



Community Development Planning Division
P. O. Box 1083
Corvallis, OR 97339
(541) 766-6908

AGENDA

OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force

6 pm, Thursday, July 23, 2015

Madison Avenue Meeting Room, 500 SW Madison Avenue

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Public Input Opportunity
- III. Discussion of Task Force Process Memorandum

Chair Gervais prepared a draft overview of the process used by the Task Force in order to draft recommended revisions to OSU-related Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies. This memo is proposed to accompany the recommendation from the Task Force to the City Council.

- IV. Continued Review of Written Testimony

At the July 9, 2015, Task Force meeting the group began review of Dan Brown's June 30, 2015 testimony (from the lavender-colored handout from July 9, 2015, meeting). The Task Force completed review through Finding 13.2.p.

- V. Review of Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2015
July 9, 2015

- VI. Public Input Opportunity

- VII. Adjournment

Attachments:

- A. Task Force Process Memorandum
- B. Task Force Issues of Concern, from March 12, 2015, Task Force meeting
- C. Draft June 22, and July 9, 2015, meeting minutes
- D. Written Testimony received prior to the July 9, 2015, meeting

For the hearing impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours notice.

For the visually impaired, an agenda in larger print is available

Process Used by the OSU-Related Task Force, Spring-Summer 2015

The City Council voted to initiate a legislative review of the Comprehensive Plan at its December 1, 2014 meeting, although no decisions regarding the details were reached. The legislative review was to be limited in scope to policies and findings related to Oregon State University. In a memorandum from Ken Gibb dated January 9, City staff outlined several considerations and potential options for accomplishing the task (memorandum from Ken Gibb, January 9, 2015).

The mayor appointed four planning commissioners and three city councilors to the task force on January 20. The charge was “to review concerns about community impacts related to Oregon State University development. This review may lead to a recommendation to the City Council for legislative land-use changes. The initial charge to the task force is to draft their scope of work.”

Accordingly, the Task Force convened on February 9, 2015 to define the scope of work, set procedures and protocols for the meetings, and determine how to proceed with the review. At that meeting, City Attorney Coulombe explained the potential issues with going straight into an overhaul of Chapter 3.36 in the Land Development Code. The decision was made by the Task Force that a legislative process would be most appropriate, so that concerns about ex-parte contacts and other issues with the quasi-judicial process could be avoided. This would preclude updating LDC 3.36. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan is the foundational document for the Land Development code. For these reasons, the Task Force determined that it would focus on updating the Comprehensive Plan. The Task Force also determined that one check-in with Council was appropriate, particularly because each standing committee of the Council was represented in the Task Force membership.

The Task Force therefore defined the scope of work as a legislative review of the Comprehensive Plan policies and findings that pertain to OSU. The Task Force determined that it would identify relevant policies in the Comprehensive Plan, gather information including previous findings with the assistance of staff, and make recommendations for potential changes and additions to the current Comprehensive Plan. Once the package of recommendations had been completed by the Task Force, the City Council would need to determine how they wished to proceed.

To start the process, staff provided a list of what they considered relevant policies and findings, in addition to a list created by searching the Comprehensive Plan document for the words “Oregon State University.” In addition, staff provided copies of the Collaboration Task Force’s recommendations in a matrix format indicating issues, suggested actions, and progress. We assigned sections of the Comprehensive Plan to Task Force members for identification of policies or findings that related to OSU that were not already identified by staff in either of their lists. We also made requests of staff for information that would support either updated or new findings and policies. We then reviewed the material so identified in addition to public testimony in subsequent meetings. These three-hour sessions were held February 26, March 12, March 31, April 13, April 27, May 14, May 28, June 8, June 22, July 9, and July 23. Each of these meetings provided opportunities for public input. David Dodson of Oregon State University was present at every meeting. He provided additional information and edits to the draft changes.

Progress was slow, because of the detailed discussion that frequently arose regarding meaning, intent, wording, evaluating how findings supported policies, and whether policies made sense in the context of providing a framework for Oregon State University's District Plan. We worked hard to provide direction and scope in such a manner that potential solutions or specific policies would not be precluded by the language of our suggested changes. In addition to the material identified by staff and individual task force members, we carefully and thoroughly reviewed public testimony. In all cases, we made decisions by consensus.

The City Council received an update from the Task Force on March 23, 2015. The public at large provided comments on the completed draft of the updated Comprehensive Plan findings and policies on June 22. The Task Force is currently reviewing the additional testimony and editing the draft changes as needed. We anticipate needing two or three additional three-hour sessions to finish this task.

We used the opportunity of reviewing the Comprehensive Plan to identify policies or findings that were severely out of date, or that required minor changes (Dunawi Creek was still identified as Squaw Creek, for example). Therefore, some of the suggested changes will not relate directly to Oregon State University. Given that it is likely that another two years might elapse before the new version of the Comprehensive Plan is drafted, we took the opportunity to bundle some simple updates with the potentially more contentious changes. In addition, various issues that we identified as needing to be carefully considered in a revised Chapter 3.36 will be compiled for Council review.

Task Force Issues of Concern

Non-adaptable housing types

Housing stock is not meeting diverse needs

Monoculture of housing types

Allow alternatives to on-site parking (satellite lots,etc.), promote alternatives to Single Occupant Vehicles (SOVs)

Consider temporary parking measures (allow gravel parking at South Farm, etc.). Current growth rate may be temporary, so may not require permanent improvements.

Mechanisms to test the efficacy of measures and to allow adjustments would be good.

Recognize that there has been a parking problem in some areas of the City for decades. What factors are driving that?

Campus housing can impact parking and transportation.

Other modes of transportation should be given more weight/priority.

Mixed use development should be promoted to reduce the need for vehicle trips. Reduce scale for commercial nodes.

Scale services appropriately for large student housing developments.

Make sure that alternative modes connect commercial centers.

Future on-campus parking management should be structured to maximize utilization of existing parking.

Flexibility needed for meeting parking requirements.

OSU and the City need to coordinate parking measures to work in tandem.

Parking utilization should be measured on campus and near campus.

Public transit scheduling should factor in class schedules.

Adaptive management and flexible strategies are needed for next District Plan.

Parking needs on campus vary greatly by use. A good plan will factor that in.

Explore regulating/classifying housing by lease arrangement.

How will we know when we have enough student housing? (and what should we do when we do?)

Integrating students into fabric of community maybe shouldn't be a bad thing?

Policy 9.7.3 – move to 28-30% on campus?

Need to balance multiple housing needs in neighborhoods to enhance livability.

Student housing places a demand on parks and open space areas.



Community Development
Planning Division
501 SW Madison Avenue
Corvallis, OR 97333

DRAFT
CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
JUNE 22, 2015

Present

Planning Commissioners:
Jennifer Gervais, *Chair*
Paul Woods
Ron Sessions

City Councilors
Frank Hann

Excused Absence:

Roen Hogg
Barbara Bull
Jasmin Woodside

Staff

Kevin Young, *Planning Division Manager*
Mark Lindgren, *Recorder*

Visitors:

Dave Dodson, OSU
Dan Brown
Courtney Cloyd
Gary Angelo
Court Smith
Marilyn Koenitzer
Councilor Penny York

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force (PRTF) was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 7:30 p.m. in the Downtown Fire Station Avenue Meeting Room. Introductions were made. Written testimony submitted prior to the meeting was provided by staff (Attachment A).

II. INTRODUCTION TO THE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE

Chair Jennifer Gervais said that there had been some misunderstanding in the community about the work of the Task Force. She explained that the group learned from the City Attorney's office that it could not address Land Development Code (LDC) Chapter 3.36 in this legislative process. Since it dealt so specifically with OSU, review of LDC Chapter 3.36 would require a quasi-judicial process. So, instead, the group set to work on the Comprehensive Plan (which overarches the LDC) policies and findings as they relate to OSU. It is not intended to be detailed; it is broad and aspirational, and creates room for development of Land Development Code language, which will address detail.

The task force considered all public testimony and tried to work it in. She said the public still has a chance to submit testimony over the next week. She noted the current Comp Plan is based on the 2020 Vision Statement; however, there hasn't been a re-visioning in over twenty years. While some testimony was submitted regarding Chapter 3.36, the task force could not consider it, since it was outside its scope.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

OSU Campus Planning Manager Dave Dodson highlighted his testimony (Attachment A) regarding proposed OSU comments. The comments sought to clarify, simplify, to remove duplication, and to remove “how-to” details (the latter should be codified). Regarding Article 3, Findings, 3.2.c, he recommended deletion of “In particular, cooperation is necessary to prevent simply land use conflicts from one entity to another”. OSU felt that was judgment rather than fact.

Regarding Proposed Policy 3.2.9, the recommendation was to re-word it, to the effect that “The City supports OSU’s leadership in carbon-smart programs”.

Article 5, Proposed New Finding, 5.2.f, should be re-worded from “In an attempt to keep university students close to the campus, the surrounding neighborhoods have been zoned for higher density” to “With increased enrollment at the university, surrounding neighborhoods have re-developed at higher densities”. Regarding 5.4.l, he was it was duplicated by 5.2.g, and so proposed striking 5.2.g.

Regarding Historic and Cultural Resources, OSU recommended only referencing intent of a policy, rather than the policy itself, since numbers can change over the years.

Regarding New Finding 5.4.o, OSU recommended changing from “The City of Corvallis and the Historic Resource Commission” to “The City of Corvallis and the locally designated landmarks commission” (since the name of the body can change over time (and *has* done so)).

Regarding Article 7, OSU proposed cleaning up typos and referencing. For example, 7.2.k states “On average, 20% of the land in the city is *in streets*”; he proposed “..devoted to streets” instead.

Regarding Housing, page 3, 9.7.e, he proposed rewording it to: “Development and redevelopment in higher density zones near the university has been designed to serve students, rather than family and employee housing types, which has led to *livability concerns* in some neighborhoods”.

Regarding New Finding 9.7.h, he proposed “Rapid growth in student population” striking the preceding “Negative impacts resulting from..”. He said the point was that rapid growth in enrollment was not adequately managed by Comp Plan policies in the Code.

Regarding Findings 9.7.l and 9.7.m, they are nearly identical, so OSU recommended keeping the simpler of the two: 9.7.m.

Regarding 9.7.2 and 9.7.3, he related that OSU was confused about the policies’ intent-whether it was aimed at students living on campus, or on or near campus. OSU suggested referencing that it is ideal for students to live *on* campus, but another acceptable option is for them to at least live close to campus, as opposed to further away.

Regarding 9.7.6, page 4, OSU felt it was important that the City explore options for experimental communities- “rather than “..to cooperate to facilitate the development of..”. Regarding 9.7.7, he proposed re-wording it to “The City shall *encourage* the university to

explore public/private partnerships". He proposed minor re-wording of 9.7.9, adding that it was similar to 9.7.m, so proposed striking 9.7.m.

Regarding Transportation, he proposed wordsmithing in 11.4.m, and suggested striking the reference to the source of the information listed in 11.4.n.

Regarding the Proposed New Finding under Transit, he proposed re-wording it to "The increase in use of CTS routes by students has affected certain CTS routes, contributing to over-crowding". He highlighted minor proposed wordsmithing in 11.7.j.

Regarding Transportation issues, he highlighted OSU's proposed re-writes in 11.12.c and 11.12.h. He proposed modifying 11.12.7 to "Explore the *viability* of remote parking options".

Regarding 11.12.8, OSU proposed striking it, since it wasn't sure of the purpose or intent. The language deals with the "how" to implement the policy, and OSU wasn't able to come up with a recommendation to change it. OSU proposed a re-write of 11.12.9.

Regarding Article 13, Finding 13.2.b, OSU suggested striking it, since *all* land uses have an impact on the community.

Regarding 13.2.f, page 6, OSU suggested striking it (it simply states history). He proposed grammatical edits to 13.2.j. Regarding 13.2.k, OSU felt portions of the Finding were opinion, rather than documented fact. OSU felt that 13.2.l was also more opinion than fact. Regarding 13.2.m, he said OSU has significant impact, but asked in what way it was disproportionate.

He highlighted suggested edits to 13.2.p, saying it should contain the correct metrics. Perhaps we need more reasonable, or different, metrics. OSU suggested striking or re-writing 13.2.q; OSU didn't know of any public-private partnerships that were actually done.

He suggested edits to 13.2.r. In 13.2.1, OSU proposed replacing "to provide the mission activities" with "to achieve the educational objectives".

He noted the new Plan was being termed a District Plan, not a Master Plan.

Under Proposed New Policies, 13.2.6 states "how" monitoring programs should be done, not the aspirational desire, regarding the need to provide monitoring programs to provide assurance that things were being done as they were expected to be done. There were proposed minor edits to the two other Policies.

Regarding 13.2.q, on public-private partnerships, Councilor Frank Hann said what was in mind were the developments with the hospital for a medical clinic on campus; the hotel; and other private sector things, and asked what would OSU call those rather than public-private partnerships. Mr. Dodson replied that these could be characterized as uses not primarily focused on the educational mission of the university; they are ancillary or supporting uses, not necessarily core uses operated by the university. He suggested using examples such as hotels and medical facilities in order to clarify.

Dan Brown stated he would later submit extensive additional written testimony. His overall concern goes back to the task force's decision not to address Chapter 3.36; that work will remain to be done.

He stated that the wording of 11.2.16 “Transportation requirements associated with development must be clear, measurable, and carefully monitored for effectiveness” was clear and appropriate. He cautioned that it will be difficult for average readers, without background, to understand the document. For example, he cited 13.2.q, “Unanticipated development, including public-private partnerships, led to community concerns that typical development requirements were not provided, and resultant uses were not primarily university oriented”.

Chair Gervais responded that the City Attorney had advised that legally the task force could not touch Chapter 3.36 as a legislative process; that would have to be quasi-judicial. The Comp Plan that must be changed before the Land Development Code.

Courtney Cloyd highlighted Proposed Policy 11.4.10, “On-street parking provides for a wide diversity of needs for Corvallis residents and people coming through Corvallis for work, school events...”. He said auto parking should be allocated according to the following principles- “Principal A- The streets of Corvallis belong to the community. Principal B- On street parking is a public resource which should be managed for the public good”.

He highlighted Principle C- “The parking fee system should be self-supporting and can provide additional resources for transit or transportation improvements” and Principal D- “Parking fees can be considered an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improved livability”. He commented that Principal C appeared to be an opportunity to invent another revenue stream, counter to frequently expressed general public opinions expressed during hearings on the parking districts proposals last June. There’s nothing wrong with regulation of parking, but it should not be seen as a revenue generator. Principle D also appeared to be another revenue generation opportunity, undermining the principle of streets belonging to the community, for community access.

