



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

**CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
JUNE 8, 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:

Charles Vars
David Bella
David Dodson

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force (PRTF) was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 6:11 p.m. in the Madison Avenue Meeting Room. Introductions were made.

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

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 (**Attachment A**).

David Bella said policies should reflect the findings. He highlighted one new policy in his written testimony that reflected findings regarding car dependency.

Commissioner Woods said he agreed with most of it, saying that while there is little we can do locally to affect global climate, we *can* adapt to the effects of global climate change, and our resources were better spent to determine how best to do that. He gave the example of gray-water reuse. Commissioner Gervais asked if he thought we should re-write the policy. Commissioner Woods said there are several other good reasons to reduce car dependence apart from global climate change.

Councilor Hann concurred, saying we need to look at Statewide Goals in terms of the Comp Plan. It also relates to Sustainability Goals in terms of the budget, and reduces our contribution to climate change. Commissioner Woods said it didn't address all the other things, apart from car-dependence, that impact climate change. There are many other things we do that also affect climate change, and car use is only one of them; he feared the policy as written could cause a negative impact on the economy.

Commissioner Sessions said this initiative promotes a collaborative environment; we generally want to be responsible; this is a simple statement, and it goes in the right direction, and is not limited to reducing car dependence. All global citizens need to take small steps in order to make a big difference overall, and down the road. Chair Gervais suggested a compromise, noting there were findings to back it up, and that the State of Oregon had a goal of seeking a 75% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. She proposed a new policy to support that statewide goal in 7.2.h: "To reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve livability, and improve environmental quality in the community, OSU and the City shall work together to reduce car dependence". Commissioner Woods said there were additional, pragmatic reasons that could be listed, such as improve health and reduce inefficiencies, which could improve buy-in. Chair Gervais said those were fine, if there is a finding to back them up.

III. Continued Development of Revisions to Findings and Policies Not Yet Addressed

Chair Gervais highlighted Rollie Baxter's March 24, 2015 testimony, starting with the Sector Concept, asking whether it should be in the LDC. Commissioner Woods said it ended up in Land Development Code (LDC) Chapter 3.36, but he felt that it didn't work well, since it looked at any new construction on campus as the development site, but parking might not end up where it needs to be. Something in the Comp Plan needs to eventually trigger something in Chapter 3.36. Commissioner Gervais asked if he had a finding to add; Commissioner Woods said Dan Brown also brought it up. Chair Gervais highlighted Dan Brown's April 22, 2015 testimony, but didn't see anything about Parking Districts.

Commissioner Woods said that if the new District Plan somehow addresses the location of parking relative to the parking generators. Manager Young suggested focusing on parking generators and where parking demand is; there may be other reasons why Sectors may be helpful for planning purposes, unrelated to parking. Chair Gervais proposed Commissioner Woods craft language and give it to Manager Young to bring it back; Commissioner Woods agreed to do so. Commissioner Sessions said his concern about parking by sector was that it may cause traffic to come readily in and out much like a shopping center; however, if parking is a little less available and handy, then people may do a better job of combining trips.

Councilor Hann said our mission was to look at the OSU Comp Plan relative to the OSU planning process, and to determine what aspects don't adequately reflect the community's interests in relation to OSU. We'll be working in broad terms, and the Planning Commission will follow up later in detail. Manager Young said the goal was to get public comment and then finalize a recommendation. The interim agreement expires in about eighteen months.

Chair Gervais felt most of Rollie Baxter's testimony, including on congestion, was addressed by previously discussed policies and findings. Chair Gervais summarized that we don't need to address his point #3, since we've already addressed parking.

Regarding #4 she highlighted Councilor Hann's concern that he was not sure we've clearly identified Zone C as a primary area of parking loss and intense development, and this could be a finding to support a policy of the need for a method (such as a trolley or people mover) of transporting large numbers between the core campus and remote parking. Commissioner Gervais felt it wasn't the place of the Comp Plan to tell OSU how to develop within its boundaries, but we still need a way to address parking overflow into neighborhoods.

Councilor Hann understood removing traffic from the core, but it makes the center much less accessible to the general public, especially for short trips (such as returning a library book or attending campus events); people can't get in and out. Commissioner Gervais said there hasn't been discussion of campus development in terms of limiting the ability of short-term campus visitors to get in and out of the campus core.

