CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
May 14, 2015

Present
Planning Commissioners:
Jennifer Gervais, Chair
Paul Woods
Jasmin Woodside

City Councilors:
Barbara Bull
Roen Hogg
Frank Hann

Excused Absence:
Ron Sessions

Staff
Kevin Young, Planning Department Manager
Blanca Ruckert, Recorder

Visitors
David Bella
David Dodson
Charley Vars
Court Smith

I. Welcome and Introduction

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 6:05 p.m. in the Madison Avenue Meeting Room. Introductions were made.

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITIES

David Bella passed out some charts to illustrate points that Court Smith mentioned at the last meeting and to illustrate some things he is working on. Diagrams are a new way of presenting information to shift our imagination about how we do things. Long reports are not the answer, so he reviewed his series of cards with mostly pictures and a few words to make his points. Bella stated that the future we are building is centered on a car dependent structure that has all sorts of impacts. These pictures are actual pictures taken here; not rush hour with only one human being that is a pedestrian but the rest are cars.

Bella provided an explanation for the series of cards. He stated that they present new ideas about doing something different, making places more walk-able and establishing connections between two walk-able areas, such as the downtown area and the campus. The card illustrates the number of possibilities for the use of bike tramways. He added that for special activities, like farmer's market, there's an opportunity ~~here~~ to provide different kinds of transportation. The idea is to carry out some of these ideas to see how they work and see the results and realize that there are alternatives to the automobile. The last cards provide a draft policy that gets us to see other possibilities but it will take creative imagination.
In reference to the pathways shared with trams, there was a question as to whether there were areas that already do this. Bella answered that there are some that could easily do that, such as Campus Way to fairgrounds which allows for bicycles. His concept is to have the area from downtown Corvallis to campus be the model and then imagine other areas like school zones.

David Dodson complimented the task force on the great job they are doing. He imparted some knowledge he garnered while at the National Planning Conference in Seattle last month. In a session that dealt with parking and transportation issues faced by San Francisco in dealing with Google and another large employer, California removed requirements for level of service being a consideration of functionality with regards to traffic and transportation impacts. The Environmental Review entity did that because they realized that level of service simply provides information that something doesn't meet a certain standard, a

certain level of service, so in other words, it's congested and it's failing for whatever reason. He noted that the problem has been that in addressing an issue, something is done to accommodate more traffic. What does it accomplish in the long run? It's a whole network of problem solving in dealing, promoting and advocating for more cars, so you get more congestion and the issue continues. At some point there's only so much right of way and so much land to accommodate the automobile and that's not going to solve the problem. The focus needs to be on how to get people out of cars and into other modes of transportation that will lessen or at least minimize the transportation impacts that are creating problems in intersections and functionality. He stated that when looking at improvements, their focus is not on accommodating the automobile but in improving other modes. California ia doing things to enhance pedestrian safety or the pedestrian experience, or additional bike lanes and bike parking and things that advocate and promote more transit improvements all along the lines of what Bella's group is talking about.

Councilor Bull asked if they address the cost of housing prices rising when the private Google shuttle serves only the employees. Dodson replied no, the Google campus is predominantly an office park so there is no residential housing; auto use was 75% to 80% people driving to work. Google took on the transit system and built their own. Another employer handled the housing piece recognizing that putting housing close to where people work means less need to go long distances. Another group handled the main street, housing, commercial retail use, services, restaurants; the challenge was to put a cap on development. Limiting square footage doesn't result in less trips; part of the puzzle is looking at the type of development and whether it will eliminate or add trips. Dodson stated that to develop housing either adjacent to or on campus would impact a reduction of vehicle trips just because those people would not likely need a car

III. REVIEW OF Version 2.0 Draft Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies

Gervais focused the group on the work for the evening starting with Attachment A, the updates, as put together by staff, with the strike out element. She suggested they proceed by reviewing page by page, noting comments or recommendations and staff and task force members can ask questions.

Mr. Young directed attention to page 1 of Attachment A noting it is a new policy and proposed new finding in section 3.2. Staff sees this section of the comprehensive plan relating to general language to be applied throughout the City and may be more appropriate to locate these proposed new findings and policies in section 13.2 which provides for a specific focus on OSU. So the first question is whether the group agrees. In relation to proposed new policy 3.2.9, a suggestion was to keep the first sentence, "the City and OSU shall closely coordinate land use…" and leave it at that. Another suggestion was to add an appendix; staff commented it might be another layer that may get lost. Bull suggested keeping it as policy but add that it will be monitored on an annual basis or at least require "there's going to be an annual review" of some kind. Consensus was to keep "if these conditions and assumptions exceed and also "these monitoring programs can occur anywhere in the community".

In reference to Finding 3.2.s "OSU students currently make up approximately one-third of people…" Woodside suggested adding 2015. Also suggested was a grammatical correction to Finding 3.2.r, in "because of the disproportionate impact OSU has on the community as a result of its relative size..." deleting the double because.