Mr. Cloyd highlighted OSU’s tiered parking pricing, which sets the value of parking closest to the core campus at the highest price. He said that proposals that the City use parking permits open to the highest bidder; or on a first-come-first served basis; or requiring residents of neighborhoods near campus to pay a fee commensurate to fees charged by OSU; would be terribly counterproductive and undermine livability and having safe and accessible streets for periodic parking for residents, visitors, contractors, and students. Easy accessibility is the primary goal, so he proposed striking Principle D, as well as the second element of Principle C. He said that you’ll find a lot of objection for using streets for revenue generation.

Commissioner Wood replied that the reasoning behind the principals was that currently there isn’t easy access to those parking spots, due to overflow parking from campus. So, the idea suggested by the public was to use price to essentially create empty spaces. Mr. Cloyd said he was in a neighborhood affected by overflow from campus, and was a proponent of parking districts, though he’d initially opposed them in 2010. He stated that overflow parking has significantly increased just this year; the City’s study in his neighborhood showed a 91% occupancy during school week days in spring term.

Mr. Cloyd said that parking districts could be fairly administered with a certain number of permits per dwelling unit (with a kitchen). Many neighborhood residents rely on on-street parking (some older houses have no on-site parking). Users should pay a fee commensurate with the cost of administering the fee. You wouldn’t need to buy a permit if you didn’t need parking. Also, two-hour, once-a-day permits in a parking district allow for circulation, visitors, students and contractors; he’s seen it work in his Zone C. Though some contend that OSU

should be paying the cost of permitted parking for parking districts, he felt that it's a City issue that the City needs to address.

Commissioner Gervais said the intent of the language was not to rule out parking districts, and the language could be revisited. The solutions were proposed by community members, and background research studies from other communities suggested that free parking could actually be a real problem, as opposed to charging some amount of money. Perhaps we need to review 11.4.10. The Comp Plan is not intended to narrow solutions; instead, it should expand space for a wide range of solutions. Mr. Cloyd said the Comp Plan should provide guidance to create equity in use of community resources; this isn't as clear as it needs to be.

Marilyn Koenitzer said she wrote much of the first Comp Plan; much has changed since then. She felt the draft Plan was a very good start, going in the right direction, and just needing a little fine tuning. Regarding Mr. Dodson's suggested deletions, she said the last phrase in 3.2 should be retained ("cooperation is necessary to prevent simply shifting land use conflicts from one entity to another"). That could be re-visited; OSU expansion without proper planning or notification is a huge issue in Corvallis- the biggest since the riverfront.

She stated that most of Mr. Dodson's clarifications were reasonable. 9.7.h on page 3 could be retained or re-worded. Regarding 9.7.7, page 4, the statement is not as strong with Mr. Dodson's proposed deletion. Regarding 11.12, the first Finding, OSU proposed removing "parking"; she advocated leaving it in.

Regarding 11.12.8, she said that it affects her a lot- driving from north to south, and from east to west around the university is very difficult. The more roads OSU can keep open, the better it is for the community. We need to have a conversation on this, even though OSU proposed taking this out.

She said that 13.2.k and 13.2.l could be re-worded; we only need one statement about the changes since the last Comp Plan, and how OSU has affected livability. 13.2.m should perhaps refer to the impact on community land use, the building, and the multiplex apartments going up in neighborhoods. It should perhaps be re-worded from "disproportionate impact" to better clarify the intent.

She suggested re-wording 13.2.6 Proposed New Policies to clarify intent. Regarding 9.4.11, on page 9, she said that we need to include better architectural design criteria and better spatial relationships of buildings to one another as well as the streets to the land. She cited poor layout on a recent development on SW Brooklane.

Regarding 9.4.11, we're one of the densest cities in Oregon of our size, with smaller lot sizes. We need to increase our building standards if we're going to become more dense, such as improved soundproofing, improved insulation, and maintaining privacy in balconies and courtyards. Seniors might prefer living in apartments with such improved standards.

Regarding 9.5.j, she said that the 2014 Policy Options Study on housing prepared for the Council by EcoNorthwest proposed streamlining the annexation process. However, the major cost of housing is land; we worked hard to institute the existing annexation reforms. She also had concern about the urban renewal proposal. The study seems to have a very narrow scope, focusing on commuting rather than the kinds of housing we need. We need a better housing study and to figure out ways to make it happen.

She wished we had more single level housing for sale for seniors; there are not many available. Chair Gervais said the task force will likely meet in early July, and advocated submitting testimony at least several days before we meet. Chair Gervais thanked her for her work on the original Comp Plan.

Gary Angelo, of the College Hill Neighborhood Association, concurred with Mr. Cloyd's comments. Regarding parking fees, he said it would be helpful for language to distinguish between parking fees such as meters and parking district permit fees; and separate that from discussion of funding transit. Parking district self-funding models have been successful; they are a response to inadequate parking in appropriate places in older neighborhoods surrounding campus. Older neighborhoods have garages and driveways meant for smaller cars; you can't apply generic parking theory to specific cases in our older neighborhoods, which need to be protected. Currently we're in danger of losing our old neighborhoods due to our policies and development; he's heard some residents say that they might have to leave in a few years.

He noted that he was a member of the Traffic and Parking Work Group of the Collaboration. He said there is an administrative side to parking districts, annual \$15 per year needed to cover printing and issuing permits, and installing and maintaining adequate signage. The fee can be raised over time to be self-supporting. The intent was to assure that fees would fully support the cost of administering and maintaining the physical aspects of the district. Permit fees are not intended to support enforcement; the cost of paid parking tickets supports that. The Council felt there should be a guaranteed minimum fee for violations in order to support an enforcement funding stream.

Court Smith, on behalf of OSUPAL, advocated in favor of Policy 11.4.10. There's a good deal of evidence in looking at parking districts and fees as separate things; however, studies show that getting parking *right* is essential for communities. Studies have shown that whatever parking arrangement is in place, roughly 80% parking spaces should be filled, but some need to remain open for use. Also, you need to control parking in high traffic areas; the turnover is beneficial for businesses. The two references that OSU sought to delete in this regard provide good evidence for getting parking right, pricing it right, and not giving it away for free (which has tremendous costs for communities).

He emphasized that funds do go to transport and transit. Transport includes infrastructure, such as streets- everything used for cars. You need money for parking signs- we need a revenue source for that, and the state and the federal government wouldn't give money for that. Transit is an option to solve problems, making it easier to get to places people want to go without taking a car. For example, downtown is underused at some peak times due to inadequate parking or the means to get there without a car. The proposed use of funds was to improve the community, not taxing people unfairly. He proposed having cars pay their own way; cars consume 20% of the land in the community and there is little charge for using that land. Everyone loves free parking, but we need some kind of rules to allocate parking. Some allocations make no sense; for example, he could park on 16th Street for a week for free, while people are paying \$300 or \$400 for parking within a block of there.

Regarding parking districts, they do not pay for themselves; the big funding source is people parking illegally, (bringing in over 50%); residents only pay a very low fee. Simply painting parking lines would promote more efficient usage, but that costs money, from a revenue source. Parking regulations must be designed to fit our city.

Councilor Penny York commented that Mr. Dodson’s so-called minor edits in the last two items fundamentally change those proposed policies, and are not minor edits. In 3.2.7, changing “..shall be *required*” to “considered” changes the policy entirely to an idea rather than a mandate. This is a policy change, not a grammatical change.

Regarding “The City and OSU shall encourage OSU to develop a means..” she said that the intent was to encourage OSU to develop a decision-making process more transparent to the general public. She proposed the task force examine the intent of the language and clarify it.

Chair Gervais encouraged additional comments. She noted that, prior to adoption of any revisions to The Comprehensive Plan, the City Council and the Planning Commission will both review this, so there would be additional opportunities for testimony.

IV. DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Commissioner Woods highlighted Director Ken Gibb’s June 5, 2015 memo to the task force, Attachment E-1, from the June 8, 2015 packet. The thrust was that the LDC amendment process might be considered too burdensome to make changes in monitoring that could be required in a new District Plan. In the old Campus Master Plan, there was an LDC section on monitoring, but there was a proposal to change that. However, that process has not gone through in the official way that it should have been undertaken, and Director Gibb was seeking to making these changes in the future and avoiding the LDC amendment process. He said that Director Gibb was recommending an alternative method- the City Council creating a Council Policy. Commissioner Woods said that his concern was that a Council Policy would not have the force of law and that OSU would be under no obligation to follow it.

Manager Young replied that he’d discussed the issue with the City Attorney and the Community Development Director. A Council Policy does not have the same force of law; the LDC has the force of law, but the intent expressed was to allow more flexibility to make adjustments to monitoring. The LDC process is not very nimble, and takes time. The recommendation was for a means, such as a Council Policy, that could be utilized, in relation to monitoring. The mechanism would need to be binding on both parties through adoption of the District Plan. A Council Policy can be changed through committee review process, along with Council process and a public comment opportunity.

Commissioner Woods said he was hearing confirmation that a Council Policy does not have force of law. He cited a case in which a statement in The Campus Master Plan was not being performed by the university, but there was nothing in the LDC that implemented that policy, and the university declined to do so, saying it was not in the LDC. The LDC amendment process, while it can take a while, is not much worse than the Council Policy process, just requiring two public hearings rather than one.

Chair Gervais asked Manager Young to present a contrast between Council Policy review versus LDC process. Manager Young replied that the LDC is a minimum three-month process; it may take longer, and is subject to appeal. Commissioner Sessions noted that Council Policy still took six weeks or so; while changing the LDC can be a piecemeal process, it is not onerous. Manager Young said staff weren’t opposed to utilization of the LDC amendment process if that is the desire of the Task Force. It is just not a very flexible tool; there may be other tools, as well. Chair Gervais asked staff to bring back a list of possible tools, but we don’t have the information tonight to respond to this. Commissioner

Sessions said we want a set of minimum standards for reporting for OSU, but circumstances may change, and other reporting criteria may be mutually agreed upon by both OSU and the City. Chair Gervais asked that this be put on the next agenda.

Commissioner Woods said he wanted to respond to Director Gibb's proposal to use Council Policy. He said he hadn't had a chance to read testimony received today. Manager Young said one option is to step back in terms of the specificity of the Comp Plan policy. It may be enough to say that OSU monitoring requirements should be binding, but should include some means for adjustments if monitoring fails to measure issues of concern. The details could be worked out later; The Task Force concurred with this approach. Manager Young will bring back draft language.

Regarding questions from public testimony, Chair Gervais said that testimony regarding the quad and the Women's Building appeared to be unrelated to the task force's work, and seemed to be more like a code enforcement issue. Commissioner Woods said it may depend on interpretation of how to regard the Olmstead Plan. Manager Young said it could be viewed several ways. The writer cites provisions of the existing Master Plan; they relate to design considerations for campus planning, so it could be viewed as a violation of the current framework or in terms of whether we need to craft policy on quads and the historic plan for the campus and preserving that pattern of development. Chair Gervais replied that we've stayed away from telling OSU what to do on its property.

Commissioner Woods said there is not a legal violation of the Master Plan. This underscores that any code we suggest should be translated carefully into the law through the LDC- the only thing the university has demonstrated that it will follow. Manager Young noted that in the area in question, both the new Business School building and the Classroom Building were reviewed by the HRC and found to be compatible.

V. DETERMINE NEED / AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Gervais anticipated at least one more meeting. A Doodle poll would be sent out to schedule the next meeting. Councilor Hann suggested avoiding another Housing conflict; Manager Young said the first and second weeks in July were being considered.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.



Capital Planning and Development
100 Oak Creek Building
3015 SW Western Blvd., Corvallis, Oregon 97333
Main Line: 541-737-5412 | Fax: 541-737-4810

June 22, 2015

Members of the Plan Review Task Force:

OSU appreciates all the work the Task Force has done to update the OSU related Articles of the City’s Comprehensive Plan. We respectfully request that you consider some additional edits as noted below in blue. As always, we will be available to answer questions during your meeting this evening.

Article 3. Land Use Guidelines

3.2 General Land Use

Findings

3.2.c Continued cooperation among Corvallis, Benton County, Linn County, and Oregon State University is important in the review of development. This should help to ensure compatibility between uses on private and public lands. In particular, cooperation is necessary to prevent simply shifting land use conflicts from one entity to another.

Proposed New Policy

3.2.9 The City supports OSU’s should consider being a community leadership in carbon smart programs and transportation demand management that benefits the larger Corvallis community.

Article 5. Urban Amenities

5.2 Community Character

Proposed New Findings

5.2.f In an attempt to keep University students close to the campus, the surrounding neighborhoods have received an underlying zoning that is denser than the existing neighborhoods. With larger increased enrollment numbers at the University, the surrounding neighborhoods have redeveloped to at higher densities.

Note: the finding below is identical to 5.4.1 below and should be deleted.

~~5.2.g City zoning allowed for the redevelopment of single family homes in the neighborhoods surrounding OSU and, accordingly, the growth of student-oriented complexes. While these student-oriented complexes help reduce vehicle trips to campus, they can also alter the character of the older single-family neighborhoods.~~

5.4 Historic and Cultural Resources

Proposed New Findings

Note: making reference to specific finding and policy numbers is not advisable, as they are subject to change and difficult to track.

~~5.4.n The lack of progress on historic inventory and preservation work, as reflected in Policy 5.4.8 has failed to protect older neighborhoods in the vicinity of Oregon State University and downtown.~~

~~5.4.o OSU maintains an inventory of historic resources on campus for the review and use of the City of Corvallis and the locally designated landmarks commission.~~

Article 7. Environmental Quality

Proposed New Findings

~~7.2.i Car ~~D~~dependence increases pollution, reduces air and water quality, causes public health problems, raises safety issues, and adds to global climate change.~~

~~7.2.k Car dependence requires land for infrastructure. On average, 20% of the land in cities is ~~in~~ devoted to streets, not including land in parking lots, driveways, and garages.~~

Article 9. Housing

9.7 Oregon State University Housing

Findings

~~9.7.d The student population is not expected to increase significantly during the planning period. The percentage of the total population who are students will decrease as the non-student population increases.~~

~~Historically, Long range forecasts of student enrollment growth have not always proven to be accurate, therefore, In addition, these forecasts are not have not been a reliable measure of impacts to the community.~~

~~9.7.e There are approximately 140 acres of land zoned medium density residential and 85 acres of land zoned medium high residential within a 1/2 mile of the main OSU campus, all of which has some potential for rezoning to a higher density.~~

~~Development and redevelopment in higher density zones near the University has been designed to primarily serve students, rather than family and employee housing types, which has led to reduced livability concerns in some neighborhoods.~~

New Findings

~~9.7.h Negative impacts resulting from rRapid growth in the student population between 2009 and 2015 were not adequately managed by Comprehensive Plan Policies and Land Development Code requirements in place at the time.~~

Note: finding 9.7.l and 9.7.m are nearly identical. OSU recommends using 9.7.m as it provides the same facts with fewer words.