Chair Gervais suggested a draft finding that "Loss of parking in Sector C makes it more difficult for members of the public to access the core of campus for events open to the public". An accompanying policy could be "OSU and the City will work together to accommodate short-term visitors to the campus core". Councilor Hann observed that producing better pedestrian safety has meant less connectivity with the community at large. Commissioner Woods said it made it hard for him to use the library; he opined that you should be able to run in and park for an hour or so.

There were no comments regarding #5. Chair Gervais felt #6 had been addressed elsewhere. She concurred with Councilor Hann's comment that as long as it is modified to state that it is a contributing factor to this trend (vs. the only cause), it could be included as a Finding. He didn't think including it was necessary.

Regarding #7, Chair Gervais said it appeared related to Chapter 3.36 and so we shouldn't touch it. We discussed working with OSU to ensure housing opportunities on campus for faculty, staff and students; and working with OSU to ameliorate parking and traffic generation. Commissioner Woods said the District Plan was a compromise on how the community deals with OSU growth and development; if the community has nothing to say about it, there's no point to this District Plan. He said this item had to do with monitoring the rate of growth, not absolute numbers. The rate of change was so rapid that it had a huge impact on parking and with infill changing the character of neighborhoods, and Mr. Baxter's point was that our infrastructure can't accommodate that rate of growth.

Councilor Hann felt it was too speculative. He highlighted Director Gibb's memo in the packet; he said it had already been absorbed elsewhere in terms of the need for better mechanisms for monitoring and adjusting to change. While the university didn't even come near the amount of square footage it could build, neither the City nor the university realized what the impact of growth was going to be. Commissioner Gervais said it was a combination of enrollment and not accommodating the students.

Commissioner Woods felt that that rate of growth was unlikely to recur again; perhaps there could be a finding that the rate of growth is also an important factor in absorbing changes. Chair Gervais asked Commissioner Woods to craft a statement and bring it back.

Commissioner Sessions said the Code already requires monitoring of the university growth rate. There could be a policy that if the university exceeds the anticipated growth rate by X%, then it should meet with the City and work out mitigating circumstances in terms of how to compensate the City in order to provide the infrastructure that supports OSU activities. Chair Gervais said that was already in the draft: "If criteria that was in the Master Plan are exceeded, it will trigger a review regardless of whether or not the Plan is due to expire".

Regarding #8- monitoring was already addressed.

Regarding #9, Chair Gervais said findings and policies were already developed.

Chair Gervais said #10 and #11 had already been addressed. Regarding #12, she asked if there was already language in 4.0 to the effect that “..any development not meant to serve the campus community will undergo the public review process”; Manager Young replied that there was a proposed policy from the previous meeting, along with a supporting finding. He highlighted Attachment B-24, containing a proposed new 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”. The supporting finding is in 13.2.2.

Regarding #13 and #14; they have been addressed. Regarding #15, Chair Gervais cited Dan Brown’s testimony that parking in neighborhoods has actually been a decades-old problem. Commissioner Sessions said we can’t tell OSU how to fix these problems. Councilor Hann added that we should recognize that everything in this process is dealing with not making it worse as we go forward, not trying to recapture what we’ve lost.

Regarding #17, Chair Gervais said there was language in the Comp Plan regarding review of things that serve the public, not just the OSU community. She wasn’t sure she agreed, since Chapter 3.36 went through extensive review and public process; it’s just a matter of making sure it reflected what people needed. Councilor Hann said he often hears from constituents in his ward that OSU is included in most boards and commissions, but there really isn’t reciprocity, with no City liaisons on OSU decision-making bodies to get input from the perspective of the city. Therefore, he felt the point had validity.

Chair Gervais suggested a draft finding that finding that “The public has expressed a concern that there has been inadequate public review and input on campus development”. Manager Young noted that before the campus Master Plan, individual development on campus was reviewed through a public hearing process, and a new building went through a PD review. The university was not satisfied with this, due to the lack of certainty of outcomes, and the community wasn’t necessarily well served, since, in looking at individual buildings, it didn’t look at the bigger issues. The balance is finding the appropriate level of public involvement. The previous system didn’t work well, but the current system also has its problems.

Councilor Hann said the public sometimes feels there is a culture of decisions being made outside a public process. Commissioner Woods said that having a Council Liaison represented in OSU campus planning would facilitate State Goal #1, but not be too intrusive. Councilor Hann replied that there’s communication with City staff all the time. Manager Young said that the campus planning staff level is probably not where decisions get made. Chair Gervais said perhaps it’s more about transparency in the decision-making process, with a line of communication to City staff to help address some of the concerns the public has expressed.

