



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

**CITY OF CORVALLIS
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
APRIL 13, 2015**

Present

Planning Commissioners:
Jennifer Gervais, *Chair*
Paul Woods

City Councilors
Frank Hann
Barbara Bull

Excused Absence:

Roen Hogg
Ron Sessions
Jasmin Woodside

Staff

Kevin Young, *Planning Division Manager*
Blanca Ruckert, *Recorder*

Visitors:

Dave Bella
Dave Dodson
Charley Vars
Court Smith

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

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

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITIES

David Bella said he had put some information together for the TF. In one of those reports, the Climate Action Plan, one of the findings was electric cars are not a good solution due to the amount of energy and fossil fuels it takes to produce them. This is an example of where reviewing good data to avoid bad solutions is important. This relates to the question of how many parking spaces are needed when you have a new resident car. Building a parking space for each car would not solve the problem in the long run.

Mr. Bella said Court Smith and he are working on other data together and individually to gather good data for the TF. He reminded the TF to regard the university as an “education institution not in terms of just parking or housing”. Which leads to the question what kind of example is set for the thousands of students that are coming here from all over the world. An example that depends upon the automobile is not what the world needs.

Commissioner Woods commented that in his review work and findings it was his hope the TF would incorporate some of the work presented by Bella and his colleagues.

Bella stated that he presented ‘strategic and tactical’ findings which he defined as broad findings vs. on just particular topics. He cautioned the TF to be cautious about thinking that findings lead to good policy. For example, the automobile has been around for a while

compared to street cars or other people movers, therefore more facts exist on cars. If we rely on just facts that exist it is likely to rule out other options. Findings could be feasible possibilities that we don't have but we could actually do. The danger of being too factually based on measurements may lead to doing what we already have done because it based on the data that is available.

Commissioner Bull asked if maybe looking at capacity using transit might be an option. Bella replied that being more creative and not relying solely on "car" pathways might open up more possibilities, to keep that creative imagination. Right now with a car dependent infrastructure, the green house emissions are probably about the same for buses as they are for cars. Bella cautioned the TF from relying on the status quo at the expense of creative solutions.

III. REVIEW OF MINUTES

Motion was made by Hann to approve the March 31, 2015 minutes as presented; seconded by Woods. Motion passed unanimously with Hogg, Woodside and Sessions not present.

IV. REVIEW OF DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FINDINGS AND POLICIES

Gervais directed the TF to the revisions and new policies prepared by different TF members as well the proposed changes since the last meeting. She expressed disappointment that Commissioners Woodside and Sessions and Councilor Hogg were not in attendance since their input was instrumental. There was some discussion about trying to contact Commissioner Woodside via phone. Kevin Young located a number and then an email indicating she would be running late.

Gervais discussed how best to stay on schedule. She said it would be good to get some discussions and agreements on some things at this meeting to go forward with a public hearing. She addressed the concern about the final language and stated that staff could help with that but more importantly what things need to be changed and what policies need to be included.

Gervais suggested the TF start on Article 8, Economy, in particular 8.2.d and review the comments submitted from Hann and Woods. Woods commented that he and Hann didn't work together but both did review the material and submitted their comments.

Gervais noted that the some language was suggested to indicate that Samaritan Health Services and HP are the second largest employers as did Hann in his statement, so this information needs to be updated. Finding #1 as suggested by Woods is to note that the largest employers are now not-for-profit and do not pay property tax. It is his belief that most property tax is paid by rental property owners. Gervais suggested this finding should be checked for accuracy. There was some discussion about what would happen with a non-for-profit on a for-profit scenario and who would pay the property tax. Bull stated it was her belief that for private construction on an OSU property, the property owner would pay the tax. Hann stated that finding #1 would be to re-order and identify who the largest employers are.

Bull noted that she wanted to flag the items that are useful but also how is it going to be presented to City Council and public review. The TF could make a recommendation about those things that need to be addressed. Bull wants those flagged items to be included to reflect that the TF deemed them important and bringing them to the attention of the City Council and public along with having them on the record for the next review. It's a statement

that the TF realized it was something to be updated but could not address within this time frame and process.

Staff noted a number of items in Article 8 Economy that were clearly out of date, noting more up-to-date information has been requested identifying the current 12 largest employers in Benton County. Hann stated that the State Assessor's office could provide information on an evaluation of tax basis in the City rather than just rental properties. He noted there's been substantial development on the OSU campus that hasn't generated a substantial tax income, although it does generate development fees. This could be another finding.