~~9.7.l Between January 2009 and March 2015, the City's demolition permit data suggest that approximately 69 detached single family dwellings were demolished in Corvallis. Many of these units were replaced by student-oriented housing, characterized by five-bedroom dwelling units, with one bathroom provided per bedroom, and multiple floors within units.~~

~~9.7.m Characteristics of student-oriented housing have more recently included a preponderance of five-bedroom units, with one bathroom per bedroom, and multiple floors within units.~~

Policies

9.7.2 The City shall encourage OSU to establish policies and procedures to encourage resident students to live on or near campus.

9.7.3 ~~The City and OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the students who attend regular classes on campus in units on campus or within a 1/2 mile of campus.~~

The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of housing faculty, staff, and students who work and attend regular classes on campus to live in dwelling units on or near campus.

New Policies

9.7.6 The City and OSU shall ~~consider exploring options for cooperate to facilitate the development of~~ experimental communities that are not dependent upon the single-occupant automobile.

9.7.7 The City shall ~~encourage promote the utilization by~~ the University ~~to explore~~ of public-private partnerships to provide additional, on-campus student housing that provides housing that would be more attractive to upperclassmen, graduate students, and University staff than traditional on-campus housing options.

9.7.9 ~~The City shall consider a~~ amendments to the Land Development Code ~~shall be considered~~ to address the negative impacts resulting from the development of student-oriented, off-campus housing, ~~as described in Finding 9.7.m.~~

Article 11. Transportation

11.4 Auto Parking

Proposed New Findings

11.4.l ~~Many residences lack adequate off-street parking, resulting in increased and place parking demand on adjacent streets. While many major traffic generators provide off-street parking, they also create on-street parking demand. The generators include OSU, LBCC, District 509J, City and County government, multi-household dwellings, businesses, offices, and churches.~~

11.4.m ~~People have various needs for parking on streets to reach a job, obtain services, purchase goods, visit, or provide services to businesses and residences, get to places for recreation, and attend events. Thus, parking rules must accommodate a variety of needs of Corvallis residents, businesses, and transients to the community.~~

11.4.n ~~Parking fees can benefit communities when used to develop transit and transportation options (Shoup 2011, Speck 2013).~~

11.7 Transit

Proposed New Findings

11.7.i ~~The Corvallis Transit System (CTS) charges no fares. The increase in use of the CTS by students has significantly affected certain CTS routes, contributing to overcrowding.~~

11.7.j The limited frequency of service and inconvenience of connections ~~has limited~~ transit ridership.

11.12 Oregon State University Transportation Issues

Findings

11.12.c OSU and the City are cooperatively studying the use of ~~Off~~ campus on-street parking ~~by of~~ university-related vehicles ~~to determine the level of impact has a significant impact~~ on the availability of on-street parking near campus. The University and the City are working together by ~~maintaining the free transit system encouraging increased use of the free transit pass program, encouraging increased~~ bicycle and pedestrian travel, and by ~~studying and devising a developing and implementing a parking~~ plan.

Proposed New Findings

11.12.h ~~Loss of parking in Sector C of the OSU Campus makes it more difficult for members of the public to access the core of campus for events open to the public events.~~

Proposed New Policies

11.12.7 OSU shall work with the City and other community partners to explore ~~the viability of~~ remote parking options.

~~11.12.8 The practice of limiting vehicle circulation through campus has had an effect on traffic patterns. When OSU decides to limit or cut off vehicular access to campus, a plan shall be developed to assess the existing traffic patterns and how they will be affected by the change. A mitigation plan shall be developed and approved by the City to mitigate negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods and to the City's transportation system.~~

11.12.9 OSU and the City shall work together to accommodate short-term visitor ~~parking nears to~~ the campus core.

Article 13. Special Areas of Concern

13.2 Oregon State University

Findings

~~13.2.b The location and function of University land uses have a major impact on the community.~~

13.2.f In 1986, the City adopted the Oregon State University Plan which updated the Physical Development Plan for the main campus. This made the Oregon State University Plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with State law.

Proposed New Findings

13.2.j Enrollment projections under the 2005 Campus Master Plan were exceeded by 1,883 students, or 7.7%. In 2004 ~~t~~There were 3,422 beds on campus within residence halls and co-ops, with a ~~f~~Fall ~~t~~Ferm on-campus undergraduate enrollment of 15,196. In 2014, on-campus ~~f~~Fall ~~t~~Ferm undergraduate enrollment was 20,312, and there were 4,846 beds provided in on-campus housing.

13.2.k Oregon State University added 5,316 students and 1,775 faculty and staff between 2003 and 2014 – 201.5, ~~r~~resulting in changes to the community. OSU's impact on the community with respect to the percentage of the overall community exceeds any other entity.

13.2.l ~~T~~The disproportionate contribution made by OSU to the community's resident and employee composition results in a disproportionate impact by land-use decisions made by OSU relative to any other entity.

13.2.m Because of ~~t~~the disproportionate impact OSU has on the community as a result of its relative size and economic impact, land-use decisions made by the university require a great degree of ongoing communication, coordination, and monitoring by the city.

13.2.p Community concerns were raised about the adequacy and implementation of monitoring, as described in the 2004 – 2015 Campus Master Plan and required in LDC Chapter 3.36. Concerns included ~~m~~onitoring that was not completed, LDC monitoring requirements that did not contain ~~r~~reasonable~~t~~he ~~c~~orrect metrics, and changes in monitoring without commensurate LDC text amendments. A review of the monitoring submittals over the 2005-2014 time period indicates that while a high percentage of the required monitoring information was provided, there were periodic gaps primarily related to parking utilization counts in off-campus parking districts, transportation demand management reports, and Jackson Street traffic counts.

13.2.q ~~U~~nanticipated development, including public/private partnerships, led to community concerns that typical development requirements were not provided, and resultant uses were not primarily university-oriented.

13.2.r ~~S~~ome members of ~~t~~he public ~~h~~aves expressed concern that there has been inadequate public review of development on campus.

Policies

13.2.1 The University and City should work cooperatively to develop and recognize means and methods to allow the University to achieve its educational objectives, provide the mission activities.

13.2.3 The City shall continue to work with Oregon State University on future updates of the 2004 Oregon State University Campus Master Plan, or successor university master plan document and amendments to the 1986 Oregon State University Plan. Coordination shall continue between the City and Oregon State University on land use policies and decisions.

Proposed New Policies

13.2.6 The city and OSU shall closely coordinate land-use actions that have the potential to impact either the university or the surrounding community. Monitoring programs shall be established to determine whether conditions and assumptions underlying the Campus Master Plan-OSU development are valid ~~on an annual basis. These monitoring programs can occur anywhere in the community. If conditions exceed pre-determined thresholds or evidence suggests that metrics are not tracking conditions of interest, a review of the OSU District Plan shall be implemented even if the planning period has not expired. If necessary, adjustments shall be implemented.~~

13.2.7 Permitted uses on the OSU Campus shall be primarily University-related. Where public-private partnerships have the potential to significantly impact the larger community, a public review process shall be considered required.

13.2.8 The City and OSU shall ~~encourage OSU to develop a means of development-a decision-making process that is that is more~~ transparent.

We appreciate your time and effort and look forward to your final recommended changes for the City Council to consider.

Sincerely,

David Dodson

David j. Dodson, AICP
University Land Use Planning Manager

June 22, 2015

OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE

Thank you for your extensive, time consuming work on the Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies related OSU. This is a complex and confusing topic for citizens and I am sure that few citizens will weigh in. That does not mean that we are not interested or concerned, but rather that we lack confidence in our ability to understand the documents and to contribute effectively.

I have attempted to wade through the Proposed Revisions posted at the City's web site and I find many improvements and things to like. I feel that you have listened to comments made by citizens and have proposed many needed changes. I offer the comments or observations below not expecting many additional changes but hoping that everyone continues to be vigilant and alert to potential issues.

- 1) 3.2.i Land within the Urban Fringe contains large contiguous Oregon State University agricultural and forestry land areas. The ability of these areas in support of instruction / research and extension activities requires that these large areas must be maintained free from division into small land parcels.

I wish to address the highlighted phrase. This would seem to imply that all agricultural and forest lands either in the UGB or inside an area considered Urban Fringe remain in agricultural and forest uses. I assume the Urban Fringe is a specific boundary and some of OSU's agricultural and forest lands are within this boundary. For instance, some of the land between 35th and 53rd. This wording then seems to imply that these lands cannot or should not be converted within the planning period to other uses such as housing, parking or instructional buildings. I do not know if that is the intent or not.

I would like to suggest either a clarification or a revision to this phrase. It should be clear that OSU needs to have access to agricultural and forest lands in proximity to the campus. However, some lands that are currently in agricultural or forest uses may need to be converted to other uses such as housing or institutional structures. Of course, OSU may need to replace these converted lands with other lands suitable for agricultural and forest research. The idea of having large tracts of agricultural and forest lands inside the Urban Fringe without them ever being able to support urbanization seems counterintuitive. Or perhaps these lands (if your intent is to permanently designate them agricultural and forest) should be removed from the Fringe designation.

Personally, I think some of OSU's agricultural and/or forest lands may need to be converted to housing uses and that this wording has been inserted to prevent or block any such conversion. Added note: Later in the document I did find some wording that implied some openness to future conversion of lands, although it still seems a rather low emphasis.

- 2) Regarding Article 5. Urban Amenities; 5.2 Community Character.

It seems to me that there could or should be an additional finding related to how the character of the City has morphed or changed with growth of OSU. After all, it is the amenities that have been impacted and changed the character of our community. OSU's enrollment has impacted City

services including transportation and traffic; library; parks and recreation; and others. We have experienced increased tax levies and service cuts while OSU growth has put pressure on services. At least to some degree, this change in character can be connected to growth at OSU. The OSU community (students and staff) now constitutes a bigger percentage of community population and OSU's growth exceeded the City's ability to sustain levels of service. I do not have specific wording to offer at this time but hope that you discuss this before advancing your findings to Council.

3) New Parks and Recreation Finding 5.6.w : The University offers many recreational opportunities.

Perhaps this should read "The University offers many recreational opportunities while the City, at tax payer expense, augments University activities with City-funded programs. Obviously this true and is more accurate in stating the condition of recreation related to OSU and its student population.

4) Proposed new finding 5.6.x:

This new finding should point out that the unexpected and unplanned enrollment increases over the last 10 years have placed a significant burden on the City's capital and operational needs for park facilities and recreational programs. Property tax revenues support P&R activities and OSU pays no property taxes. Yet students housed on campus make regular use of parks and recreational facilities.

5) 8.2 Employment and Economic Development.

One of the problems (as your findings point out) is that Corvallis has a high percentage of non-tax paying entities. Uncontrolled (unregulated) growth in the tax exempt category results in service problems for the City. Perhaps we should consider a Policy that indicates that growth should not exceed the community's ability to pay taxes and fees to support services. I suspect this would be hard to do, but to have no Policy about this problem doesn't seem to be adequate either.

6) 8.4.d.

This finding under Economy/Education lists many of the contributions OSU makes to the community, not just Education contributions. This item also ignores the adverse impact from the fact that OSU pays no property taxes to support local government services. Are Findings only intended to point out positive aspects while ignoring the negative?

7) Policies 8.4.1 and 8.4.2

These Policies both call for the City to "support" OSU. I am wondering what support means, particularly when it is preceded by "shall". I have no problem with "encourage" or "cooperate".

8) Housing Affordability Finding 9.5.e

Why does this Finding refer to "ownership" only? It seems to me that there is an "increasing need for housing types which offer lower cost rental and ownership possibilities.....". The cost-of-housing problems in Corvallis are not limited to ownership.

9) Finding 9.7.d regarding the inaccuracy of enrollment growth forecasts.

I was pleased to see this added, although one could argue that it should say “OSU forecasts”, since it was OSU’s campus forecasts being referred to. One could also note that the City failed to recognize the error in forecasted figures for many years, thus compounding the problem. My point here is that unless the City recognizes that forecasts must be tracked and measured, then the City will never know if it is on track or not. Perhaps this could be added as Finding 9.7.h: “The 2004 OSU Campus Plan had inaccurately low projections of student and faculty populations which went unrecognized by the City for over a decade”. It isn’t enough to say that the projections were wrong, it needs to be said that they were overlooked or ignored.

10) OSU Housing Finding 9.7.i.

This finding should be re-worded. The current wording implies that needed seismic upgrades was the reason for converting the housing to office use. While that may be the excuse used, in reality, OSU wanted to “re-purpose” the structures for office use. They are still seismically at risk and still occupied by people.

11) OSU Housing Finding 9.7.j.

The way this is worded seems to imply that there is a bigger demand in Corvallis for multi-family housing than there is for single family housing. Is there a basis for this? Is there a higher vacancy rate in single family housing than apartments? I would say that there is high demand for all types of housing in Corvallis and that there is an undersupply of almost every type of housing. There is particularly a dramatic under supply of single level, single family homes for senior citizens. Now, if the current wording is simply trying to say that in Corvallis there is a higher percentage of apartments to single family homes (than typical communities) because of student populations, then ok. But that isn’t how it reads to me. I would hate to see the wording here used to justify conversion of every single family zoned parcel to multi-family to accommodate student housing.

12) OSU Housing 9.7.n

Did anyone check the numbers? The item reads “...increases in overall enrollment haven’t ***necessarily*** resulted in an increase in the freshman class...”. Either it did or didn’t. This appears to be a justification for why OSU build fewer on-campus units than might otherwise be expected. But in fact this simply points out the tremendous burden that OSU’s policies and practices placed on the community’s private housing infrastructure.

13) Article 11 Transportation, Policy 11.2.17

I am concerned that this policy only requires measureable TDM measures. It does not require that the TDM measures accepted in lieu of improvement actually be effective. If a TDM measure is approved at time of development, there should be some monitoring over time to assure that the TDM measure actually worked. There needs to be a mechanism to insure that the developers and their hired engineers are responsible for correcting deficiencies when TDM measures prove to be ineffective. Perhaps this can be simply achieved by inserting the words “enforceable” and “effective”.