She suggested a Finding that “The public has expressed concern that there is inadequate public review of campus development”. An accompanying Policy could be “A means of creating more transparent communication between OSU and the City on planning matters”. Commissioner Sessions said we need to consider that when the new Campus Master Plan is submitted, that will be a public process, with an opportunity for the public and Councilors to provide input.

Councilor Hann paraphrased Councilor Bull, saying that there are provisions within the County development code that would allow OSU a fairly broad range of uses on lands west

of 35th Street; the public would like to know what the future looks like there. The Collaboration Project occurred because it was felt that there was no mechanism of communication adequate for people making decisions on both sides, with the university appearing to have a deaf ear to the surrounding community, and with the subsequent degradation of a lot of housing. He said the university has a statewide responsibility to include public input; hence the Campus Master Plan. Manager Young noted that new university governance has more independence from the State; many decisions are made by the Board of Trustees.

Manager Young read the draft policy “The City encourages OSU to develop a means of development decision making that is more transparent”. Chair Gervais said the language was adequate as a placeholder, with the accompanying finding: “The public has expressed concern that there has been inadequate public review of development on campus”. Commissioner Woods said one mechanism is to have an elected policy maker be a liaison to supervise the transparency; Chair Gervais said that would be up to the LDC to decide.

Regarding item #18, Chair Gervais said issues of triggering and monitoring had already been addressed; 3.36 will eventually be re-written.

Regarding item #19, Manager Young said it wasn't accurate; Chair Gervais concurred.

Regarding item #20, Chair Gervais wasn't sure if it was true or should be included. Manager Young said a recently passed levy included support for fire protection services. OSU pays no property taxes, but there was some arrangement between the Fire Department and OSU. Councilor Hann said it would come up under the Sustainable Budget Task Force work, and so would be addressed elsewhere, not here.

Regarding #21, Chair Gervais said the reference to the BLI was not true. Councilor Hann said that in the future, ideally we should cite where something was already addressed. Manager Young said he could look at what we've already done in Findings and Policy. Chair Gervais said the main thing was to reflect in the public minutes that we seriously and carefully considered all public testimony.

Regarding New Land Use Findings, David Dodson's testimony, Councilor Hann felt that Mr. Dodson and Mr. Smith's testimony has already been discussed and much of it already included. Chair Gervais highlighted Version 4.0, 3.2.t; Manager Young explained that much of 3.2 got moved to Article 13. Regarding 13.2.o, Chair Gervais felt it should be retained, since it was OK to repeat some items, as findings support following policies, and heard concurrence. Regarding 3.2.9, action will occur if monitoring hits a pre-defined triggering point; though the *how* and *what* should be left to the LDC, and concurred with staff moving it to Chapter 13.

Commissioner Gervais highlighted Mr. Bella's 3.2.x.1 with Mr. Dodson's suggested edits. She wanted to keep “If conditions exceed pre-determined thresholds, or evidence suggests that metrics are not tracking, a review of the Campus Master Plan shall be implemented, even if the planning period is not expired”. She said that while it was specific, it helped address the public's feeling that despite rapid change, there hadn't been adequate review before the Campus Master Plan applied. Manager Young said that changes in 13.2.6 were made at the previous meeting, reflected in Attachment B-23; Chair Gervais said that addressed her concern.

Regarding items #n through #s (3.2.n through 3.2.t in version 2, and 13.2.i in Attachment B-21), Manager Young asked if the group was accepting Mr. Dodson's proposed language. Manager Young said staff offered a change to 13.2.j, based on updated data from the university, and sought direction on which iteration to use.

Given the difficulty of reconciling several versions, Councilor Hann suggested moving on to Court Smith's testimony; Chair Gervais concurred. Councilor Hann said most of Court Smith's observations had been included in some form. He cited Mr. Smith's testimony that requiring garages does not always result in the provision of parking or controlling cars on the street, especially since many have been converted to living space or other uses. Councilor Hann said some testimony was informational and there are also some specific recommendations. He cited Smith's policy 1.0.3, from his April 7, 2015 memo.

