space and Resource Land section.

Manager Young said the current Master Plan has language that when conditions have changed, we need to revisit it. This is a Comp Plan Policy and is not a regulation itself. When we go through the District Plan process, we’ll want to review considerations and how to flesh it out (e.g., predetermined thresholds). Councilor Hann wanted to ensure it didn’t trigger a level of effort that the City didn’t have the staff time for; Manager Young replied that it *could*, but not in and of itself.

Commissioner Woods said the piece needed a finding. Commissioner Gervais replied that there was extensive public testimony on concern that monitoring didn’t reflect what was really happening in the community. Commissioner Woods added that in some cases, monitoring wasn’t done at all, or was modified. Councilor Hann suggested expounding in an existing Finding, such as 13.2.i. Commissioner Woods stated that the fact the growth occurred made

the lack of monitoring obvious. Commissioner Gervais added that the monitoring did happen, but was not measuring the correct metrics (the ones important to the community, and was not responsive to community concerns).

Commissioner Gervais suggested “Community concerns were raised about the adequacy and implementation of monitoring under the previous (2004) Campus Master Plan and the implementing chapter of LDC 3.36. Concerns included monitoring not being completed, monitoring metrics not measuring relevant parameters, and changes in monitoring without City Council approval.” There was consensus to add this finding.

Councilor Hann said some uses that fell under LDC Chapter 3.36 were not anticipated, such as the Samaritan Athletic Medical Center, and partnerships with private enterprise, which, while valuable, when they fell under the OSU regulations, parking wasn’t required, though parking demand was generated. Manager Young said this did not seem to be a monitoring related issue, though it may be a Finding. Councilor Hann replied it fell under 3.36, in which projects didn’t have to adhere to the LDC; however, some major uses were not anticipated. Councilor Bull said that it’s a mistake to give implicit approval for an excessive amount of development; we should figure out a way in the Comp Plan, and perhaps in the LDC, to tie development approval with staying in line with the plan that had been agreed to. We have to agree on what is allowed outright and what requires a special approval process.

Chair Gervais suggested a new finding to highlight what went wrong. Commissioner Woods said the current regulations have allowed development to happen that was not consistent with non-3.36 standards. There were development activities that were allowed because they were inside the OSU Zone. Councilor Bull asked if we need to regulate the use in order to not end up with something that is inappropriate. Commissioner Gervais said the problem was with uses that were unanticipated under 3.36. Commissioner Woods said that the issue is that the requirements are different under 3.36; we have to distinguish between a 3.36 development and a non-3.36 development.

Manager Young said there is a history of campus public-private partnerships, such as franchise restaurants, OSU Bookstore, the Hilton Garden Inn, etc. One issue may be whether enough parking is provided for such developments; MU restaurants are aimed at OSU students. Commissioner Woodside suggested a policy “OSU District Plan shall provide a mechanism for the City to evaluate use”. Councilor Bull said this points to deciding what is appropriate use, and what requires public review.

Chair Gervais asked whether the issue is that the general community is using the sports medicine complex, so it is bringing in outside traffic. Councilor Bull said that under review, it appeared to be aimed only at students and faculty, and we have no mechanism in place to check that. Manager Young replied that we looked at the issue; there’s language that uses must be university-affiliated. City staff needed to be satisfied it was primarily serving the university communities, and we were provided that assurance by the University. Councilor Bull added that we have no recourse. Chair Gervais summarized that the public perception is that OSU got away with development that was not anticipated in the Plan. Manager Young said the issue is what it was that OSU got away with that should be addressed next time. Councilor Bull suggested addressing additional trips better.

Councilor Hann explained that the problem was we tried to provide OSU with a mechanism to provide some freedom for determining when the threshold requiring additional parking was triggered; however, under that freedom came in uses that would ordinarily trigger intensive provision of parking. For example, under the LDC, a health care facility should have one parking space for every 200 square feet; however, that was not provided. Were it only for

faculty and students, that would not be a problem, but now the hospital is using it as a means of unfairly competing. In trying to provide freedom to develop, other uses came in and abused that system.