14) Auto Parking Finding 11.4.i

This finding is somewhat misleading to me. Paved parking lots can easily be removed and the property converted to development-ready status. It is true that a paved lot cannot easily be returned to pristine open space or plant-based uses, but neither can a gravel lot. So what is the point? If parking is required, why is there any thought to eliminating the required parking? I am not sure what the point of this finding is or who proposed it. If it is desired to allow gravel lots for OSU (and others?), then why not a finding that says that gravel lots may be an option rather than coming up with some bogus excuse. I am not opposed to (some) gravel lots for OSU, but this just seems disingenuous.

15) Pedestrian

I didn't see any policies in the report regarding pedestrians. That seems somewhat strange given the importance of pedestrian access to campus. And then I remembered the Campus Crest development when OSU refused to grant either a pedestrian or bicycle easement across OSU property to Campus Way. Obviously, such access to campus would have been easier, safer and faster for campus bound students living in this development. Can there not be a Policy that says "OSU shall cooperate with the City to establish safe and effective pedestrian routs to and through campus"? It isn't good enough that the City cooperate with OSU; OSU must also cooperate with the City.

16) OSU Transportation Issues Finding 11.12.i

This suggests that lack of regional transportation options influences student's decision to bring cars to campus, but would it not influence their decision to bring cars to Corvallis also? What I have observed (I think) is that some students bring cars to Corvallis but don't necessarily take them to campus.

17) OSU Transportation Issues

I notice that 11.12.2 requires OSU to develop and implement a parking plan. But the Policy does not indicate that the City shall review or in any way accept or approve the plan or receive reports on effectiveness. Since parking is one of the major issues in the community, would it not be advisable to include some role for the City?

Thank you for reading and considering.

In the final analysis, I think it is the LDC that regulates OSU development and is where our efforts need to be centered. These findings and policies have little impact unless the LDC incorporates mechanisms and controls that insure the outcomes the community desires.

Rolland Baxter

From: [Jeff Hess](#)
To: [Young, Kevin](#)
Subject: Re: Input for OSU-Related Comp plan review task-force
Date: Saturday, June 20, 2015 9:56:44 AM

Amended and corrected...

I'm afraid I'll be out of town during the public input opportunity. Please consider the comments below and thanks to everyone who's worked on this document.

Regards,
Jeff Hess

5.2.g ... This process also resulted in an exodus from neighborhoods of families and established communities resulting in many un-planned moves and hardships. It also removed the 'self-policing' impact of established, mostly non-student, communities.

5.4.n change from "has failed" to "contributed to the failure"... An additional contributing factor was the lack of leadership to quickly address the lack of protection for these neighborhoods via the same (already proposed), LDC amendments that ultimately arrested it.

5.4.o OSUs recent growth spurt catalyzed a housing crisis in Corvallis whereby fewer people who work or attend classes in Corvallis can purchase homes here.

7.2.9 People attending Oregon State University athletic events make a significant contribution to green house gas emissions.

7.2.10 Using recently completed transportation studies OSU and the city shall develop a quantified environmental impact measure for student housing located on-campus vs. off-campus based on commuting habits, housing density, concentration of services and runoff.

7.2.11 In response to OSUs recent growth spurt the city has developed significant amounts of wetlands and threatened species habitat.

8.2.d Change to "The stability of Corvallis and Benton County's economy is unhealthily dependent on

8.2.p Corvallis has a population component that is not benefited economically by OSU's presence or growth (seniors, work at home individuals, non-student oriented businesses, etc.). Concentrating solely on the overall numbers of OSUs economic impact to Benton County or the city of Corvallis when weighing city-altering decisions misses the significant negative impact OSU decisions can have upon these populations.

8.2.q Student debt is a national crisis. OSU is one of the largest generators of student debt in the PNW. Each year there are more university graduates then there are comparable jobs in the market.

8.2.r The significant percentage of non-tax paying entities in Corvallis requires that Corvallis funds a disproportionate amount of non-city related services. These added costs are visited upon businesses and individuals in the form of new taxes and fees that make Corvallis less attractive to businesses that are unrelated to OSU which would help diversity the local economy.

8.2.s The significant conversion of 'own-able' housing to 'rental' housing, coupled with the many neighborhoods now dominated by the influence of student housing, has reduced Corvallis' attractiveness to diversifying businesses that would seek to attract skilled employees interested in a more traditional, family oriented lifestyle.

8.2.t The housing crisis created by OSUs recent growth makes Corvallis less attractive to diversifying businesses that would seek to attract skilled employees interested in avoiding a commute-based lifestyle.

8.4.1 Remove the verb "support" (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

8.4.2 Delete altogether (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

9.7.b According to OSU spokesperson Steve Clark, Cauthorn hall (267 rooms) was closed from 2004-2005 for renovations thus using 2004 as a comparison falsely inflates the capacity OSU has added. A more accurate baseline to compare against would be 2003 or 2006.

9.7.h Negative impacts resulting from unforecasted rapid growth in the student population...

9.7.o University-provided on-campus housing is policed by state officers at no cost to Corvallis, off-campus housing has required a new tax levy to fund special policing requirements.

9.7.p University-provided on-campus housing is protected from free-market housing fluctuations and demand-based pricing while privately-owned housing elsewhere in the community does not.

9.7.q OSU has found that students living on-campus do better in classes and are more likely to earn a degree than those living off-campus.

9.7.r Given the ability of OSU decisions to impact the housing market, and the impact their statements have on investor-based developers, OSU should work with the city to develop housing plans prior to announcing or implementing any changes.

9.7.3 OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the faculty, staff and students work work and attend regular classes on campus in on-campus housing.

9.7.10 OSU shall undertake a donor campaign to provide "debt free" on-campus housing for students where dorm rates only cover upkeep & replacement costs (no bonds).

9.7.11 In response to OSUs recent growth spurt the city has moved to develop land

that voters had previously set aside for much-needed 'own-able' single family housing, for student oriented rental housing.

9.7.12 Studies* have correlated improved psychological health, physical health, parenting and children's academic achievement & behavior and social and political participation in homeowners over renters. *Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/hbti-04.pdf

11.4.11 Zonal parking districts instill an economic gradation to campus access as students from higher-income households can afford access students from lower-income households cannot. Among students, OSU should consider making all zones a single price but distributed by lottery (or some form of random assigning), allowing all students an equal opportunity for preferred parking spaces.

13.2.t Changes OSU implements to parking fees and program structure affect parking habits (as demonstrated with OSUs current zonal parking plan). Similarly past changes were also likely to have affected parking behavior and should have nullified parking utilization goals that were set based on a different, original, structure and fee base.

13.2.6 The 2004-2015 Campus Master Plan stated ..."if conditions change significantly or other unanticipated events occur, it may be necessary to update the CMP before the end of the planning period." As the enrollment growth realized was not anticipated in the projections of this CMP it should have triggered an update which then could have addressed the housing and parking needs of this new growth. This update did not occur to some great detriment. ... Then on to proposed policy.

On Sat, Jun 20, 2015 at 12:32 AM, Jeff Hess <jeffhess100@gmail.com> wrote:
I'm afraid I'll be out of town during the public input opportunity. Please consider the comments below and thanks to everyone who's worked on this document.

Regards,
Jeff Hess

5.2.g ... This process also resulted in an exodus from neighborhoods of families and established communities resulting in many un-planned moves and hardships. It also removed the 'self-policing' impact of established, mostly non-student, communities.

5.4.n change from "has failed" to "contributed to the failure"... An additional contributing factor was the lack of leadership to quickly address the lack of protection for these neighborhoods via the same (already proposed), LDC amendments that ultimately arrested it.

7.2.9 People attending Oregon State University athletic events make a significant contribution to green house gas emissions.

7.2.10 Based off recently completed transportation studies OSU and the city shall develop a quantified environmental impact measure for student housing located on-campus vs. off-campus based on commuting habits, housing density, concentration of services and runoff.

8.2.d Change to "The stability of Corvallis and Benton County's economy is unhealthily dependent on

8.2.p In spite of OSU's economic dominance, increased taxes/fees visited upon Corvallis residents to pay for OSU induced expenses unfairly impact those residents who do not benefit from OSU's presence. Cost externalizations upon the city result in increased taxes making Corvallis less attractive to businesses unassociated with OSU which would help to dilute the local economy.

8.4.1 Remove the verb "support" (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

8.4.2 Delete altogether (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

9.7.b According to OSU spokesperson Steve Clark, Cauthorn hall (267 rooms) was closed from 2004-2005 for renovations thus using 2004 as a comparison falsely inflates the capacity OSU has added. A more accurate baseline to compare against would be 2003 or 2006.

9.7.h Negative impacts resulting from unforecasted rapid growth in the student population...

9.7.o University-provided on-campus housing is policed by state officers at no cost to Corvallis, off-campus housing has required a new tax levy to fund special policing requirements.

9.7.p University-provided on-campus housing is protected from free-market housing fluctuations and demand-based pricing while privately-owned housing elsewhere in the community does not.

9.7.q OSU has found that students living on-campus do better in classes and are more likely to earn a degree than those living off-campus.

9.7.r Given the ability of OSU decisions to impact the housing market, and the impact their statements have on investor-based developers, OSU should work with the city to develop housing plans prior to announcing or implementing any changes.

9.7.3 OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the faculty, staff and students work work and attend regular classes on campus in on-campus housing.

9.7.10 OSU shall undertake a donor campaign to provide "debt free" on-campus housing for students where dorm rates only cover upkeep & replacement costs (no bonds).

11.4.11 Zonal parking districts instill an economic gradation to campus access as students from higher-income households can afford access students from lower-income households cannot. Among students, OSU should consider making all zones a single price but distributed by lottery (or some form of random assigning), allowing all students an equal opportunity for preferred parking spaces.

13.2.t Changes OSU implements to parking fees and program structure affect parking habits (as demonstrated with OSUs current zonal parking plan). Similarly past changes were also likely to have affected parking behavior and should have nullified parking utilization goals that were set based on a different, original, structure and fee base.

13.2.6 The 2004-2015 Campus Master Plan stated ..."if conditions change significantly or other unanticipated events occur, it may be necessary to update the CMP before the end of the planning period." As the enrollment growth realized was not anticipated in the projections of this CMP it should have triggered an update which then could have addressed the housing and parking needs of this new growth. This update did not occur to some great detriment. ... Then on to proposed policy.

DRAFT
CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
July 9, 2015

Present

Planning Commissioners:

Jennifer Gervais, Chair

Paul Woods

Jasmin Woodside

City Councilors:

Barbara Bull

Frank Hann

Roen Hogg

Staff

Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager

Terry Nix, Recorder

Visitors

Dave Bella

Jeff Hess

David Dodson

Charles Vars

Excused Absence

Ron Sessions

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force (TF) was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 6:00 p.m., in the Madison Avenue meeting room. Introductions were made.

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Jeff Hess said he previously submitted written comments. He thought the recommendation could be strengthened with findings related to the City's dependency on OSU, as well as the argument that we have a finite housing base and, in order to have a diverse economy, we need housing for employees of industries that want to come to Corvallis. He referred to the statement that off-campus housing is the only student housing that pays taxes; while this is correct, he believes there is a net loss to the City in that, as former Councilor Sorte has explained on the record, residential property taxes do not fully pay for the services required by residents, therefore, property taxes paid by businesses are what fund the City. He said we should make sure housing is not consumed by one mono-business, especially one that doesn't pay business taxes and that consumes a lot of housing which actually costs the taxpayers.

Jennifer Gervais referred to Mr. Hess's written testimony in which he stated that in response to OSU's recent growth spurts, the City has developed significant amounts of wetlands and threatened species habitat. She asked if there are documents to back that up. Mr. Hess said he was primarily referring to the Sather Annexation, where the Army Corps of Engineers had to issue wetland fill permits and the process took close to a year because of wetlands there.

Mr. Hess said this process is frustrating, where the City lists findings and policies and OSU pushes back without just having an honest conversation. He thinks the idea of having student housing on campus is so significant that putting together an argument is challenging because one would have to quantify the cost of increased commute time, traffic

mitigation costs, greenhouse gas emissions, etc. On-campus housing at OSU is the only way to guarantee students can walk or bike to campus. From an environmental perspective, it is such a significantly better option that it's frustrating to have to find a way to encourage OSU to pursue that, but he does encourage that. He discussed the amount of student debt being accumulated due to housing costs, and he said it is shortsighted of OSU to set enrollment without considering the implications of student debt.

Councilor Bull said the transportation component of the Comprehensive Plan update is intended to look at future growth and land use scenarios; that update process is beginning and she hopes that Mr. Hess will participate.

Commissioner Woods asked what was meant by "finite housing base." Mr. Hess said the City has goals of being a compact city and not going beyond the defined urban growth boundary. Along with zoning, that provides for a finite number of housing units. Seeing a significant plot of land that was set aside for single-family housing converted into student housing is a big hit from the perspective of trying to attract other business into the economy. A free housing option on campus would speak directly to student debt as well as the housing issue, and that is the model he would like to see OSU pursue.

III. DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Gervais initiated discussion about how to proceed.

Councilor Hann said there was some conversation at City Council that the TF is working on a fairly technical look at the Comprehensive Plan. He noted the TF's work is based in part on comments from the Collaboration project and community concerns, but there was some feeling that perhaps the entire picture isn't clear unless we also address where the recommendations came from. He would also advocate including some information related to Chapter 3.36. Because of time elements, he suggested that some of that work could be done in smaller groups.

Commissioners Woods said the process thus far has been to identify OSU-related Comprehensive Plan findings and policies, and update them. He agrees it would be helpful to have a narrative, but that seems like a shift in direction.

Councilor Bull said she would like to make the information a bit more accessible, especially in terms of explaining the issues and the progress made on those issues.

Councilor Hann said, in his mind, this process was started to communicate more effectively to OSU what the City wants as they update their master plan. If this group can do a more complete job and send a recommendation forward with some background information and clear direction to OSU, he thinks time will be saved.

Councilor Hogg asked about the possibility of expanding the scope of the consultant that Council has already agreed to hire to develop The Vision and Action Plan, so all of the work is consistent. Manager Young said it may be difficult to expand that scope at this point. He stated that it has been his understanding that the goal of this exercise has been to facilitate the community's conversation about OSU-related issues, to evaluate current Comprehensive Plan findings and policies, and to recommend adjustments. His expectation is that the group would forward a recommendation to the City Council, which would then likely direct staff to prepare the analysis that would be associated with a

Comprehensive Plan amendment. As far as identifying some of the issues behind the recommendations, he suggested that going back through some of the Collaboration work would be a good place to start.

Chair Gervais said this process is in response to a need to do something right now because OSU is working on their master plan. It isn't meant to replace the Comprehensive Plan update which has to follow the visioning, and she thinks it's important to separate those two processes.