Chair Gervais proposed a draft finding that "Garages are not always equivalent to a parking space. Garages are frequently used for purposes besides vehicle storage". Commissioner Gervais said it is background to how parking is counted and provided; it is an issue that has come up due to OSU's growth, and may inform future allocation of parking resources. Councilor Hann highlighted Planning Commission discussion prior to the last ten years on garages on alleys repurposed for accessory dwelling units. Manager Young suggested that if there was a finding to this effect, it could lead to discounting garages, leading to more surface parking in general, since that language would not be confined just to OSU but also to the community in general. Councilor Hann said we could drop it, but it is an interesting observation.

Commissioner Gervais asked whether there had been findings and policies regarding transit to surrounding communities. Manager Young replied there were findings following OSUPAL testimony regarding transit specifically, such as the difficulty in making connections, and limited transit ridership. Councilor Hann said the important aspect was that there is not an adequate way to move students from surrounding areas to the city center, and a way to get out on weekends, or to Portland. Chair Gervais suggested a finding that "Lack of regional transportation options may influence student's decisions to bring cars to campus." The group concurred with this suggestion. However, an accompanying policy may be tough, since it involves Benton County, the state, Amtrak, Greyhound, etc. Manager Young said the Union building features a We-car rental as part of the development; promoting things like that could be useful. Councilor Hann suggested accompanying policy: "The City and OSU should examine mechanisms to improve the efficiency of moving students to access regional transportation options". Manager Young suggested "The City and OSU should explore options for improving the efficiency of regional transportation for students". Councilor Hann observed that many student cars are simply parked until students use them to get out of town.

Regarding Mr. Smith's findings on 1.03, page C-7, Councilor Hann highlighted findings to support the impacts of our activities beyond the borders of the city. Commissioner Woods disagreed, feeling it was clutter, was beyond our scope, and wouldn't help us make decisions. Commissioner Gervais concurred with Councilor Hann, saying that it was an aspirational document, and could help guide policy to occur; OSU has claimed a role in being a leader in technology (though the wording needs to be re-written). She said the community may well give guiding testimony on the issue.

Councilor Hann said that we looked at communities our size that have addressed these issues, so maybe it belongs in a vision document, but we do have opportunities to

demonstrate ways that communities our size can effectively address issues and provide leadership. Corvallis is small enough that our problems are solvable. Commissioner Woods objected that it doesn't help solve Corvallis problems; Councilor Hann suggested removing the "developing countries" section. Chair Gervais said she liked the section, but the wording and concepts need work, and suggested waiting until the main overhaul of the document, since it is not OSU-specific. The scope is broad enough that it should be part of a community overhaul, and not just from this group. These are very large and key ideas that we need to leave it up to the community. Commissioner Woods said it should be in the vision document. He added that David Bella and the students had a specific desire to carry out a development related to OSU.

Councilor Hann highlighted a recent letter to the editor on models of development on campuses. He said that were Betty Griffiths alive, she would likely be focusing on ways to develop on a college campus that addressed the needs not only of students, but also faculty, staff, and the community. He said it could be left for the Vision Statement, but it was ok to put it into the Comp Plan as well. Commissioner Gervais added that it needed to be better formed, and needed to be grounds for a larger discussion.

Regarding suggested policy 1.0.3 "Planning is an iterative process..", Councilor Hann said the previous monitoring discussion had left out "adjustment" or "course correction". Manager Young highlighted Director Gibb's memo in Attachment E-2, with a revision to policy language that addresses this issue in a more detailed way that focuses on the Master Plan. "Future updates to the Master Plan and associated LDC provisions shall establish a requirement to monitor performance in addressing key plan elements and code requirements. The opportunity to adjust the specific monitoring requirements over time should be provided through means such as a Council policy, rather than requiring an LDC text process" (this is what is required under the current Plan). Members felt the change was a good one.

Commissioner Woods expressed concern that a Council Policy is very different from an LDC text amendment. Manager Young replied that Council Policies may serve a variety of functions. An LDC text amendment is a lengthy process that requires notice to the state, along with Planning Commission and Council decisions; in contrast, a Council Policy may be much more nimble in responding to changing conditions.

Commissioner Woods countered that there is no force of law in Council policies. Manager Young replied that staff view them as one way to ensure that things are done, citing the example of improvements in the right-of-way; policies are administered as if they are code language, but may be changed through a simpler process. Commissioner Woods said that where the Comp Plan and 3.36 disagreed, OSU's reasoning for what it did or didn't do was based on what was written in 3.36, and nothing else. If you want something to change, it must be in the LDC; the Council policy will not be enforceable. Manager Young said we'd need the City Attorney's help to clarify it, but staff viewed Council policies as definitive; staff will bring back more information.