Gervais raised a question about process in order to have a document ready for public review. Staff suggested they can work on factual updates to findings, where findings are clearly out-of-date.. At the next meeting Staff will bring a document with redline and strikeout showing current language and then the changes that are proposed to update those facts in the findings or policies. If the TF can address the findings more quickly then it could tackle the policy discussion. Gervais summarized that what the TF needed was: identifying the largest property tax payers, identifying the largest employers and distinguishing between for-profits and non-profits. Staff recapped the discussion and noted the TF wanted to amend 8.2.d to confirm who the largest employers are and then a finding that would get at who are the largest property tax payers in Corvallis.

Gervais commented that in 8.4.d, the last line, "changes in Oregon State University employment will be affected mainly by research activities" might need to be updated to reflect a shift to E-Campus but may not be necessary right now for the task at hand.

In reviewing 8.2.2, Woods noted the policy did not need to be changed but was concerned about how the City will "monitor". How is it being accomplished? How do we see the results of the monitoring? Gervais commented to flag this item as it seemed it might be for the overall overhaul of the LDC. Hann suggested adding a couple of words in the structure to imply there is some periodic review and recognizing that the Planning Commission is monitoring this on a periodic level and making decisions and recommendations on their observations.

Bull stated that data is out of date and monitoring hasn't happened. Bull proposed that some be updated and some get flagged based on what needs to be answered, i.e., how is it implemented, how is it monitored.

Staff stated that, in their discussion of the Vision and Action Plan Council Goal, the City Council is interested in developing a vision for the community and identifying a matrix regarding monitoring and reporting. So a suggestion would be a policy that speaks to that effort. For example, the City shall develop a matrix to monitor progress. Woods would prefer a pointer to the LDC that says this is how it's done and then maybe that points to a place in the archive that says these are the previous reports. Woods' concern is that this really doesn't exist, so it comes across as 'it sounds really great but it's not being done'. Bull commented that Kevin is talking about a vision that would include implementation and measurement, periodic monitoring checking on progress which would hopefully give us that. Woods still believes it needs to be flagged that it be verifiable and there was general consensus. Staff noted this item and other related items would be flagged for future effort.

In reviewing 8.2.4, "The City shall monitor the jobs/housing balance" Woods questioned *how* is this being accomplished. Woods also suggested a follow up policy to promote start-ups

based on OSU research, particularly in engineering and agriculture, and the impact on the economy and jobs. Bull states that this might be a gap that isn't captured in the policy as it stands. Gervais wants clarification about whether 8.2.4 is to include discussion of implementation. Woods believes it's more about future comp plan review. General consensus is that it is affirmed and needs to be monitored, putting it on the radar and part of a broader discussion about where are the houses, where are the jobs and where are the people now to get there? Staff commented the Economic Development Advisory Board is already considering it. Woods noted that Hann mentioned that the OSU region accelerator and the HP network that might really speak to what is being discussed.

In regards to 8.4.b, Gervais noted that Woods did not note any need for changes, however, it was her suggestion to evaluate "how OSU employment will be affected by research" as a needed change. Hann questioned whether in order for OSU to decide to elevate some programs to an elevated tier that drove to expansion was a finding. Staff stated that if it's a matter of fact that's not arguable then it may be a finding. Bull suggested adding a key statement about the key strategy for OSU to meet its mission or goal is to attract students. Discussion followed about OSU's growth and consensus that this is a finding that impacts the City.

Gervais moved on to 8.4.d which there was agreement it needed updating. Staff reported there have been some recent economic studies that would have more current data available.

In regards to 8.6.d, Woods reported somehow he skipped over this item, but mostly needed updating. Then 8.6.i also just needs to be updated. In reviewing 8.9.k, Woods commented that the impacts go beyond the campus boundaries just like the impact of the students go beyond the microbreweries downtown or food establishments; it is a growth from OSU and the presence of that program here. Staff mentioned that a planning article nationwide showed that in Oregon, microbrews resulted in the highest per capita income accountable to microbrew. Gervais suggested changing the finding by adding a statement at the end that says "for example the fermentation sciences at Oregon State University have contributed substantial technology which has led to a major growth sector in Oregon's economy". Hann suggested just saying some of the developments of new programs or technologies at OSU have created economic benefits for the community.