Councilor Bull said she understood Councilor York was asking for a staff analysis. Manager Young said it hasn't been his role to provide a lot of direction through this process; we want this to be the community's conversation about OSU, understanding there will be a subsequent process when the concepts will likely be further refined. He suggested that the recommendation could be organized by laying out the issues that were heard, along with the findings and policies that flowed from each, but that would take some time.

Councilor Hann clarified that he doesn't want to broaden the TF's scope but he wants to present the information in the most understandable way possible. Chair Gervais agreed; she said the TF already has a tremendous amount of information to summarize, consider, and package.

Councilor Hogg said Councilor York was concerned that we are lacking a vision that will drive the policies. Chair Gervais said she thinks we have to rely on the current adopted vision statement because that update process will likely take a couple of years. Councilor Hann added that this group's focus is much narrower in communicating to OSU how the City wants things done.

Councilor Bull suggested a check-in with Council to lay out the issues and the work done to date, and start the conversation about the next process and timeline. She said this higher level check-in might allow for more focused work. Chair Gervais said she doesn't want to expand the TF work beyond its current scope, and the only way to shorten the task would be to not consider testimony received. Councilor Hann said the scope is in place and he wants to complete the process; he thinks the work can be divided and completed by September. Chair Gervais agreed; she suggested the group's time should be spent reviewing testimony and fine-tuning the proposed language, and the narrative and packaging be done as "homework" and shared with the group.

Discussion followed regarding how to best package the information. It was agreed that Chair Gervais will draft a narrative which summarizes the process used, the concerns heard, and the intent behind the proposed changes. Councilor Hann will work through the Collaboration matrix and summarize the issues. Commissioner Woods will draft information about issues related to Chapter 3.36. manager Young will organize all revised and new findings and policies by theme, in order to provide a better sense of the ground that's been covered. "Homework" will be circulated early next week. Staff will circulate a Doodle Poll to schedule the next meeting.

IV. FINALIZE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO FINDINGS AND POLICES/ NEED FOR ANOTHER MEETING?

Chair Gervais led an item by item review of Dan Brown's testimony, dated June 30, 2015, Subject: Improving Proposed Changes to the Comprehensive Plan. The group discussed each suggestion and revised the proposed findings and policies as noted below.

Finding 13.2.q: Chair Gervais recalled that this finding was proposed based on testimony that some development on campus was perceived as a workaround of the regulations, and that development that serves the larger community should meet the requirements of that larger community. She noted Mr. Brown's concern was related to specificity.

It was agreed to reword the finding as follows: *Private businesses that operate in coordination with OSU, but serve the larger community have led to concerns that City development requirements that would have been applied outside the OSU zone were not met.*

Policy 13.2.7: Chair Gervais reviewed the proposed language and Mr. Brown's proposed change. Following review, it was agreed to reword the policy as follows: *Permitted uses on the OSU campus shall be primarily University-related. Where public-private partnerships are intended to serve the larger community, a public hearing review process by the City shall be required for development proposals.*

Policy 9.7.6: Following review of the proposed language and Mr. Brown's question regarding the term "experimental community," it was agreed to reword the proposed policy as follows: *The City and OSU shall cooperate to facilitate innovative development that is not dependent upon the single-occupant automobile.*

Councilor Hogg asked if the above contradicts other proposed policies. Chair Gervais said it's not unusual to have contradictory policies in the Comprehensive Plan; the goal is to create an umbrella under which other things can happen. The intent of Policy 13.2.7 is to make clear that some development should come to the City for review, but this should not be so restrictive that there is no room for innovative attempts to solve problems.

Finding 11.4.n: It was agreed to delete the reference to (Shoup 2011, Speck 2013).

Policy 5.4.18: The group reviewed the proposed policy, noting the intent is to balance density with historic character. It was agreed to reword as follows: *The City shall evaluate zoning patterns in the neighborhoods near OSU with the intent of balancing density goals with preservation of neighborhood character.*

Policy 9.7.3: Chair Gervais reviewed the proposed wording and Mr. Brown's comments. She said "dwelling unit" means some kind of housing arrangement, and she doesn't think it's necessary to define all of the particulars. Commissioner Woods noted that "dwelling unit" is defined in the LDC. He said the intent isn't that all faculty and staff would be housed near campus, but that the option would be more available. It was agreed to revise the policy slightly for clarity: *The City and OSU shall work toward the goal of housing more faculty, staff, and students who work and attend regular classes on campus in dwelling units on or near campus.*

Finding 11.2.k: Following discussion, it was agreed to reword the finding as follows: *The proximity of University-related housing to OSU affects the number of trips made on the transportation system, which affects its performance.*

Finding 13.2.p: Chair Gervais noted the intent of the finding was to get at concerns about the monitoring. In discussion, it was noted that the plan stated that monitoring would occur but the process was not clearly defined. It was agreed to reword the finding as follows: *The 2004-2015 Campus Master Plan monitoring process was not clearly defined. A review of the monitoring submittals over the 2005-2014 time period indicates that there were periodic gaps primarily related to parking utilization counts in off-campus parking districts, transportation demand management reports, and Jackson Street traffic counts.*

V. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

David Dodson, OSU Campus Planning Manager, said OSU has been making refinements to the District Plan (DP), which is a much higher level plan than the Campus Master Plan (CMP), because they found there was confusion when it came to certain land use decisions. The DP stays at a higher level, provides background statistics, and speaks more to aspirations. He said OSU is well aware of issues related to parking and housing, and they are currently working on mitigation strategies which will later be presented for public comment. Regarding the discussion about Chapter 3.36, he said that once this group has made its recommendation on the related Comprehensive Plan policies, that will provide sufficient information for OSU to begin moving ahead with packaging the DP application and associated materials to be reviewed by the City, Planning Commission, and City Council.

Councilor Hann asked for information about OSU's timeline. Mr. Dodson said it is hoped that the Comprehensive Plan policies related to OSU will be adopted or acknowledged by October. Based on that, they envision submitting application materials to the City at the end of January. They have built in two iterations of staff review, three Planning Commission meetings, three City Council meetings, and final adoption of findings, with a finalization date toward the end of 2016.

Councilor Hann asked if calling out concerns about Chapter 3.36 would help OSU's efforts. Mr. Dodson said any clarity and guidance is helpful; however, OSU is aware of many of the issues and where the rubber meets the road is what OSU is going to propose to provide assurances and mitigate impacts.

Councilor Hann said it is his opinion that none of us know can predict the future that the University will be moving into. He sees lots of creative things that can happen; but at some point there has to be transparency. He said issues, such as the hospital facility locating on campus, have created problems and lost the public trust. He said it would be great if OSU would house all students on campus, but that isn't realistic. Looking into the future, he said, OSU giving transparent feedback, in a really forthright and honest way, that is realistic and achievable in terms of housing would be really helpful.

Mr. Dodson said he has conveyed to the University the importance of the housing issue. He said OSU's new food pantry and childcare facility fall under the existing use category of University Services and Facilities, and a question was raised related to how much of those facilities are associated with OSU. City staff made a determination that the threshold is 70% of the patrons utilizing such a facility should work or study at facility must be used by OSU, and both of those facilities exceed that threshold. He said OSU will continue to take a stand that, with the size of campus and in order to maintain the core of campus as an attractive, pedestrian- friendly environment, they don't want delivery trucks and cars in the

core of campus. The question is how to accommodate accessibility needs, and there are things that can be done to make that better.

Councilor Hann said that reduced accessibility to the library and events on campus is almost creating an environment where campus is more isolated from the community as a whole.

Commissioner Woods asked if the University is expecting to offer LDC language. Mr. Dodson said it is their hope to be able to develop that language.

Dave Bella thanked TF members for their work. He distributed *Planning: A More Holistic Approach*, submitted by himself, Charlie Vars and Court Smith (Attachment A). He said one of the early meetings of this group included a discussion about big strategies, and the paper he submitted includes some of those ideas. The information isn't intended to bring more work to the TF at this point; but perhaps it could be submitted along with the recommendation. He and his group will be following up with OSU on opportunities to do some really creative things in terms of accessibility. Brief discussion followed.

VI. REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES

May 14, 2015

Corrections to name spellings for Jennifer Gervais and Jasmin Woodside were noted. In addition, Chair Gervais suggested that clerical corrections were needed.

MOTION: Councilor Hann moved to approve the May 14 minutes with clerical corrections. Councilor Bull seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0.

May 28, 2015

MOTION: Commissioner Woodside moved to approve the minutes as presented. Councilor Hann seconded the motion, and it passed 6-0.

June 8, 2015

The following corrected language was requested for Item II, the first paragraph: "Charles Vars distributed written testimony on a new Finding 7.2.8, and stated that OSU and the City should cooperate to reduce car dependence."

MOTION: Commissioner Woodside moved to approve the minutes as revised. Commissioner Woods seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0-1, with Councilor Bull abstaining.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Planning: A more Holistic Approach

The planning process within the Corvallis community puts the focus on particular actions based on findings and policies. A broader perspective can be lost in the business of addressing details.

The following comments provide a language to address our concerns.

Dave Bella, Charlie Vars and Court Smith

RECEIVED

JUL 9 2015

July, 2015

Community Development
Planning Division

The words "strategy" and "strategic" refer to long term and overall aims and purposes and the means to achieve them.

The words "tactics" and "tactical" refer to limited and immediate aims and purposes and the means to achieve them.

Strategies are concerned with the whole (cumulative, overall) outcomes of many tactical (limited, immediate) decisions.

Independently, each tactical decision may make sense; but cumulatively, they can lead to harm and even disaster. That is, the character of the whole (strategic outcome) cannot be reduced to the character of the parts (tactical decisions).

Common examples of wholes that cannot be reduced to parts include the following. The character (quality) of great music cannot be reduced to the quality of notes. The humor of jokes cannot be reduced to "funny" words.

Undesirable and even catastrophic outcomes can emerge from a succession of well intended tactical decisions that each made sense at the time.

Strategies serve to redirect tactical actions to promote favorable cumulative outcomes.

A strategic perspective requires looking at wholes (patterns, interactions, cumulative outcomes). This requires a shift in thinking that is difficult to imagine.

To: OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force
From: Dan Brown

June 30, 2015

SUBJECT: Improving Proposed Changes to the Comprehensive Plan

The *Comprehensive Plan* is a very important public document. Every time someone reads it, it will deliver a public relations message about the City of Corvallis, and hopefully that message will be positive. Changes should improve the quality of the document. At a minimum, the general public should be able to understand and appreciate the language. Further, changes should have staying power because they will be around for a long time. To that end, I am suggesting a list of possible improvements to the proposed language and content of the proposal.

Vague Meanings

The *Comprehensive Plan* should communicate clearly with the general audience: applicants, City councilors, citizens groups, etc.. Here are examples of statements which, although they may make sense to the writers, will likely be difficult for the uninitiated to understand.

13.2.g Unanticipated development, including public/private partnerships, led to community concerns that typical development requirements were not provided, and resultant uses were not primarily university-oriented.

- Where? When? Who?

9.7.6 The City and OSU shall cooperate to facilitate the development of **experimental communities** that are not dependent upon the single-occupant automobile.

- What is an "experimental community"? For example?

11.4.n Parking fees can benefit communities when used to develop transit and transportation options (Shoup 2011, Speck 2013).

- Who are Shoup and Speck, and who thinks they important authorities?

5.4.18 The City shall evaluate zoning patterns in the neighborhoods near OSU, as well as **associated housing variety**, in relation to impacts on the historic neighborhood character in these areas.

- What is "associated housing variety" and who is concerned about it?

9.7.3 The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of housing **faculty, staff**, and students who work and attend regular classes on campus in **dwelling units** on or near campus.

- How could the City house all faculty and staff near campus? There is not enough land to do this. Do faculty and staff want to live in "dwelling units"?

*11.2.k The proximity of related developments affects the number of trips made on the **system**, which affects the performance of the **system**.*

- Proximity to what?
- Is "system" about a **transportation** system? What is that?
- Repetition of word "system" is clumsy.

13.2.p Community concerns were raised about the adequacy and implementation of monitoring, as described in the 2004 – 2015 Campus Master Plan and required in LDC Chapter 3.36. Concerns included monitoring that was not completed, LDC monitoring requirements that did not contain the correct metrics, and changes in monitoring without commensurate LDC text amendments. A review of the monitoring submittals over the 2005-2014 time period indicates that **while a high percentage of the required monitoring information was provided**, there were periodic gaps primarily related to parking utilization counts in off-campus parking districts, transportation demand management reports, and Jackson Street traffic counts.

- Too long and complicated for the average reader.
- The clause "while a high percentage of the required monitoring information was provided" sounds like rationalizing. Why include it?
- How does this finding benefit the Planning Commission and City Council in making land use decisions?

Toothless Advice for Another Government Agency

A couple proposals are more like wishful thinking than like policies. There is no "shall" in them.

3.2.9 OSU **should consider** being a community leader in **carbon smart** programs and transportation demand management that benefits the larger Corvallis community.

- Does everybody know what "carbon smart" means?
- When would OSU do this? How?
- How do **carbon smart** programs relate to land use planning?

13.2.8 The City encourages OSU to develop a means of development decision-making that is **more transparent**.

- The sentiment is good, but . . .
- Who will do the encouraging - staff, mayor, etc.? When?
- Will the "transparency" be perfunctory OSU style or rigorous City style?
- "More transparent" than what? More transparent to whom?
- Based on experience, why would we expect OSU to become more transparent without a requirement from the City?

Passive Voice

Good writing is based on declarative statements including an identified subject and an action verb. Here is an example from the document:

5.6.w The University offers many recreational opportunities.

When writers overuse of the passive voice, they weaken the language. Failure to identify the actor makes statements ambiguous. For example:

5.2.f In an attempt to keep University students close to the campus, the surrounding neighborhoods have received an underlying zoning that is denser than the existing neighborhoods. With larger enrollment numbers at the University, the surrounding neighborhoods have redeveloped to higher densities.

13.2.q Unanticipated development, including public/private partnerships, led to community concerns that typical development requirements were not provided, and resultant uses were not primarily university-oriented.

13.2.7 Permitted uses on the OSU Campus shall be primarily University-related. Where public-private partnerships have the potential to significantly impact the larger community, a public review process shall be required.

Passive voice is overused in many other proposed changes, for example

Findings: **5.2.f; 8.4.e; 8.4.f; 11.2.j; 11.2.k; 11.2.l; 11.12.d; 13.2.o; 13.2.q**

Policies: **5.4.17; 9.4.11; 9.7.8; 9.7.9; 11.2.16; 11.4.9; 11.2.11; 11.4.9; 11.12.11**

No Conclusions - Just Data

In order to be useful, findings require more than just statistics. Usually this means a conclusion about a trend or a comparison. Here is an example from the document of a finding with a useful comparison to the past.