Regarding Policy 1.0.3, Commissioner Woods said it didn't seem worded like a policy. Councilor Hann said the key thing in it was the word "*adjusting*"; it says that we'll monitor, and if we see something's not working, we'll make that determination; however, we haven't said anywhere that we'll adjust to correct that. Commissioner Gervais said there is language that a review process will be triggered, though action after that hasn't been determined. Councilor Hann replied it doesn't call for any means of amelioration or adjustment or any

change in what we're doing. Manager Young noted that proposed new policy in 13.2.6, Attachment B-23, speaks to monitoring; the last sentence states that "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".

Commissioner Woods said we need to clarify if we have the authority to change midstream. Chair Gervais asked if that was a Comp Plan issue or an LDC issue. Manager Young replied that it was an LDC issue. Councilor Hann said that correcting or adjusting is a Comp Plan policy, and the LDC gives options to make a course correction. Manager Young opined that the specific mechanism for correction should be in the LDC. Councilor Hann said that the policy that there should be a course correction should be in the Comp Plan; Manager Young concurred. Commissioner Gervais suggested adding, "If necessary, adjustments shall be implemented"; there was consensus. Councilor Hann noted that monitoring for its own sake didn't accomplish anything if there's something happening contrary to the envisioned outcome.

Regarding Article 11, Transportation; Section 11.4 Auto Parking, Findings, Commissioner Gervais highlighted page C-2 of Court Smith's April 7, 2015 memo, saying the task force had already dealt with most of it. She asked if the group had decided not to incorporate 11.4.e "All traffic generated should coordinate with the City .. to ensure adequate access to operations...". Commissioner Woods said the code already demanded a certain amount of parking for all types of structures. Commissioner Gervais felt 11.4.i, "The streets are created for all residents.." had been addressed elsewhere.

Regarding Article 3, Land Use Guidelines (on page C-4), Add Findings, 3.2.n is a new finding. She wasn't sure if 3.2 and 3.2.q had been incorporated yet. Commissioner Wood said this relates to the car-free experiment, but doesn't need to be in this document; Commissioner Gervais concurred, saying that it seems more relevant to visioning and the transportation process underway.

Regarding Article 14, Urbanization/Annexation, Section 14.2 Growth Management, Commissioner Gervais highlighted Smith's proposed Policy 3.2.9, she suggested re-wording it to "Future large development aimed at housing faculty, staff, and students of OSU should emphasize clustering, and either inclusion of services, open space and businesses to support car-free transportation, or be located as close to services and businesses as possible". She suggested striking "..to support car-free transportation.."; she said the thrust is to reduce traffic and parking issues. Commissioner Woods said the concept is good, but there may be too much detail. Manager Young said it doesn't speak to locating it on the OSU campus; Commissioner Gervais said it wasn't intended to.

Commissioner Woods asked if it changed the LDC in the future in order to get the desired clustering; Commissioner Gervais said it could, and hoped to make space for that; though wasn't sure it should be limited to OSU students. Commissioner Woods said it shouldn't be limited to OSU students; also, we already have language on Compact Urban Form. Chair Gervais added that there was also already language in Walkable Neighborhoods, Neighborhood Centers, etc. and proposed striking it.

Regarding 13.2.6, Chair Gervais said we don't have to bring it in, saying she found the policy problematic, given the contradiction of the insistence on large tracts of open space along with Compact Urban Form. Commissioner Woods replied that open space was an important

component to the proposal; the open space complements the clusters. He liked the ideas, but wasn't sure it belonged here. Councilor Hann suggested leaving it out, saying it was beyond the scope of what was important to communicate to OSU.

Regarding Dan Brown's April 22, 2015 testimony, Councilor Hann said they address the issue of livability (mass and scale); he said it is difficult to codify. Manager Young said the development of livability indicators for the community that would be measures of progress is being discussed as part of the Vision and Action Plan work. We're looking at other jurisdictions for indexes. Councilor Hann said livability indexes measure health, air quality, etc. Commissioner Gervais said it is an important discussion, but beyond our scope; also, different people may well have different measures. Commissioner Woods said Mr. Brown's standards of livability were measured by traffic, parking and housing. Councilor Hann said much of it involves neighborhood compatibility; it belongs in the Comp Plan, under livability and compatibility. Manager Young said those factors are appropriately considered by discretionary decision making bodies. Commissioner Gervais said that she was surprised to find that livability was defined in the Corvallis 2020 Vision Statement.