Discussion moved to Article 9, Housing, reviewing Attachment B page 12, 9.4 through 9.5. Beginning with Article 9, Woods believed most of the statements were pretty true or just reflected statewide policy. However, 9.4.h was outdated; the housing study that was recently commissioned indicated 55% single family homes vs. 76% owner occupied, much lower than the statewide average. The same thing in 9.4.i it is pretty constant and is now at 56% owner occupied vs. the 54% that is stated in the 1960s.

Gervais surmised that all this needs to be updated data. In reviewing 9.5.f on page 7, Woods comment about "implications for town houses and condos" a lot of the townhouse development aren't easily convertible to something in the future. Discussion followed about various developments around the city that have occurred and architectural styles that make it difficult to convert to other uses. Various aspects of developments were discussed such as stairs, play yards, open areas, historical ramifications. Bull suggested looking at it from a level of service perspective that required parks or certain amount of park area in the plan. Hann pointed out that in looking at a collaboration project that somehow the language should reflect that available green space or community areas are included.

Gervais turned attention to Attachment B, Page 14, Policy 9.y, “housing types that can serve multiple segments of the population with minimal remodeling shall be strongly encouraged to reduce the need for future redevelopment as demographics shift”. Discussion centered on language where developments wouldn’t need to be torn down and replaced with something else. Bull suggested having a mixture of housing types that address a mixture of housing needs. And also something that addresses the level of service overall for transportation and cars. Bull’s concern is that there aren’t policies in place that require that adequate levels of service be maintained. Staff noted the LDC currently has requirements for open space, private open space or public open space, shared open space, lot coverage, that are required on a per unit basis.

Bull questioned how that shows up. Staff stated that it could be included in the count of patios, front yard areas. Staff concluded that it might point toward a code change if those requirements weren’t adequate. Bull clarified she was referring to the level of service not property in the neighborhood. Discussion shifted toward density and providing adequate park space for the growing population. Gervais suggested it was more LDC centered than CP because of the detail being addressed, the how, the specific mechanisms to make sure certain things occur are in place. Gervais suggested a policy wording of “zoning for density will include an overall level of service assessment for parks and open space, maintain a level of service, or incorporate”; “increasing density will include a consideration of levels of service including appropriate open space, parks or other infrastructure”. Bull maintained that parks have to be there for the density to be there or it needs to be in a plan. Gervais argued it still appeared to be LDC related. Staff concluded the mechanism could be something to work through at the LDC level.

Hann mentioned the findings at the end, stating that the first one is for higher density near the university that has been mostly for students vs. family or employee housing types and has led to degradation of some neighborhoods. Discussion ensued about the mix of housing types and the finding of a mix of housing that meets a variety of housing needs and housing types. Bull suggested that it be treated as a special type of student housing as Woodside suggested and could be looked differently in planning. For example, fraternities, sororities, senior housing, special housing types that would have special code. Staff suggested changing “degradation of livability” to “reduced livability” of some neighborhoods.

Woods recommended keeping “rapid changes in student population “as just a statement.

Woods commented that the average age of Corvallis residents is 27 versus 39 statewide, which affects the type of housing needed.

Gervais directed TF to Housing Attachment B, Page 21 and comments by Woods. He reinforced Bella’s presentation about promotion of the cooperation between OSU and the City for experimental planning and design. He requested staff help with crafting wording. Hann suggested “current implementation has led to a car centric development pattern where there is an opportunity for creative solutions”. Woods wants to emphasize that OSU has some unique resources and could assist the City with adjusting zoning because that’s a barrier to trying new things in existing zoning. Woods also made a final point that OSU provided on-campus housing does not produce property tax revenue, as mentioned by Jim Moorefield. The finding is that on-campus housing does not generate property tax but the inhabitants do utilize city services. Gervais suggested wording to the affect of “OSU dormitories do not pay property taxes whereas privately owned entities in the community do”. Discussion ensued about private public partnerships and how that would benefit the City.

Those discussions are in progress. In terms of crafting policy, “the City **shall** encourage OSU to utilize public private partnerships for housing on campus”.

Gervais, directed the TF to Article 9, Attachment B, page 14, finding 9.xl, the goal was to track the change in housing options. Woods commented that student-oriented housing is not always as clear of a threshold and the need for clear and objective data of what housing is okay to provide housing for students. Gervais suggested eliminating that and just saying “during this time this many single family permits were issued”. Staff thought City staff has data on that.