9.4.k Historically, the Corvallis owner- and renter-occupied housing markets have been characterized by low vacancy rates.

The document, especially in Article 9 includes too many examples of floating statistics with no conclusions, for example:

9.4.j The 2013 American Community Survey found that the average number of persons per household was 2.42 for owner-occupied homes and 2.25 for renter-occupied homes in Corvallis.

- What is the conclusion for the reader? What are the policy implications?

13.2.j Enrollment projections under the 2005 Campus Master Plan were exceeded by 1,883 students, or 7.7%. In 2004 There were 3,422 beds on campus within residence halls and co-ops, with a Fall Term on-campus undergraduate enrollment of 15,196. In 2014, on-campus Fall Term undergraduate enrollment was 20,312, and there were 4,846 beds provided in on-campus housing.

- What is the conclusion for the reader? What are the policy implications?

City Council Obligated to Spend Money

Two policies would obligate the City to conduct research, which in turn, would require funding from the City's budget. Based on discussions about such studies during this year's budget deliberations, it is not clear that the City Council would want to allocate those funds/

11.7.8 A study of student use of the CTS **shall** be performed to assess the need for additional routes to serve students and residents. OSU shall partner with the City for this analysis.

5.4.18 The City **shall** evaluate zoning patterns in the neighborhoods near OSU, as well as associated housing variety, in relation to impacts on the historic neighborhood character in these areas.

Irrelevant to OSU

It would seem that a group called the "OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force" would stick to matters directly involving the University. Some of the material in the proposals goes well beyond those boundaries, for example:

9.4.o The 2012 Oregon Housing and Community Services Needs Assessment determined that there were 2,290 farm workers in Benton County, and no dedicated farm worker housing units to serve them.

Most of the material in **Section 9.5** and **Section 11.2** suffers from this same problem.

Matter of Opinion

Each of the following proposed statements is merely a matter of opinion which is likely to be controversial and may not reflect the consensus of the community

11.12.e Students prioritize cost over convenience in choosing transportation modes. Employees tend to prioritize convenience

- This is not a fact, it is just an unsubstantiated opinion.

11.4.10 On-street parking provides for a wide diversity of needs for Corvallis residents and people coming to Corvallis for work, school, events, appointments, services, and shopping. Auto parking should be allocated using the following principles:

- A. The streets of Corvallis belong to the community.
- B. On-street parking is a public resource that should be managed for the public good.
- C. The parking fee system should be self-supporting and can provide additional resources for transit and transportation improvements.
- D. Parking fees can be considered as an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improving livability.

- Transit funding is not directly a land use issue or subject for the *Comp. Plan.*

11.4.n Parking fees can benefit communities when used to develop transit and transportation options (Shoup 2011, Speck 2013).

- Transit funding is not directly a land use issue or subject for the *Comp. Plan.*

3.2.i Land within the Urban Fringe contains large contiguous Oregon State University agricultural and forestry land areas. The ability of these areas in support of instruction / research and extension activities requires that **some of** these large areas must be maintained free from division into small land parcels.

- Very broad statement - no limits. All the contiguous land areas or just some?
- Add "**some of**" to clarify.
- The new solar panel array west of 35th, built by OSU, is on a small land parcel and violates this finding.

11.2.17 The City **shall** consider allowing trade-offs in conjunction with student housing developments to provide measurable Transportation Demand Management (TDM) **measures** in lieu of traditional transportation system improvements.

- This loophole could be a HUGE policy change.
- The word "shall" should be replaced with "may."
- What are the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) **measures** you have in mind? Are they input or output measures? For example, providing bike racks do not necessarily change travel behavior.
- What are "**traditional**" transportation system improvements?

Voids

For the Planning Commission and the City Council to make definitive land use decisions, and for the benefit of the average reader, jargon must be defined and explained in **Article 50** of the *Comprehensive Plan*.

The term "**transportation demand management**," and the acronym **TDM**, are used frequently in proposed changes: **3.2.9; 11.2.6; 11.2.17; 11.4.h; 11.12.11; 13.2.p**. There is little clue about what this process means, and so everybody is free to impose their own interpretation on City policy. The City Council must make clear what the TDM goals are and what the term "TDM measures" include in Corvallis land use planning. TDM should be defined in Article 50.

The ambiguous term "**car dependence**" is used freely in the list of proposed changes, for example: **7.2.i; 7.2.j; 7.2.k; 7.2.8**. This jargon is not being used in the current *Comprehensive Plan*, and it is not defined there. As a goal variable, how is "car dependence" to be measured? This should be defined in article 50.

The terms "**district**" and "**campus master plan**" are used without definition. If these terms are going to be used in land use decisions, the *Comprehensive Plan* should explain them in a way that average reader will understand their roles and significance. These should be defined in Article 50

The term "livability" is used as a goal variable several times in proposed changes: **7.2.8; 9.7.e; 11.2.m; 11.4.10; i3.2.i**. This term is not defined but should be in Article 50 to reduce ambiguity.

The existing *Comprehensive Plan* is so old that it does not mention the **national historic districts** in Corvallis which were created after it was written. This omission includes the OSU National Historic District located on the University campus. Thus, the numbers in the following finding are not complete or accurate

5.4.a There are a number of inventories of buildings with historic significance located within the Corvallis Urban Growth Boundary, including those developed by the State Historic Preservation Office and the State Board of Higher Education. As of 1998, 375 inventories of historic sites and structures had been conducted in Corvallis. They identify the 26 Corvallis structures on the National Historic Register, 12 structures on the Oregon State University campus, and many other buildings as having historic significance. In 1989, the City created the Corvallis Register of Historic Landmarks and Districts which contains 85 properties. The City will be adding properties to this listing on an ongoing basis

Simple Edits

I will first propose a few simple changes which will provide consistency and meaning but should not be very controversial.

5.2.g and **5.4.l** repeat the same words verbatim. One of these findings should be eliminated.

There are two findings labeled **11.4.h**. One requires a new number.

The term "**college**" should be added to clarify the meaning of the word "student" in: **9.7.l; 9.7.m; 11.2.17; 11.7.8; 11.12.10**.

The words "**University**" and "**City**" (relating to the City government) should either always be capitalized or never be capitalized. Currently there is a mixture of conventions.

9.7.m Characteristics of **newly constructed** college student-oriented housing have more recently included a preponderance of five -bedroom units, with one bathroom per bedroom, and multiple floors within units.

- Add "newly constructed."

9.7.7 The City shall promote the utilization by the University of public-private partnerships to provide additional, on-campus student housing that provides **housing** that would be more attractive to upperclassmen, graduate students, and University staff than traditional on-campus **housing** options.

- awkward worded verbal in first clause
- "housing" used too many times in the same sentence

11.2.17 The City shall consider allowing trade-offs in conjunction with student housing developments to provide **measurable** Transportation Demand Management (TDM) **measures** in lieu of traditional transportation system improvements.

- "measures" and "measurable" in same sentence is awkward.

13.2.6 The city and OSU shall closely coordinate land-use actions that have the potential to impact either the university or the surrounding community. Monitoring programs shall be established to determine whether conditions and assumptions underlying the **Campus Master Plan** are valid on an annual basis. These monitoring programs can occur anywhere in the community. If conditions exceed pre-determined thresholds or evidence suggests that metrics are not tracking conditions of interest, a review of the **OSU District Plan** shall be implemented even if the planning period has not expired. If necessary, adjustments shall be implemented.

- There is no such thing as a "District Plan" now. Why assume there will be?
- Should not use both names for the same document in the same policy.

13.2.7 Permitted uses on the OSU Campus shall be primarily University-related. Where public-private partnerships have the potential to significantly impact the larger community, a public review process shall be required **for development proposals**.

- What? Add "**for development proposals**"
- What kind of process - the rigorous City of Corvallis kind or the perfunctory OSU kind?

Editing for Improved Language

In some cases, changing a few words will clarify the meaning of findings and policies.

5.4.m Downtown **residential** neighborhoods have characteristics that include large street trees, wide planting strips, **parking limited to just one side of the street, small garages**, and a large proportion of buildings dating from the 1940s and earlier.

- What is the intended point of this finding?
- The problem is inadequate on-street parking infrastructure, not age or trees.

7.2.8 To reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve livability, and improve environmental quality, OSU and the City shall work together to reduce car dependence, **consumption of fossil fuels, and miles traveled**.

- "car dependence" is a buzzword.
- would benefit from additional indicators: e.g. fossil fuel consumption, miles traveled

8.4.e Ongoing and emerging development of educational programs impact and provide **opportunities for economic growth**. Expansion of the robotics and autonomous systems program and engineered wood products are recent examples.

- Who? Does this finding relate to OSU research? If so, say so.
- Where? Does this mean economic growth in Corvallis or in the Willamette Valley?
- What? Is this statement just about unrealized opportunities or about real economic growth?

9.4.11 When increasing residential densities through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, consideration shall be given to impacts on desired or required levels of service, including parks, open space, and other **infrastructure**.

- This is a long list. The meaning would benefit from spelling out infrastructure: streets, sewer and water, bike paths, etc.

11.4.10 On-street parking provides for a wide diversity of needs for Corvallis residents and people coming to Corvallis for work, school, events, appointments, services, and shopping. Auto parking should be allocated using the following principles:

- A. The streets of Corvallis belong to the community.
- B. On-street parking is a public resource that should be managed for the public good.
- C. The parking fee system should be self-supporting and can provide additional resources for transit and transportation **infrastructure** improvements.
- D. Parking fees can be considered as an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improving livability.

Add **infrastructure**

11.4.h *Use of parking **infrastructure** depends on the success of transportation demand management measures, parking accessibility, convenience to the final destination, and price, and **permit allocation policies**, among other factors.*

- "Parking" is a verb. This statement needs a noun such as "infrastructure."

11.4.h *Parking needs may reasonably be expected to **fluctuate** through time. There are demands created by large employers such as Oregon State University that have **changed** dramatically in the past and may do so again in the future.*

- The words "fluctuate" and "changed" are obfuscations.
- To date, all "fluctuation" in OSU parking demand has been **growth**. It grew.

11.4.8 Temporary parking lots, which are not improved to full City standards, and which can more easily be converted to lower-intensity uses, shall be explored as a means of reducing costs and environmental impacts associated with parking when demand is expected to **fluctuate**. Such lots may play a major role in designing and testing multimodal transit connections, such as park-and-ride facilities.

- The word "fluctuate" is an obfuscation.
- To date, all "fluctuation" in OSU parking demand has been **growth**.

13.2.i *OSU Campus growth **can** lead to off-campus impacts, such as increased congestion at key intersections, lack of on-street parking in neighborhoods adjacent to the university, loss of single-family houses to redevelopment as student-oriented housing, and concerns about declining neighborhood livability.*

- Delete "can." "Can" implies hypothetical.
- In fact, all these impacts **have been** experienced.

13.2.r *The public has expressed concern that there has been inadequate public review of development on **the OSU** campus.*

- Need to specify whose campus. Apparently not Good Sam's campus.

13.2.7 Permitted uses on the OSU Campus shall be primarily University-related. Where public-private partnerships have the potential to significantly impact the larger community, a public review process shall be required **for development proposals**.

- add for **development proposals**
- What kind of process - the rigorous City of Corvallis kind or the perfunctory OSU kind?

Editing for Meaning

The following edits, although minor, are probably the most controversial. The City Council will have to decide what they really intend the following to say.

9.7.d Historically, forecasts of student enrollment growth have not been accurate **due to unanticipated changes in University policies**. In addition, these forecasts have not been a reliable measure of impacts to the community.

- Other than for the past 10 years, when were forecast(s) inaccurate?
- The problem is not market demand; University policy is the problem,.

9.7.i *The availability of traditional lower cost on-campus student housing options, including co-ops, has been reduced for a variety of reasons, including the **cost of needed seismic upgrades**.*

- Why call out just "seismic"? OSU made these decisions were made for other reasons also.
- Calling out "seismic" seems like a defensive rationalization.
- The buildings are still being used. People still work there.

9.7.k *University-provided on-campus housing does not generate property tax revenue, while privately-owned housing elsewhere in the community does generate property tax revenue.*

- How about privately-owned housing on campus, e.g. INTO?
- How about the Hilton garden Inn?

9.7.n *OSU's enrollment growth from 2004 to 2015 was not matched by construction of housing for students on campus. The dual enrollment program has allowed a number of students to attend a community college their first two years before transferring to OSU to complete their degree. The University has predominantly housed freshmen on campus; therefore, increases in overall enrollment haven't necessarily resulted in an increase in the freshman class enrollment. Historically, OSU has provided limited on-campus housing opportunities for upper class students.*

- There are too many ideas mixed up here. What's the point?

9.7.3 The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of housing faculty, staff, and students who work and attend regular classes on campus in dwelling units on or near campus.

- Most faculty and staff do not live in the City of Corvallis.
- The city does not have enough land near campus to house all these people.
- Too aspirational, not realistic in the next two decades.

11.4.n *Parking fees can benefit communities when used to develop transit and transportation infrastructure options (Shoup 2011, Speck 2013).*

- Is this finding about land use planning or something else? Does it belong in a *Comprehensive Plan*?

11.4.h *Use of parking **infrastructure** depends on the success of transportation demand management measures, parking accessibility, convenience to the final destination, and price, and **permit allocation policies**, among other factors.*

- OSU excludes all but prescribed persons from parking in designated lots. Others cannot park there.
- "Fluctuate" implies up and down. Parking needs at OSU have always gone up.
- Permit sales are not an accurate measure of overall parking demand.

11.4.k *Most people would like to park on the street adjacent to their residence, if on-site parking is limited or not available **or too expensive***

- Although landlords at new college student apartments are often required by the LDC to provide off-street parking, that parking is usually not free. It is expensive for college students and too expensive for some.

11.12.10 The City and OSU should explore options for improving **college** students' access to the regional transportation system.

- What regional transportation system does this refer to?
- Why not **shall** explore instead of should?

11.12.11 Transportation demand management should be encouraged as a means of reducing carbon emissions, vehicle miles traveled, and parking demand.

- Why not **shall** be encouraged

13.2.k Oregon State University added **5,316** students and 1,775 faculty and staff between 2003 and 2014 – 2015. OSU’s impact on the community with respect to the percentage of the overall community exceeds any other entity.

- Who is trying to prove what with these numbers? They are very biased.
- These numbers must be explained: The OSU website shows:

<u>2014</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>Change</u>		
28,886	18,979	9,907	not	5,316

- Further, who chose 2003 as the base year? In the current *Comp Plan*, finding **9.7.a** says that enrollment was **14,127** in the real base year, 1997

<u>2014</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>Change</u>		
28,886	14,127	14,759	not	5,316

Housekeeping

While changes are being made to the *Comprehensive Plan* anyway, it would be efficient to make some obviously needed housekeeping changes.