Chair Gervais said part of the issue is when a facility draws in users from off-campus. Councilor Hann said that if something is not related directly to the stated mission of the campus, then it really shouldn't fall under rules intended to provide freedom to develop for student and faculty use. Commissioner Woods said Chapter 3.36 was there to allow convenience for the university to do university-specific activities without a lot of public input. However, some businesses may feel that OSU public-private partnerships are unfair, since they don't have the same requirements as those off-campus, so partnerships should be subject to a more standard approval process. Councilor Bull said that an airtight transportation requirement would likely have much less impact on the community, and so there would be less concern. She asked whether there should be a placeholder on public-private partnerships.

Manager Young read the crafted draft new finding: "Unanticipated development, including public-private partnerships, led to community concerns that typical development requirements were not provided and resultant uses were not primarily university-related." There was consensus to include this new finding.

In discussions on the issue of public-private partnerships, Councilor Hann asked what triggered the review of the Hilton; Manager Young replied that he didn't know, but that it eventually went to LUBA. Mr. Dodson added that it preceded the Master Plan. Councilor Bull noted that a hotel was in the current Plan; she asked whether that meant that another could be built at any time in the OSU Zone, as well.

Chair Gervais suggested draft policy that "Partnerships that involve uses beyond the immediate campus community shall trigger a more thorough review". Councilor Bull asked whether we wanted a different review for public-private partnerships, since we're encouraging housing, which can be very speculative. Manager Young said he's heard a lot of sentiment in the community for more on-campus housing, which may be best provided through a public-private partnership. He added that creating a process requirement to get there would make it harder to do. The District Plan could include parameters to ensure compatibility and reduce negative impacts. He suggested alternate policy language that "Development and activity on the OSU campus shall be primarily campus-related." Perhaps if there is a question as to whether something is campus-related, it should go through a public review process.

Commissioner Gervais said the public has objected to perceptions of unfair business advantage. Apart from whether use involves something beyond the campus community, it also involves triggers of use- if no one travels on and off campus, then no one would likely care. Commissioner Woodside suggested that the District Plan come up with a framework for the City to evaluate; Chair Gervais replied this effort is intended to come up with a Comp Plan policy. Councilor Bull said the City has a clear interest when new trips are generated.

Councilor Hann related that the interim agreement used square footage to trigger some level of review. He wanted OSU to be an economic generator, but past a certain threshold of development, it should go back to the LDC, such that "Policy mechanisms to mitigate or ameliorate public-private development impacts on the community shall be incorporated into the LDC".

Chair Gervais said the main issue here is whether development generates new trips to and from campus. Councilor Bull cited community concern that Corvallis gave OSU a free ticket, which it then shared with the private sector. Commissioner Woods said that if you define

livability impacts on parking, housing, and traffic, you could craft a policy to the effect that “If it impacts livability, then we apply standard City processes”. Councilor Bull noted that trips were easy to measure. Chair Gervais cited community concern that OSU crossed a line in developing campus facilities for broader public use, giving OSU the ability to develop in a way that would not be allowed to occur outside campus. Commissioner Woodside cited Finding 13.2.m regarding the disproportionate impact of OSU on the community, and that land use decisions by the university require a great deal of ongoing communication, coordination and monitoring by the City. Councilor Bull said that if OSU plans a facility with any interest in serving the public outside the campus community, then it requires a different review; that would not apply to housing. The issue is whether something is for campus use or not.

Manager Young suggested new policy that “Permitted uses on the OSU campus shall be primarily university-related. Where on-campus public-private partnerships have the potential to significantly impact the larger community, a review process shall be required”. Councilor Bull said we don’t have to limit that policy to public private partnerships. The group agreed to that draft language as a placeholder.

Councilor Bull highlighted her concern regarding land within the Urban Growth Boundary that is not within the Zone (Urban Fringe). It should be mapped, and we need some assessment of potential development there. She asked that there be a placeholder for the issue.