Gervais asked for comments or concerns regarding policy 9.yl. Bull suggested objective criteria of what to call what is accessible, to include in wording. Gervais thought that was an LDC policy decision and stated a preference for keeping it broad.

Reviewing finding 9.x2 regarding characteristics of student-oriented housing, the question was raised whether it is a specialized housing type or other housing type. Gervais believes it is a special type of housing type that has certain features more often than not, including 5 bedrooms, with a bathroom for each bedroom, and characterized by multiple stories. Staff agreed that if described thusly, this finding would be a factual statement.

Discussion centered on policy 9.y2, Hann supports looking at it as a separate category. Staff raised concerns regarding fair housing rules. Gervais asked about breaking it apart as units that are meant to be leased individually vs. units that are not. Staff responded that an attorney would need to tell us if that approach is legally permissible. Bull would like to explore options to address this. Gervais concurred because there are characteristics about student housing that make them less appealing to everyone else. Bull commented that there is a planning aspect and a housing market aspect; it affects the market if the distinction is not made about the housing types needed. Staff hears the intent of the discussion but cautioned against a statement about “you can’t live here because you are a student”. Discussion continued about how this is handled with senior housing and how it could be applied to this particular group. Gervais requested Staff assist with the intent and crafting wording to address the concern.

Gervais directed attention to Transportation, Article 11, Attachment B, page 23. Bull prefaced that her comments were introductory, however Gervais stated that she would rather include it and be redundant than realize later it was something that needed to be included. Bull believes this a place to discuss pedestrian-oriented transportation vs. support for transit. Woods noted that Bella stated that if adherence is to the concepts that already exist; we will be unable to stay open to alternate forms that we don’t even know yet. There was brief discussion about keeping open to creative alternatives. Gervais suggested adopting all as written and review comments by Commissioner Bull, Woods suggested conversation as a marker about concerns the TF had.

Bull in reviewing page 24, noted that there are some very specific policies about pedestrian or transit transportation modes, and that she would like to see groupings about general statements and what’s taken care of and where and how. Gervais commented that it sounded like a comprehensive plan organization overhaul, which might be too big a task for this effort. Gervais suggested reviewing comments regarding page 25 and recognizing that reorganization is warranted but not within this time frame. Discussion ensued about how to accomplish the reorganization and present it to the City Council and for public review.

Gervais suggested that a recommendation would be “reorganization of Article 11 in categories of policies related to different modes of transportation”.

Hann commented that a finding be included about special pedestrians risks that need to be addressed, such as east-west crossings and dealing with the sun, wintertime darkness, lack of lighting, crossing safety, bike path. Discussion continued about various locations with specific problems. Gervais commented that it might be an implementation issue as a result of the geographic layout of pre-existing traffic patterns and road use. Because this might be an implementation issue, it would be something the LDC or the campus master plan cannot address. Gervais suggested wording, “pedestrian safety and bicycle safety may be particularly problematic around the university, there’s a concern for bicycle and pedestrian safety around campus because of geographic factors, pre-existing street patterns, traffic flow and flow and other special considerations that may need to be considered”. Staff noted that there may be existing comprehensive plan policies that already cover this but maybe an LCD implementation issue. Gervais commented that this was a particular issue as Hann suggested and needed to be a finding, there’s a safety and convenience issue and also several significant problem areas, addressing the challenges around campus. Staff noted that concerns have been raised regarding safety of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling to the University due to the increased student numbers, vehicle traffic, public improvement limitations and visibility issues, that’s a finding. Bull suggested specifying public improvements to facilitate safe crossing for pedestrians and lighting.

Staff asked for clarification on the last two policies on B.23, and wondered if there was agreement to include them. Discussion was brief and consensus was they were good with a little word smithing but captured things that needed to be stated. Bull did comment that the policy on “zoning on OSU related” is not really necessary, pointing out that there is particular pedestrian demand. Woods questioned whether *will* is the same as *shall*? Staff commented *shall* is stronger, and there was a consensus to change to *shall*. Bull asked about the second finding regarding “proximity *will* affect” and consensus was to not change that.

Gervais turned attention to Attachment B, page 14, about temporary parking lots. In findings 11.x1 and 11.x2, Bull thought them to be useful in addressing temporary needs. Staff pointed out that with temporary gravel lots, there are storm water measures impacts to consider. Woods asked if they were pollution related, which Staff responded it could be. Gervais asked how to draft objective language without running afoul of this thing. Staff responded that as proposed the findings were a statement of fact. Gravel lots allowed on a limited basis because of concerns about storm water and the impacts on water quality. Water must be contained where it goes and which way it’s released into the system. There was discussion about temporary parking lots and concerns.