2.2.c According to the December **1997** Citizen Attitude Survey, a majority (53.7%) of persons who had used the City’s land use planning services rated the quality of those services as excellent or good.

- More recent data exist.

2.2.f **During the last five years**, the City has undertaken several collaborative, public participation processes for addressing land use planning issues. Examples include the South Corvallis Area Plan and the West Corvallis - North Philomath Plan.

- That was back in the twentieth century.
- BTW - whatever became of those plans? Do we use them now?

2.2.1 The City shall appoint a **Committee for Citizen Involvement** that is independent from all other boards and commissions, and whose function is to educate and facilitate citizen involvement in all phases of land use planning and decision making. The Committee will review the effectiveness of all citizen involvement efforts and make recommendations to the City Council.

- This group no longer exists by that name.

3.2.a In the 1996 Benton County Needs Assessment Report, 92% of the Benton County residents rated Benton County as an excellent or very good place to live.

- That was 20 years ago. We need a new statistic.

9.4.g The housing stock of Corvallis is relatively new, with nearly 80% of the existing units having been built since 1950. Many of the approximately 12,350 residential units built prior to 1975 are of an age such that major structural elements (e.g., roofs, electrical / plumbing systems, foundations) are or will be in need of repair or replacement.

- "New?" 1950 was 65 years ago.
- The first sentence is less true today than in 1991 and is not necessary.

Date: 2 July 2015

To: Members of the Plan Review Task Force

From: Marilyn Koenitzer, 4240 SW Fairhaven Drive; Corvallis 97333

Re: Article 3 Plan Update

You have done an excellent job of converting problems that have arisen since the last Comprehensive Plan and USU Master Plan updates to findings and policies that can help return some lost livability to Corvallis residents. Thank you for your work on this.

My key for easier reading is that my writing is in this font, suggested changes are in italics, your document excerpts are written in your original font.

After carefully examining your draft, I suggest you move "Article 13. Special Areas of Concern" to the top of the document. It fits better under the "Land Use Guidelines," which needs beefing up to make it a strong opening.

Some of the findings and policies I am submitting are similar to yours, but they show you that I am in agreement with your excellent work. Several of my policies are strong, especially in the "Land Use Guidelines" section, and should give food for thought.

Overall, I agree with the comments of Jeff Hess and R. Baxter. Some of their work could certainly be incorporated into the document. I agree with some of the minor wording changes offered by Dave Dodson, of OSU, but I do not agree with his substantive changes. You have listened to your city constituents, told the story of impacts to the City's livability since the Comprehensive Plan was last updated, and written many thoughtful policies to improve life in Corvallis. Your work is necessary, excellent, and should remain as part of a stronger document.

Article 3. Land Use Guidelines

3.2 General Land Use

Findings

MK New findings:

There is a limited supply of developable land within the city. A large part of the restriction is due to long held, private, large-acreage ownership patterns with no schedule to develop.

Enrollment at OSU in the past five years has rapidly and significantly increased without timely notification by OSU or the state Board of Higher Education so that both OSU and the city could plan for the increase. OSU enrollment affects all segments of the Corvallis housing market and transportation network.

To catch up with housing needs for students, the majority of newly built housing in Corvallis in the past five years has been solely student oriented. Both infill and new lot

development have occurred. This development has impacted older existing neighborhoods and taken needed family housing out of the supply.

More housing for non-OSU students is needed. Very little land exists within the city to build it. Two undeveloped areas that could be used for non-OSU slated housing are currently under consideration for more student housing.

The student only housing market is beginning to be over built.

MK New Policy: *The City shall prohibit or strongly discourage new development on private land solely for single-use, student-oriented housing. Any further housing development shall be a mix of housing meant for anyone.*

3.2.c Continued cooperation among Corvallis, Benton County, Linn County, and Oregon State University is important in the review of OSU development. *MK Insert: Any further planned new building construction and increases or decreases in enrollment should be communicated in a timely manner to the above affected government entities so that proper planning for housing, parking and needed infrastructure can ensue.* This should help to ensure compatibility between uses on private and public lands.

3.2.i Land within the Urban Fringe contains large contiguous Oregon State University agricultural and forestry land areas. The ability of these areas in support of instruction / research and extension activities requires that these large areas must be maintained free from division into small land parcels.

Enrollment at OSU in the past five years has rapidly and significantly increased without timely notification by OSU or the state Board of Higher Education so that both OSU and the city could plan for the increase. OSU enrollment affects all segments of the Corvallis housing market and transportation network.

:

OSU can choose to develop some of its remaining large land parcels in the urban fringe to accommodate needs for parking or campus housing or other institutional needs.

MK New Policy:

Because the enrollment at OSU so greatly affects housing and parking and transportation needs in Corvallis, OSU shall communicate its development and enrollment plans well in advance of their completion. This may require at least quarterly meetings between OSU, the city of Corvallis and any other affected government entity. (Your policy 13.2.6. is good.)

MK New Policy: *The City shall encourage OSU to develop some of its remaining large land parcels in the urban fringe to accommodate needs for parking and campus housing.*

Original Proposed New Policy

MK Comment: This policy has no relationship to the original findings, above. It either

needs a new finding regarding carbon smart programs and transportation demand management or this Policy should go in Article 7.

3.2.9 OSU should consider being a community leader in carbon smart programs and transportation demand management that benefits the larger Corvallis community.

5.6 Parks and Recreation

Proposed New Finding

5.6.w The University offers many recreational opportunities.

MK Comment: These recreational opportunities are usually available to the general public only as spectators. These recreational opportunities are not enumerated. I suspect they are sporting events, lectures, and concerts.

Proposed New Policy

5.6.20 The City will work closely with OSU to develop the potential for recreational opportunities on campus that serve the larger community. *Good idea*

Article 7. Environmental Quality

Proposed New Findings

7.2.i Car dependence increases pollution, reduces air and water quality, causes public health problems, raises safety issues, and adds to global climate change.

7.2.j The State of Oregon has a greenhouse gas goal of a 75% reduction from 1990 levels by 2050.

7.2.k Car dependence requires land for infrastructure. On average, 20% of the land in cities is in streets, not including land in parking lots, driveways, and garages.

MK comment: Policy 3.2.9 could go here.

8.2 Employment and Economic Development

MK comment: There is no policy for these two findings:

Finding 8.2.d

The stability of Corvallis and Benton County's economy is dependent on a few major employers in a few economic sectors, i.e., Oregon State University, Samaritan Health Services, and Hewlett - Packard; other local, State, and Federal government employers; firms engaged in electronics, forest and agricultural products; consulting and medical services; and retail businesses. In 2014 the 10 largest employers in Benton County were located in Corvallis, representing 41% of the total employment in the County. Two of the three top employers in the City are non-profit organizations, which do not pay property taxes.

Proposed New Finding

8.2.p Seven of the top twenty Benton County property tax payers in 2014 were owners of multifamily residential developments in Corvallis.

MK comment: I hope you will look into ways to tax these non-profits. According to my recent conversation with Benton County Assessor’s office personnel, OSU pays the land and building taxes for the Hilton Garden Inn and Hilton pays the yearly business tax. The reason given that tax is payable was that the hotel is not used for educational purposes. This is another reason to pursue public private partnerships for on-campus housing.

Your findings and policies in Article 13 should help our economic situation by making our city more attractive to live in.

MK Suggested Policy: *Eliminate property-tax exempt status for non-profits, including churches and medical facilities.*

Article 9. Housing

Policies

9.4.1 To meet Statewide and Local Planning goals, the City shall continue to identify housing needs and encourage the community, university, and housing industry to meet those needs.

MK Comment: This policy is good, but doesn’t go far enough to solve the lack of adequate housing described in the findings above, such as increase in senior population, displacement of single family dwellings by student only housing, lack of variety of housing for all. Perhaps “mandate” is too strong a word to replace “encourage,” but that’s the idea. The code should be changed to discourage or eliminate any further single use developments (for students only), and instead focus on housing that can be used by anyone, without a bathroom for every bedroom. Your policies 9.7.6, 9.7.8 and 9.7.9 will be good.

Proposed New Policy

9.4.11 When increasing residential densities through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, consideration shall be given to impacts on desired or required levels of service, including parks, open space, and other infrastructure.

MK Comment: This policy treats only one factor that contributes to a lack of affordable housing: density. Many factors contribute to expensive housing. Even with land price slightly reduced by multifamily living, it still is an expense. Land in Corvallis is not taxed consistently by size of lot. At least another policy needs to be added to address other things than density and required levels of service. Affordable housing can only be achieved by essentially subsidizing cost, whether this is done through land trusts, grants, or all the ideas mentioned in the findings. Because Corvallis is a desirable place to live and land is limited, housing will continue to be more expensive than a lot of other places in Oregon. We can still strive to reduce housing costs, but it will take creative thinking in design, and collaboration (on fee waiving, etc.), among all segments of businesses and government to lower costs. What we don’t want to see is cheap looking low cost housing put in as an afterthought.

Also, Corvallis is more dense than other Oregon cities of this size. We should not increase our density unless affected residents agree and participate in the public hearing process to change zoning and unless standards to improve building quality and design are implemented. Many people do not like density unless it is well designed to assure residential privacy and quiet. Housing should be built to codes that require sound barriers between walls and floors to eliminate noise from nearby neighbors; and codes that maintain privacy and a sense of open space with courtyard and balcony placements. These elements can be found in Europe to make their dense living situations more palatable.

“9.5.j Additionally, the 2014 Policy Options Study prepared for the City Council by ECONorthwest identified the following measures as having the potential to enhance housing affordability: streamline zoning code and other ordinances, administrative and procedural reforms, preservation of the existing housing supply, reform of the annexation process, allowing small or “tiny” homes, limited equity housing (co-housing), employer- assisted housing, and urban renewal or tax increment financing.”

MK Comment: The suggestions for reform of the annexation process and tax increment financing or urban renewal should be very carefully examined for negative response from the community before trying to use them. We have had a long history of support for the current annexation process, and turned down an urban renewal proposal for downtown several years ago.

Articles 9.7 through 13.4

MK comment: The findings and policies for these sections are excellent. Good Work. “Article 13, Special Areas of Concern” should be moved to the top of the document.

From: [Gary Angelo](#)
To: [Young, Kevin](#)
Cc: [mike middleton](#)
Subject: College Hill N.A. Input for OSU-Related Comp Plan Review Task Force
Date: Monday, July 06, 2015 4:17:43 PM

Corvallis Council/Planning Commission Task Force Members:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into this important update work on the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to OSU, and thank you for all your efforts thus far and for the additional to come. As CHNA President, I would like to reinforce the limited comments I made in person at your last Public Comment meeting a couple of weeks ago, as well as add some additional comments to other proposed sections and some of the feedback they have received.

First priority for our historic neighborhood and its continued viability has to be concerning Section 11.4 Auto Parking. There is an inclusion in the proposed New Findings and New Policies of ***funding mechanisms*** that have no place in the Comprehensive Plan, as this document should be strictly related to land use planning. Funding alternatives and possibilities are matters for the City Budget process and individual program plans. Given this, the following amendments to the proposals should be made:

1. New Finding 11.4.n regarding Parking fees should be removed from this document, since it refers to possible funding mechanisms and because it is not even a "finding"-- it is a speculative opinion.
2. Proposed New Policies 11.4.10.C and D should also be removed from the Comprehensive Plan, as they are both funding-related policies.
3. If the Task Force chooses to retain 11.4.10.C, then the phrase "*and can provide additional resources for transit and transportation improvements*" should be deleted. Retaining this phrase retains the intention to direct the allocation of resources, which is a funding decision, not a land use planning decision. In addition, it does nothing to describe the parameters and extent of how such a funding mechanism would be applied-- would it cover all the various kinds of parking (e.g., parking meters, parking garages, parking lots, residential parking districts, etc.)? Would it extend to all streets and neighborhoods in Corvallis, including south Corvallis, northeast Corvallis, Timberhill, Country Club hill, etc.? Would it be limited only to high-demand areas close to downtown and the OSU campus, and if so, how could such fee funding be significant enough to fund transit and transportation improvements without driving away business traffic or forever altering historic neighborhoods?
4. Section 11.4.10.D should not be retained as it is opinion rather than policy, and for it to actually be relevant policy, it would have to spell out exactly how that "effective mechanism" would be applied. Without such a description, it provides no actionable direction that could either be objectively translated into the Land Development Code nor direction to legislative bodies as to how to comply with it. It should therefore be removed.

5. Since one of the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan is to embody the Corvallis Vision 2020 Statement, a modification to 11.4.10.B should be made to clarify the intention of this policy statement. Paragraph B relates to Paragraph A, "The streets of Corvallis belong to the community"-- which goes without saying, since there is no one else, other than possibly the state that they could belong to. The key, however, is how best to apply Paragraph B, and what all "public good" entails. Paragraph B and how it is interpreted could be limited strictly to parking availability, or it can be more expansive to include the impact of managing the resource to aid in the preservation of each of the unique neighborhoods across the community. Treating parking as being monolithic and all neighborhoods as being alike would ignore the Vision's intention to recognize Corvallis as a community of different neighborhoods, each with its own character:

Where People Live:

"...Neighborhoods can be defined by the characteristics of neighborhood identity, pedestrian scale, diversity, and the public realm. These characteristics are protected and enhanced in existing neighborhoods and are included in the design of new neighborhoods."

So, to clarify the intention of Paragraph B such that it embodies Vision 2020, the amended paragraph could better read: "On-street parking is a public resource that should be effectively managed for all in a manner that protects and enhances the characteristics of existing neighborhoods and in the design of new neighborhoods."

In addition to 11.4 Auto Parking, here are some additional feedback items we would like to include:

6. Proposed New Policy 11.2.16 leaves in place the current practice of allowing developers to select their own transportation consultants to review the impacts of their proposed developments, which is an inherent conflict of interest. Whether it is added to this statement or a new one is added, a new statement should read, "Transportation impact analyses shall be conducted by transportation engineers selected at random from an pool of pre-approved engineering firms identified by City Council and funded by the developer."

7. Proposed New Policy 11.2.16 should also include an additional statement regarding the appropriate and relevant selection of traffic generation factors that should match the specific type of development being proposed. The use of generic nationally-averaged factors for broad categories (e.g., "apartments") should not be used in cases that are more narrow and specific (e.g., high-density student housing). Factors should match the most narrow type of development specific to what is being proposed.