Regarding the Master Plan definition, Chair Gervais stated that the Council, and not the OSU PRTF, should decide it. It's not clear this was in the task force charge or scope. Councilor Hann said much of Dan Brown's testimony was regarding changes to 3.36.

Regarding David Dodson's testimony, Manager Young said he will try to reconcile Proposed New Land Use Findings versions 2, 3 and 4.

Regarding 3.2.1 (formerly 3.x.1 through 3.x.6, and 13.2.n through 3.2.s), Chair Gervais said Mr. Dodson's changes hadn't been incorporated yet in 13.2.i: "Unmanaged OSU campus growth can lead to off-campus impacts such as...". Commissioner Sessions said the question is who is managing OSU campus growth; we're not trying to get at management of growth, but given the University's autonomy, we are seeking to understand the expected growth of OSU. Councilor Hann said this informs how OSU manages the campus. Commissioner Gervais preferred "Unmanaged" to "Unexpected" growth. Commissioner Woods said it was the un-coordination that led to problems. Commissioner Sessions said that we haven't been able to anticipate the result; there was some coordination, but there were complaints resulting from increasing enrollment. Commissioner Gervais proposed eliminating the word "unmanaged"; there was consensus.

Regarding 3.2.j in version 4 (formerly 3.x.2 and 3.2.o), "Enrollment projections under the Campus Plan were exceeded." Commissioner Woods said the numbers were an improvement, but wasn't sure why square footage mattered, compared to population and parking. Commissioner Gervais said it was also a housing problem, so OSU had the capacity to provide a great deal more infrastructure for the student growth than it did; to her, that seemed like a compelling reason to link the two. If OSU *had* built the housing and parking, then its growth wouldn't have impacted the city so much. She proposed a final sentence to clarify her intent, such as "Capacity that could have been used to house students was not utilized". Manager Young highlighted language in 3.2.j, saying an irrelevant reference to square footage could be removed. Manager Young suggested adding Mr. Dodson's data, "...were exceeded by 1,883 students, or 7.7%" and deleting the reference to square footage; members concurred.

Regarding 3.2.k (3.x.3, becoming 3.2.p), "OSU added 5,316 students and 1775 faculty and staff from 2003 to 2014/2015.."; Commissioner Gervais concurred to leave that in.

Regarding 13.2.l (formerly 3.x.4, and 3.2.q), there was consensus that the language stands.

Regarding 13.2.m (formerly 3.x.5), Commissioner Gervais liked “..a great degree of ongoing communication and coordination between the City and its residents”. Councilor Hann asked whether the term “community members” or “residents” were now being used instead of “citizens”; Manager Young confirmed that was so.

Manager Young cited ACS data for the City of Corvallis to include in a revised 13.2.n. The group concurred with the revision.

Regarding 3.2.x.2, “Through innovation and leadership, OSU can remain a leader in carbon smart programs..”. Commissioner Woods didn’t see the purpose for it in the document. Chair Gervais asked for a policy that the finding supports. Manager Young said it was not a finding; it’s not a statement of current fact; Chair Gervais said it was actually a policy, and didn’t like it. Councilor Hann said it needed to be reworded, but it can be a finding that informs as a policy that ties into the goals of reducing carbon footprint and sustainability. Commissioner Gervais proposed dropping it; it needs a citation. Councilor Hann said that given all the discussions on the future moving towards technology for sustainability, even if it needs rewording, it belongs in there and informs OSU’s efforts and bringing it to bear. Commissioner Woods said a finding is not cited; he had never heard it before, and it seems more like a marketing statement; Commissioner Sessions concurred. Councilor Hann suggested removing the word “remains” to make it a finding; Manager Young replied that if it *can* happen, then it is not a finding. Maybe it is a reduction in single occupancy vehicles, but that was addressed elsewhere. Councilor Hann proposed leaving it in for now, and perhaps an audience member can give examples during testimony; there was agreement to revisit it.

Under New Community Character Findings, 5.x.1, Commissioner Gervais said she liked Mr. Dodson’s description of the conflicts (or tradeoffs) between density (such as vehicle traffic) versus livability; Commissioner Wood said it seemed accurate and relevant. Manager Young cited 9.7.l in Attachment B-15; Commissioner Gervais said that was a different issue (a change in housing stock).

Commissioner Gervais said that 5.x.3 has become a finding and has been dealt with.