Next area addressed was Special Areas of Concern on page 18 Attachment B. Woods addressed 13.2.2., and asked about parameters of “compatibility”. Requested adding “overuse of neighborhood parking related to OSU” and also whether that was a parameter. Gervais stated that overuse of neighborhood parking is a policy choice that seems to be an inevitable thing. Discussion continued about compatibility and concerns about subjectivity. Staff responded that criteria does exist such as site design, visual elements, parking impacts, traffic impacts, and environmental impacts. Kevin suggested adding wording “including the compatibility or by referencing an existing statement of these compatibility criteria”. Hann suggested a moral general statement that includes the IGA.

The TF reviewed 13.2.3 which needed an update from the 1986 reference date to the 2004 Master Plan. Woods had a question about “working together” and how that works. Reviewing 13.2.4, the suggestion was to get rid of it, however Gervais believed Community should decide that but flag as “we don’t think this is necessary”.

Woods asked for a map to illustrate finding 13.4.a where was the map? Bull stated the higher concern was regulating total development, and total open space reserved might be a community interest beyond the scope of this effort.

Gervais reviewed 13.4.b and was challenged because OSU lands add character to the community (as in the horse farm, forest, the chicken farm and the dairy farm) and benefit the community at large. Discussion followed about the scope of impact and jurisdictions involved. In particular there was concern about knowing what OSU’s intentions were as it related to impacts on City zoning and current zoning for properties off the campus. Gervais concluded this was an area of concern, but it is difficult to articulate the community’s concerns. Woods requested the TF obtain a map of the OSU properties in question. He noted that policy 13.4.1 talks about these lands on a map and at least the ones in the City limits or which abut the city or the Urban Growth Boundary would be beneficial.

In 13.4.b there was consensus for no change.

In reviewing 13.4.g Woods stated it was difficult to understand not knowing the history and there seemed to be a contradiction with 13.4.j. Staff surmised at the time these policies were written there was some unease about what could happen in these areas. Bull commented that that still exists. Discussion continued about having some understanding what this referred to. Bull believes that an important component of the future plan is that we have a clear understanding of what are OSU’s plans for the lands they control in the city core and outside the city.

V. CONCLUSIONS REGARDING TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Gervais agrees with Hann that we are not making progress and need to continue this discussion, work on Article 13 for next time, review Article 3 and 5 this evening with time allowing and should discuss what Court and other folks have presented. Have Staff work on the concerns raised about Article 13. There was discussion about process and getting to the task at hand.

Woods commented that 13.4.g should be tagged for removal. Gervais suggests that the concerns about Article 13 are OSU lands. Staff can attempt to cover what we have said about housing and transportation. Bull asked staff to draft something to start with and that instead of providing a list of numbers, include the actual policies. Discussion continued about how to present the conversations. Which ones will be deleted and which will be redlined.

Not all members are here and may need to add another meeting. The TF agree to table discussions at this point. The next meeting will not be a public input meeting but to finish this. The TF will need another meeting scheduled for public input. Staff clarified that the plan is to meet again on the 14th, to finalize the preliminary recommendations from this TF and then to publish the draft for public review. Staff will send out notice that the second meeting in May will be the public comment opportunity. Then one more meeting would be scheduled in early June to consider public comment and make any revisions that the group feels warranted.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Dave Dodson thanked the TF for the work reviewed this evening and conveyed some thoughts of what he heard and what he will contribute based on this meeting to help and inform the work of the TF. On the discussion, about OSU's private public partnership, and whether or not that housing would actually contribute to the Benton County tax rolls, he will follow up with Dan Larsen to determine that and will get the information prior to the next meeting. Regarding the zoning question and open spaces, the current campus master plan is set up with some monitoring requirements about building square footage, some open space requirements, noting that OSU has not come close to exceeding the open space thresholds that were established.

He noted that what has become more important is what to do with "the transition zone" for OSU, in the core of campus, regarding building height, density and whether we provide courtyards or plazas or open spaces. OSU needs to be thoughtful when it interfaces with the neighborhood in regard to building heights and lighting - that's where that compatibility becomes more important. We try to be thoughtful about where the buildings go and whether there are court yards or open space because again it's an environment where we want people to feel comfortable. So long as we have the historic districts some of those key open space areas, lower campus along 15th street and the quads are all protected as part of the historic district that we have on campus.