8. Finding 3.2.c should be retained as proposed, retaining the last sentence, *"In particular cooperation is necessary to prevent simply shifting land use conflicts from one entity to another."* This is particularly important in a community such as Corvallis where significant amounts of the potential property tax base is currently being

occupied by large not-for-profit entities.

9. Finding 9.7.l and m are somewhat redundant, and 9.7.m can be removed while 9.7.l should be retained, as it includes more specific information related to conversion of single-family homes into higher-density student housing. This is an important finding, as it specifically relates to impacts on existing neighborhoods and the Vision 2020 section cited above.

10. Policy 9.7.2 should be retained as proposed with the addition of the word "more" to read: "The City shall encourage OSU to establish policies and procedures to encourage *more* resident students to live on campus." OSU has fewer on-campus student residents than many benchmark universities of similar size, so this should be improved.

11. New Policies 9.7.6-9 should be retained as proposed, rather than merely "considering" the possibilities of more on-campus student housing. These are key policy provisions to encourage the redress of past and continuing negative impacts of conversion of single-family homes near campus into higher density student housing developments. The one alteration in 9.7.9 should be to replace "Finding 9.7.m" with Finding 9.7.l", if recommendation #9 above is adopted.

12. New Policy 11.12.8 should be retained as proposed, as it is a key to addressing negative impacts to nearby neighborhood traffic patterns, particularly as it relates to cut-through traffic and over-crowding of collector corridors.

13. New Policy 13.2.7 should be retained as proposed, keeping the requirement for a public review process for potentially significant community impacts. The concern is that without such public review, new public-private partnerships could create unbalanced competition for locally-owned private organizations and businesses. Such locally owned entities are a primary source of property tax funding and for enhanced community engagement, and national or not-for-profit competition may ultimately drive them out of business.

Thank you for your consideration of the above recommendations. Again, you have all put a lot of time and effort into this, and we are hopeful that it increases that chances for enhancing our Corvallis community.

Sincerely,

Gary Angelo
College Hill NA President



LWV Corvallis

PO Box 1679, Corvallis, OR 97339-1679

541-753-6036 • <http://www.lwv.corvallis.or.us>

July 7, 2015

To: Members of the OSU-Related Comprehensive Plan Review Task Force

From: Laura Lahm Evenson, President
League of Women Voters of Corvallis

Re: Comments on Revisions to OSU-Related Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies

The League of Women Voters of Corvallis appreciates the work you have done on this important update. This task is not easy. We are fortunate to live in a college town, albeit one with growing pains. We now have an opportunity to make a measurable positive impact on the economic well-being, future growth, and livability of Corvallis. You have made a good start in the Version 4.0 draft of OSU-Related Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies.

Clearly, parking and housing are two interrelated concerns.

Most employers provide parking for their employees; commercial establishments are required to provide plentiful parking for their customers. OSU, however, impacts nearby residential neighborhoods when the automobile parking is allowed to spill over into the near-by community. While we recognize the latest OSU parking plan as an attempt to ameliorate the parking issue, it has not, partly because OSU continues to remove parking from the inner core of campus. OSU also continues to build classroom and office space without adding any parking. League strongly suggests that these two practices end. League recommends that OSU consider adding low cost satellite lots with shuttles scheduled to run during class time on campus. Finally, we support an aggressive transportation education effort—one that reflects the recognition of climate impacts of single car use and focuses on solutions to parking demand and alternative transportation choices. Another part of this answer will be the increase in on-campus housing as requested below.

League supports and expands upon the housing recommendation of the Collaboration Planning Workgroup (attached). To alleviate housing pressures, and other concerns caused by off campus living, League recommends that OSU work to house 50% of undergraduate students on campus. If on-campus housing were to increase by 4% per year, this should be accomplished in fewer than 20 years. The benefits of this action would be profound. Research shows that students living on campus are more successful academically and socially; and that they have higher graduation rates. In addition, the University is able to work more closely with students who are struggling with academic and abuse issues. On-campus housing relieves the strain on rental housing in the greater community, and, moreover, students living on campus do not have to drive to class.

It seems as though the Corvallis housing market is saturated with high-end student-only housing—one bath per bedroom units. League recommends that the city develop code that does not allow single-user designs, but housing that is welcoming and accessible to all. To encourage the development of undergraduate housing on campus, however, these requirements would not apply to housing built on campus property. League also supports the proposed City policy that encourages the University to enter into public-private partnerships to provide on-campus housing for a wide range of students as well as campus staff.

These recommendations are based on League's Community Planning position that supports citizen-based land use planning, effectively implemented and urbanization policies which foster complete, healthy, and diverse communities where people can live, work, shop, and play.

NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING WORKGROUP:

REPORT TO STEERING COMMITTEE, 26 NOVEMBER 2012

Since the August 13 Steering Committee meeting, Neighborhood Planning has met seven times. During that period, we concluded our work on Objective 3 and are now working our way through the tasks related to Objective 2. Recommendations to accomplish these objectives follow.

Objective 3: Review opportunities to provide housing for OSU students that is compatible within the community.

A. Evaluate ways to increase on-campus housing, such as on-campus living requirements, public-private partnerships, etc.

First, we want to thank President Ray and his staff for their decision to require all freshmen to live on campus starting next fall. This is an important step that will benefit the students, the University, and the community as a whole.

The workgroup has three recommendations regarding on-campus housing.

1. We recommend that OSU include in the current update of their Campus Master Plan a chapter on housing that sets goals, objectives, and targets for the percentage of students living on campus, and incorporates the land use planning necessary to achieve those goals, objectives, and targets.

Integrating housing into the Master Plan would establish the topic as an important element in university's ongoing and long-term planning. By "land use planning" we are referring primarily to the need to identify specific sites for future housing.

2. We recommend that OSU strive to increase the percentage of students living on campus, using various means such as public-private partnerships to develop housing that is attractive to upper-level students; closer to market rates; allows more independence and autonomy for students; is designed so students don't have to bring cars to campus; and reserves land for future housing. **The recommended target range is 28 to 30 percent by 2019.**

In arriving at the specific numbers for this target range, we reviewed and considered a number of sources and aspects. We concluded that increasing the percentage of undergraduate students living on campus is:

- Good for students. Research on student living experiences consistently has shown that compared to students who live off campus, students who live on campus have higher rates of retention, graduation, and exposure to people whose cultures and backgrounds differ from their own. (National Survey of Student Engagement; also, *How College Affects Students*. Pascarella, Ernest T. and Patrick T. Terenzini. Vol. 2: *A Third Decade of Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/ John Wiley and Sons, 2005. Pp. 420-21)

- Good for the University. OSU’s Strategic Plan—Phase II, Goal 2 places an emphasis on improving first-year retention and six-year graduation rates, and on graduates’ ability to compete in a diverse workplace and global environment. The above-mentioned research indicates that providing more on-campus student living opportunities will support precisely this emphasis and these goals. For example, “The post-1990 research supports our earlier conclusion that students living on campus are more likely to persist to degree completion than are similar students living elsewhere ...Living on rather than off campus does promote more positive and inclusive racial-ethnic attitudes and openness to diversity, ...the residential impact is strongest in those living settings purposefully structured to encourage students’ encounters with people different from themselves and with ideas different from those they currently hold “ (Pascarella et al, 603-04).

As stated in its Strategic Plan and elsewhere, the University aims to become one of the top ten land grant universities in the nation. A comparison with nine peer universities by which OSU intends to benchmark its progress (attached) indicates that only one of them houses less than OSU’s 21 percent of undergraduate students living in university owned, operated, or affiliated housing. Assuming a 28 percent target would bring OSU close to the median of the peer group.

- Good for the entire community. The current vacancy rate for rentals in Corvallis is one percent or less. This means rental housing is nearly unavailable for students or for anyone else wishing to live here without buying a home. It also means single family homes that in better market circumstances would be available for purchase by young families, OSU faculty or staff, and others, are not available for sale because they are being converted to student rentals. If OSU is able to house 28 percent of its undergraduates on campus, it will significantly relieve the pressure on both rental units and single-family homes throughout Corvallis. A healthier rental vacancy rate will welcome students, low- or modest-income nonstudents, faculty, staff, and others all to find a place to live in, and be part of, our community.

3. We recommend that OSU place a priority on pursuing public-private partnerships or other options, for a village-style development on campus to house students, faculty, and staff.

The intent of this recommendation was to suggest one or more ways OSU might be able to achieve the 28 percent target specified in the previous recommendation. Evaluation of public-private partnerships is also mentioned in our charge as part of this particular objective. After reviewing numerous materials and in the context of the challenges inherent in traditional modes of creating on-campus housing, we found three factors in particular that made the public-private partnership model an attractive one:

- The private sector assumes most of the debt burden;
- Financing models avoid many barriers faced by publicly-financed projects;
- Partnership arrangements offer flexibility in design to meet multiple OSU objectives.

One example of such a partnership that we studied is the West Village project on the University of California's Davis campus (discussed on pp. 17-18 of the University/Community Research Working Document). Not only is UCD one of the peer comparator land grant universities cited in OSU's strategic plan, but there are also numerous similarities between the two campuses both historically and currently. In reviewing the West Village project, we noted key elements that, if incorporated into such a project at OSU, could accomplish a number of important OSU goals in addition to housing students. Examples include a mix of both faculty and student housing; a community college center; showcasing OSU expertise through use of innovative faculty and staff research in project development; and commercial retail space. Other ideas for inclusion in such a project may be seen in two lists of goals or elements to consider (attached), should the University decide to pursue this type of arrangement.

Objective 3 B: Consider the merits and means to incentivize off-campus housing in preferred target areas such as downtown Corvallis, greenfield sites, etc.

Our work group examined a number of materials about ways to incentivize off-campus housing. After several meetings reviewing and discussing possibilities, the group arrived at the following conclusion:

We do not recommend using incentives at this time; but if the City of Corvallis ever considers an urban renewal district in the future, then addressing the housing supply associated with the growth of OSU should be considered as an urban renewal district goal.

Objective 2: Review current development standards, and identify potential measures that would minimize potential impact from the creation of high density housing in or near lower density residential areas.

A. Develop and enact Land Development Code (LDC) language that would implement selected mitigation measures (measure to mitigate impacts to neighborhood character, privacy, parking and other issues, as identified).

B. Findings from the Neighborhood Parking and Traffic Study should be factored into potential regulatory changes.

The Steering Committee may recall that at your last meeting, you approved a recommendation we had forwarded to you regarding the establishment of parking standards for 4- and 5-bedroom apartments. As a follow-up to that recommendation, which has now gone through the City's land use process and been approved by the City Council, the group has provided an additional recommendation:

In order to encourage affordable housing built specifically for low-income residents, who typically have lesser needs for parking, we recommend that the City Council direct City Planning staff to develop Land Development Code language that would exempt multifamily affordable housing development, defined as units made available for rent or purchase by households at or

below 60 percent of the Area Median Income, from the parking requirements for four- and five-bedroom units.

If you approve it, this recommendation will need to go through the City's land use processes and be approved by the Council, just like the earlier one.

So far, in our work on Objective 2, we have reviewed 10 parking-related items, sending a number of them to the Parking and Traffic Work Group along with comments or suggestions mostly dealing with aspects and some potential consequences of various forms of on-street parking management.

We have also reviewed a number of items related to use of rental property. Several of them are already being addressed at the Neighborhood Livability Work Group. Following a long and thorough discussion we declined to recommend a change to the occupancy limit of five unrelated persons per dwelling.

We already have several suggestions and motions to be referred to the yet-to-be-formed Housing Work Group, which we believe are important but which exceed our scope of work.

Over the next few months, we anticipate devoting a number of meetings to issues of design standards and neighborhood identity. We expect to make use of the neighborhood survey information gathered by volunteers over the past months, as soon as the process of data entry and organization into a coherent inventory is complete.

Finally, in the process of developing recommendations regarding on-campus housing in particular, we reviewed a number of materials from multiple sources that were extremely helpful. I'd like to thank the city staff who pulled together the research on how other university communities are addressing many of the issues we face; and Eric Adams, for research he provided on a number of key issues. Both OSU's Enrollment Management staff and Dan Larsen, OSU Housing and Dining, also provided helpful information.

Student Housing Residency Comparison
Oregon State University Strategic Plan Comparator Institutions

University	Reported Total Enrollment	Reported Undergraduate Enrollment	Undergraduate Students Living in Univ. Owned, Operated, or Affiliated Housing (%)	Undergraduate Students Living Off Campus (%)
Oregon State University	23,761	19,559	21.0	79.0
Cornell	20,939	13,935	57.0	43.0
Michigan State University	41,131	36,058	40.0	60.0
Ohio State University	56,064	42,082	25.0	75.0
Penn State University	45,233	38,594	37.0	63.0
Purdue	39,726	30,836	38.0	62.0
Texas A&M (College Station)	49,129	39,148	24.0	76.0
Univ. of Arizona	39,086	30,592	20.0	80.0
UC Davis	31,392	24,737	Not Reported	Not Reported
Univ. of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign)	43,862	31,540	50.0	50.0
Univ. of Wisconsin (Madison)	42,595	30,555	25.0	75.0

Source: US News (<http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges>), retrieved August 21, 2012.

Lists related to Recommendation #3, pages 2-3
Public-private partnerships

Elements and options to consider (from Betty Griffiths, work group member):

- Housing options for students, faculty and staff.
- Apartment style housing for students – studio, one, two, three and four bedroom units
- Include one or more cooperative houses for students – perhaps special interests houses
- Mix of units to include some single family homes, duplex, triplex and fourplex units
- Mixed use type development – include food, retail and other services that appeal to students.
- Commercial development on ground floor
- Underground parking
- Include sites for research and development
- Include network of trails and natural areas
- Partner with the City for development of a Community Center (including indoor sports courts) available to all residents with special emphasis on residents in the village
- Consider partnership with 501(c) (3) for provision of some housing for low income and/or married student housing.
- Consider partnering with Community College for classroom space
- Use faculty and staff resources to develop concept and plan and then showcase unique features of the development and OSU work.
- Work towards zero net energy and LEED certification at highest level.
- Provide space for social interaction
- Provide space and opportunities for informal student faculty interactions

Goals (from Dan Larsen, OSU Housing and Dining, and work group member):

1. Increase of total beds
2. Speed to completion of project
3. Quality construction: long-term asset vs. lowest, first-time costs
4. Diversity in unit types
5. Financial proposition: Long-term investment vs. maximize short- and long-term profit
6. Educational environment consistent with University's mission
7. Student academic success
8. Management of student behavior
9. Property management and accountability
10. Positive public perception
11. Close proximity to campus
12. Impact to University's debt capacity (non-recourse, off-balance sheet)
13. Contribute to the aesthetic value of the campus
14. Economic contributor to the community