Regarding Housing, 9.7.x, Commissioner Gervais said we just addressed it in livability.

It was noted that 9.x.1 (a housing finding) has already been done. The original wording was deleted, then revised by Dave Dodson. Commissioner Gervais said requiring freshmen to live on campus may not address the problem, since many students may not be coming in as first year students. Manager Young said many upperclassmen were not drawn to student housing for a number of reasons. Chair Gervais summed up that it was added.

Regarding 9.x.x.1, on new OSU housing, Commissioner Gervais liked it. Manager Young said staff flagged 9.7.3 for further discussion. Commissioner Gervais said this finding repeats an earlier finding and doesn’t need to be added. Manager Young said Commissioner Woods said this is about character, not livability; Commissioner Gervais said this gets to that, but we don’t need to add it.

Regarding 9.x.2, Manager Young proposed “Characteristics of student-oriented housing have *more recently* included..”; it was moved to 9.7.m. Chair Gervais liked the change.

New Housing Policies, 9.y.2, has already been addressed.

Regarding New Transportation Findings (Bull), #2, 11.2.j, “effects” should be “affects”. Commissioner Gervais said that 11.4.h should incorporate Mr. Dodson’s revision; that was agreed. Councilor Bull’s #4 and #5 should add “and” at their ends.

Under New Transportation Policies (Bull) (11.12.6), Chair Gervais said the word “Will” should be replaced by “shall”; agreed to accept with Dodson’s revisions.

Under New Transportation Policies (11.x) (OSU), Commissioner Woods said there wasn’t data to support it. Commissioner Gervais suggested removing the word “primary”; there was agreement.

Manager Young said that 13.2.j had been agreed upon.

Under 9.7.b, Manager Young said that staff provided updated information.

Manager Young highlighted memos from City Attorney Brewer. He highlighted Director Gibb’s memo regarding changing 13.2.2 regarding monitoring. His concern was that we didn’t want to sound as if we monitored the wrong information. He also noted that changing monitoring requirements would require an LDC change rather than City Council approval. Commissioner Woods said we need a legal opinion on whether a Council policy would accomplish it; whether it has the force of law. Manager Young said the policy speaks to the future, so that it could be amended through Council policy, not just by an LDC text amendment. Chair Gervais proposed accepting Finding 13.2.p as Director Gibb presented; there was consensus to do so.

IV. Review of Version 4.0 Draft Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies

No discussion.

V. Responses to Task Force Questions

No discussion.

VI. Decision to Schedule Public Comment Opportunity

Chair Gervais asked about next steps before this goes to the public. Manager Young said that to go forward to public comment, he would have to incorporate the changes in a draft based on task force discussion tonight, give public notice for the meeting, and the public will give testimony. He will present the legal opinion on Council policy, but not include that in the draft.

Manager Young said it will probably require at least one additional task force meeting beyond the June 22 public comment meeting; Councilor Hann cited a conflict and there was discussion on the meeting time. Chair Gervais suggested a Doodle poll on the timing. Manager Young suggested 7:30 p.m. to start the public comment opportunity meeting; there was consensus, if that works for other task force members. Manager Young said he needs to give the public a week to review the materials, and so must send it out next Monday. James Day of the G-T said he can post it online, with a link to the document.

VII. Public Input Opportunity

OSU Campus Planning Manager Dave Dodson clarified there was discussion on policies and findings regarding Sectors. OSU will not include or propose sectors in the new District Plan, so in making references, he suggested referring to “core campus”, for example.

Mr. Dodson suggested avoiding stating how something should be done, noting that in references to Chapter 3.36, code numbers change, so you should refer to how something is implemented. Manager Young said if the task force would like to do that, he can be directed to do that. Chair Gervais suggested flagging that for Version 5.

For the public meeting, he encouraged considering that it is the first time that many have seen the changes, and proposed tracking the changes in a clear way for them.

In 3.2.x.2, he suggested striking “innovation and leadership”, making it an aspirational statement. Chair Gervais proposed revising it to “OSU should consider being a community leader in carbon smart programs...”; there was agreement.

Mr. Dodson asked about the meeting format, adding that it was critical to get the agenda and materials out a week in advance. Manager Young said he will bring extras for the public. Chair Gervais proposed simply soliciting public comment; it’s not a hearing, and we can engage in conversation with the public. Councilor Hann suggested listing what the charge, mission and objectives of the task force were; Chair Gervais concurred.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m.