In regards to the ag lands to the west, right now OSU has no plans to annex additional lands further to the west to bring that in to the city. The boundary that we currently have that's in the city limits we intend to hold that line at this point and time. The lands west of 53rd street, west of the EPA building, (correction 35th street) those lands are in the urban growth boundary but not in the city limits so the jurisdiction is the County. They are designated as public, so they allow for research and things, for the most part it's agriculture-related. The Dairy Farm has adopted a strategy of "sustainable dairy operation" where more of the food the cows eat is going to be grown on OSU lands so there's less need to import that and taking manure and applying that to farm fields to re grow the fodder that they are going to be eating. Also they've changed the breed going to a smaller animal so they can spend more time out in the fields grazing the lands and not have such a negative impact as before. He doesn't know intentions of other operations out there. For the most part it will remain ag.

With regard to some of the policies, OSU staff will look through the work that has been done, and if something is of concern to OSU, or we feel there's some additional information that might be helpful, we will bring it back as a redline and strikeout to what you have presented here and get that to you before you next meet. For example, under Article 8, Economy, expansion of the Vet program and the WAVE research program of emerging programs, honestly the robotics and drones are more on the forefront as well as the engineered wood products. Mr. Dodson said he would check 8.4.d about some of the financial contributions and look at data and provide you with documentation on that. On the discussion about the OSU Alumni center and what we call the conference services opportunity we provided some information but apparently it hasn't circled back. One last thing, discussion on Article 8 and concerns about compatibility, if you look at back of Comp Plan there are definitions there. Kevin requested the information early enough to include in packet materials, to which Dodson replied it would be provided by Thursday.

Charley Vars said he would like to share his experiences and give some suggestions about following a simple policy, compressing rather than expanding and trying to be as clear as you

can possibly can about what are the hot button issues. For example, look at the materials provided by Court Smith on parking. That is a hot topic and the TF is expected to report on. He noted Policy 11.4.3 states “all parkers and residents should be treated equitably”. According to Court that should be replaced by 11.4.8 or 11.4.9 dealing with the streets of Corvallis belong to the community, which differs from the landowner adjacent to the street. In terms of the management of the space on the streets for parking, “all cars parking on city streets should be willing to pay for the privilege”. That is a hot button issue. If parking is to become a priority planning for the City, making the parking fee system self-sufficient and providing resources for transit and transportation is at the heart of good economics. That could be rewritten so that there is a 3 or 4 page statement on the parking section of the plan would be very clear to the readers. It would a good experiment to see if your colleagues on the Council and the Planning Commission would come forward in support of that. A simple suggestion and I think you could transfer it to other sections. As you have shown an ability to write pretty well, I think you can edit pretty well. Notice I’ve not talked at all about what you might expect in strategic planning and everything related to that. Mr. Vars said the words, ‘flexible and adaptive’ should be introduced into people’s thinking in relation to all of those issues. A more holistic approach to me and my colleagues means paying attention to more things. I think that’s what the community is interested in, are you going to have a comp plan which really reflects the opportunities as well as the problems that the city is going to have in the future. My final point is that the most important thing that I think could come out of this is really a supportive community, not a community that is negative on planning. Parking really isn’t as major a problem as everybody seems to think.

Barbara Bull In my meeting with ODOT staff I mentioned that we had some very interested citizens who have come up with some pretty well defined concepts on transportation and I hope that we can incorporate your idea.

Dave Bella Keeping an open mind is important. We talk like the codes and policies are going to stop bad things from happening but they also can prevent good things from happening. We need to be open to really looking at very different options, Charlie mentioned keeping it flexible and adaptable. Car infrastructure is not flexible or adaptive. It is one of the most irreversible activities you can do and once you do that, it’s very hard to change. I was in civil engineering and the biggest research that was funded during my tenure there was testing asphalt on how to pour it. And when the major guy who retired his wife wanted to go somewhere sunny and they went down to Phoenix and he came back and said it’s so hot down there. I said what do you expect you paved it all over with black asphalt. You are living in the middle of a parking lot. Well the same thing could happen to us if you look at the projections and you look at the climate action plan and the talk about climate refugees. They talk about a population increase that is or could make what happens at the OSU look like small stuff. So I think really we need to go ahead and take a different trajectory so that all the work that you are doing to resolve real problems doesn’t result in codes that prevent really good things from happening.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.