There was discussion about the purpose of Finding 3.2.o. Gervais pointed out that even though the campus master plan growth projections were not exceeded, the impact still was not addressed. Suggestion was to add the sentence, "that the fact that the entire Campus Master Plan was not implemented it may have led to the unanticipated community impacts…" Discussion continued about identifying the real problem that needed to be addressed. Agreement to add sentence "Since 2005 this many dorms were constructed" in

2005 “X” units were available on campus and in 2015 the ratio is “Y”. Staff could use undergraduate enrollment.

Consensus to keep new proposed finding 5.2.f.

Proposed new findings 5.2.f and 5.4.L were discussed. Staff pointed out in reviewing the findings that they address two different issues, one speaks to community character and the other to historic cultural resources and it could be appropriate to keep both. Consensus was to keep both with suggestion to replace “received an underlying zoning that’s denser” to “redeveloped” in 5.2.f.

Reviewing Attachment A, page 4, policy 5.4.17 there was discussion about who is “desiring” and whether it’s a discretionary matter of taste. Staff stated that in the collaboration work recently put in place and two code amendments addressed this issue about preserving neighborhood character but not historic preservation. This language could be used both to refer to those changes but also to refer to potential future changes that might identify important historic characteristics. Staff would have to craft clear and objective code language to codify what those characteristics were and how to apply them fairly and uniformly across the board.

In reference to Policy 5.6.20, the suggestion was to revise the policy to state, “The City will work closely with OSU to develop recreational opportunities on campus that serve the larger community”.

Article 7, Environmental Quality

In reference to 7.2.i. There was some discussion about “global climate change” wording when the comprehensive plan is about policies for the community and the other reasons are sufficient. It was agreed to let wording stand as written as it supports similar language in other places in the comprehensive plan and is consistent.

Article 8 Economy

Bull asked if the task force was going to prioritize the adoption of what needs to be addressed first. She noted this section which updates Economic data was needed, but she is not sure how it affects change.

After discussion it was agreed that updated Economic data added value to the relationship with other parts of the comprehensive plan, economic development and developing relationships with OSU. It allows future decision makers to address changes.

Section 8.4 Education (Attachment A, page 6)

Language in 8.4.d is proposed by OSU staff so task force needs to decide whether they want to adopt it. Consensus was to adopt as a recommendation.

Attachment A, page 7
Editorial suggestion second paragraph from bottom “In 2014…” about the 5th line starting with “revenue…” strike out ‘does our’.

Attachment A, page 8 okay

Attachment A, page 9

In reference to 9.4.c, "Housing Division Staff propose the following update language…" seems quite lengthy and question was whether it was necessary to get LDC support. Also the question was whether it was excluded from zoning policy currently. Staff stated it was an attempt to update 9.4.c to include senior citizen population and senior housing and the data was out of date. Suggestion was to change 'elderly' to 'older'.

There was continued discussion about the need to have this; and the question was asked, "does the LDC preclude this change?" and the answer was "no." Staff responded that this section is about housing needs and identifying what those needs are. Staff also commented that not everything in the comprehensive plan was focused on LDC but also informs the housing division, their programs and practices; not everything requires Land Development Code to be written, but deals with programs and policies.

Correct 9.4.d to the politically correct language from 'disabled' to 'challenged'. Staff will determine.

Attachment A, page 11, Finding 9.4.o there was a question as to what was "dedicated farm worker housing units". Staff answered it was housing that addressed a specific segment of the population. There was discussion about the definitions and needs of this population, which impacts the community yet remains invisible.

The proposed new policy, 9.4.11, there was confusion about what the policy means, "increasing residential densities…". After discussion it was agreed to change language to "consideration shall be given to the impact of desired or required levels of service".

Attachment A, page 12
At this time, the task force checked time and work still needed to be reviewed. Staff stated the process was to prepare these recommendations to go to City Council, but first to provide a public comment opportunity. The proposed Comprehensive Plan revisions are not being considered for adoption at this time, we are just asking for public comment and making recommendations. Task force would come back in June with the public feedback and refine recommendations. A draft would be prepared for City Council and then City Council would accept or not. If Council accepts and directs that these recommendations move forward, a whole new process will proceed, involving Planning Commission review and ultimately formal recommendations to, and a decision by, the City Council.

Councilor Bull stated the direction given by the City Manager was that any change in direction would nullify the interim agreement with OSU, including changes to LDC and comp plan. Staff restated that it's up to Council to decide to accept recommendations and move forward with amendments. The Task Force asked for staff to get clarity on this question.

There was some discussion about stopping to allow public testimony since a couple of task force members need to leave at 8:30. Agreement was to continue discussions and stay on task since there would still be a quorum.

It was commented that figures in Finding 9.5.d were dismal and questioned whether it included student population. Staff will try to determine. This issue needs clarification.

