

OSU-Related Comprehensive Plan Review Task Force

Issues to be addressed in a Future Comprehensive Plan Update – Identified at the July 23, 2015, Task Force Meeting

(in addition to the specific Comprehensive Plan Finding and Policy language proposed by the Task Force)

1. There is a need for clarity of meaning and expectations when master plans, district plans, and similar plans are considered for land use approval or adoption.
2. The Comprehensive Plan should contain a definition for Transportation Demand Management.
3. There is a need to resolve discrepancies between the OSU Campus Master Plan and the requirements of Land Development Code Chapter 3.36.
4. In order for associated parking or transportation demand management measures required to serve new development on the OSU Campus to be effective, the location of parking or TDM measures in relation to the new development should be carefully considered.
5. Review of permitted uses in the OSU District is warranted to identify uses that may need Conditional Development review, based on livability impacts.
6. Management of open space has affected neighborhood livability throughout the City.
7. Proposed Comprehensive Plan Policy 13.2.6 should be amended to stipulate that OSU monitoring reports should be reviewed annually by the Planning Commission and City Council. (also, references to only the “Campus Master Plan” should be corrected in Proposed Policy 13.2.6.)
8. Monitoring of enrollment data should be included in the annual reports, including those physically on campus, e-campus, etc.
9. There should be discussion of monitoring parking annually within the University Neighborhoods Overlay (UNO) area.
10. The current moral hazard of OSU parking management (incentive to not have higher on-campus parking utilization) should be eliminated.
11. Traffic and parking studies should all be conducted at the same peak time every year.

Index of Post – Public Comment Opportunity (June 22, 2015)

Testimony:

1. Dan Brown, dated June 30, 2015
2. Marilyn Koenitzer, dated July 2, 2015
3. Gary Angelo email, dated July 6, 2015
4. League of Women Voters, dated July 7, 2015
5. Attachment to Item 4, including November 26, 2012, Report from Neighborhood Planning Workgroup to the Corvallis/OSU Collaboration Steering Committee
6. Planning: a more Holistic Approach, from David Bella, Charlie Vars, and Court Smith, received July 9, 2015

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

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.