Chair Gervais highlighted Policies 13.2.1 through 13.2.5; these were already discussed. Regarding Findings 13.4.a through 13.4.j, there were no objections. Regarding Policies, 13.4.1 through 13.4.7, she noted that Councilor’s Bull’s concern hadn’t been addressed yet. Manager Young noted that Finding 13.4.g seemed to speak to the issue raised by Councilor Bull. Chair Gervais asked if an accompanying Policy was needed, suggesting the draft “The OSU District Plan shall consider potential for future uses of lands”; further discussion on the issue was postponed. Manager Young highlighted 13.4.7- “The City shall recognize the ability of resource land exchanges between OSU and public and private land owners to provide enhanced agricultural opportunities and urban development or demonstrated public benefit to the community by the exchange”.

Regarding 13.4.g, Chair Gervais found consensus to strike “has been substantiated” in the last sentence.

Regarding 13.4.h, the place name Squaw Creek should be changed to Dunawi Creek.

Regarding Sections 13.6 (Madison Avenue Findings) and Article 14 (Urbanization/Annexation, Finding 14.3.k), no changes were proposed.

Chair Gervais noted that at least four pieces of testimony still remained to be covered, and asked members to review it. She felt one more session would finish up incorporating testimony. Council Bull asked what to expect from the process (whether any new changes would nullify the interim agreement); Manager Young related that he had not gotten an answer on the interpretation of the interim agreement yet. Councilor Bull said that that should be in the minutes; perhaps we need to put a hold on all Comp Plan amendments until we are ready with LDC amendments. Chair Gervais said that is up to the Council; right now we’re just tasked with the Comp Plan; this won’t be done before July and the Council will then have to decide what to do next, and who will do it. Councilor Bull said her understanding was that the process would take 18 months.

Chair Gervais said we won't address Chapter 3.36. She asked members to get feedback as soon as possible (by Wednesday) to Manager Young before the June 8 meeting. He'll send out testimony.

Councilor Hann said we haven't completely excluded taking a quick look at Chapter 3.36, and could identify areas broadly that need to be addressed. Manager Young recalled the City Attorney's expressed concern about quasi-judicial land use review versus legislative review. Councilor Hann suggested the final could be footnoted, where items related to the LDC.

Chair Gervais proposed focusing on testimony at the June 8 meeting, and if we have time, we could take a "big picture" look at Chapter 3.36, being careful not to conduct a quasi-judicial review. We could also schedule an additional meeting. Councilor Bull said the monitoring piece would be hard to do at the Comp Plan level, but still remains to be addressed in the code. Chair Gervais replied that that could probably safely be addressed as a code issue. After public testimony, and incorporating that, as part of summary document to Council, we can highlight issues from discussions. Manager Young emphasized that we need a quorum (four members) in order to make a recommendation at the final meeting.

The next meeting will be held on Monday June 8. Councilor Hann said it will be important to inform the Council and the next group to follow this one, on the direction to go, and the Planning Commission will have to rewrite some LDC. Chair Gervais stated that the Council can be told the task force was finishing looking at the last portion of testimony, and anticipated having Comp Plan language for the public to review after one more meeting, by a date to be determined, at the end of June. Members Gervais and Bull highlighted lengthy upcoming absences.

IV. CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF FINDINGS AND POLICIES NOT YET ADDRESSED

Not discussed.

V. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Chair Gervais proposed reviewing the April 27, 2015 minutes at the next meeting.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

OSU's David Dodson highlighted 13.2.6 regarding monitoring. He proposed striking in the second sentence reference to monitoring "...on an annual basis", since some things might not need annual monitoring. He said much of the concern about OSU's growth over the last decade has had to do with impacts from parking in nearby neighborhoods and housing impacts nearby, including higher density infill housing. In addition to monitoring, the metrics also become an important piece here, such as housing x% of students on campus in order to obtain building permits, setting a performance threshold.

Mr. Dodson suggested some Conditional uses for non-OSU-centric uses that may have impacts that may need to be addressed or mitigated, with public review, while OSU-related uses could be allowed outright. Commissioner Woods suggested monitoring "on a regular basis" instead, in the Comp Plan, and then have it specified in the LDC.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