There's a preference in Finding 9.5.p to show changes in tables instead of just updating numbers. It might be that the format for the final product should be illustrated to show trend.

Consensus to keep 9.5.L and 9.4.e in two different sections even though they address same information.

There was some discussion about 9.5.n and agreement was it no longer exists and not useful.
9.7.e – no longer accurate and agreed to strike.
9.7.c agreed to strike.
9.7.d after discussion it was agreed to amend to "forecast of student enrollment historically has not been accurate (finding). "In addition these forecasts have not been a reliable measure of anticipating impacts to the community".
9.7.f needs to be updated to include data from Opal document and get a comparison trend.
In reference to 9.7.g there was a question about whether sprinkler systems were still an issue and it was agreed to keep.
Attachment A, page 16
9.7.3 after much discussion agreed to leave in as a strike out item but not delete.
Attachment A, page 20
In reference to 11.12.6 "zoning for OSU related development will take into account.." after discussion agreed to placemark and tackle deeper later.
Attachment A, page 16 sections 9.7.4 through 9.7.6 all good
Attachment A, page 17 section 9.7.7 through 9.7.9 all good

IV. Continued Development of Revisions to Findings and Policies not yet addressed

At this point, the Task Force reviewed time and decided to start on Transportation at the next meeting. Gervais asked Task Force members to review testimony that hasn't been discussed yet, then look at David Dodson's comments, and review remainder of submissions and discuss and craft language as necessary.

Leaving at this juncture were Woodside and Hogg

V. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

David Bella referenced page A-5 and commented that once a car dependent infrastructure is established it is extremely difficult to reverse and very expensive. Expansion of car dependency is a self generating process that institutions are already set up to do. Article 7 which is on page A-5 and on 7.2.i has car dependency and so does 7.2.k. Policies should explore options that reduce car dependency. Reducing carbon emissions doesn't necessarily decrease pollution or improve air quality. Diesel might reduce carbon emissions but it increases other kinds of air pollution. In Article 7 should say "OSU and the City shall explore options for reducing carbon emissions and car dependency."

Bull asked if that particular language was strongly preferred or if they should consider "we will prioritize our transportation related investments into things that benefit non-car modes" for it to be effective and accepted by the community. People might react as though they are being punished for driving. A positive statement about priorities investing in bike lanes might be more tolerable.

Bella responded that it's not about forcing people to stop using cars.

There was continued discussion about how best to promote the concept of less car dependency and prioritize alternative modes of transportation.

Dave Dodson asked for clarification about the next meeting, and when public comment would be heard. Gervais stated that it would be decided at the meeting scheduled on May 28th. Dodson stated that OSU would rather have the Task Force's thoughtful consideration of things as opposed to rushing through

things. Dodson stated that A-16, as it relates to 9.7.3 with the emphasis on providing housing for students within 1/2 mile of campus, makes sense from a planning perspective. However, he suggested that "the City and OSU shall work toward the goal of housing faculty, staff and students who work and attend regular classes on campus in units on or near campus" would be less specific. If people live close to campus, it will be beneficial in many different ways.

Chair Gervais asked that the wording get to Staff for consideration.

Charlies Vars observed hesitancy on some of the task force in making a motion to delete or add items that would require the community or the Council to ultimately make a decision. He suggested not avoiding this step because, despite the problems, it contributes to the deciding body by making them more certain in their task and the result. He was asked for an example and he used the discussion about the 1/2 mile campus housing. People may think that this will affect change in the flow of traffic and things will work perfectly. He suggested deleting that statement as policy in the transportation area to promote discussion. The Councilors are going to ask, 'why was that policy deleted?'

Bull pointed out that discussion is the goal and going ahead and introducing an action that would lead to discussion is a good thing. Vars responded that his objective in chairing meetings was to have as many Councilors as possible ~~to~~ debate to get a good decision. Bull was concerned that the discussion might be bogged down with the minutiae. Vars stated he would view the comprehensive plan renewal process as a process best designed to get the community ~~get~~ to a certain point and Councilors are going to vote in favor of a variety of things.

Court Smith said this effort is designed to help the future that's coming and taking a look at the whole. A lot of the discussion tonight was about what was expected and what resulted; so it means we haven't been looking at the system broadly enough. Dan Brown provided a good discussion on this topic last week and he encouraged the task force to review it and also the recommendations that were presented with the April 16 packet. Think about your discussion in emphasizing that the comprehensive plan needs to look at things more broadly and where problems originate. There's a need to understand the specifics but also need to look at the bigger picture and what's happening. He suggested putting in the first statement something about looking at the whole, reviewing Dan Brown's suggestions and state at the beginning that things need to be reviewed in a broader perspective.

Chair Gervais stated that the goal tonight was to review work that had been done to date by Staff and reflect to begin building. Vars commented his statements were not to criticize.

Staff stated revisions will be prepared by next meeting about discussions this evening and included in packets to move forward.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.