



**CITY OF CORVALLIS
 OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES
 APRIL 27, 2015**

<p>Present <i>Planning Commissioners:</i> Jennifer Gervais, Chair Paul Woods Roen Hogg Jasmine Woodside Ron Sessions Frank Hann Barbara Bull (appx 6:20)</p> <p>Excused Absence:</p>	<p>Staff Kevin Young, Planning Division Manager Blanca Ruckert, Recorder</p> <p>Visitors David Bella David Dodson Court Smith Trang Tran, student Iana Shevtsova, student Mai Nguyen, student</p>
--	---

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 6:08 p.m. in the Madison Avenue Meeting Room. Introductions were made.

II. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITIES

David Dodson mentioned that OSU staff is providing testimony tonight, and is available to answer questions. A task force member asked whether the information on Attachment B, page 6 is a response from OSU or Court Smith? Court Smith stated it was his and it was meant to replace policies from his previous memo, based on Charlie Vars' testimony last time.

Court Smith introduced some students working on analyzing data from a survey on OSU parking.

Iana Shevtsova (student) from the Transportation Project School of Public Policy worked on a transportation survey team analyzing data collected from students. She and Tang Tran are here to share their findings and recommendations on the parking issue.

In looking at the factors that shifted a student's decision on which transportation mode to choose their findings indicated that:

- In comparing undergraduate to graduate students, the graduate student was more likely to purchase a parking permit.
- Faculty, staff, and professional- degree seeking or non-degree seeking students are more likely to purchase a parking permit.
- Females were more likely to purchase a permit compared to males.
- In comparing students aged 16-23 to those over 23, people older than 23 were more likely to purchase a parking permit.

Based on these findings, they presented the following policy recommendations:

- Find alternatives to driving alone, such as providing improved bicycle access, increase pedestrian possibilities, shuttle bus service, and car pooling.
- Coordinate activities with the Planning Department, Student Experience and Activity Center and other student initiatives to direct transportation by behavior, utilize an education pilot program phone application.
- Promote non-motorized transportation among OSU employees since this group has the highest probability of choosing to drive alone to campus.
- Encourage an opportunity for a homeowner to purchase a full-time parking permit in their resident area for a lower cost, but allow OSU students the opportunity to purchase a permit to park in the area as well..

Ms. Sheutsova commented that research was centered on students' on what particular mode of transportation students were likely to choose. Findings are predictable on what influences choice of transportation mode. Those who live farthest from campus tend to drive more. Recommendations to address this are:

- Bus system is not very developed in the farthest areas. More development of the transit system is needed.
- Examine why the findings showed that female students were less likely to bike as compared to men.
- When asked about carpooling or driving alone, most were more likely to drive alone. Promote carpooling by creating an online application so it's easier to find whom to carpool with.
- Organize a Civil War competition between OSU and UO as to which school carpools more, creating spirit for people to carpool.
- Create distinctive carpool parking spots so those who carpool know they have a spot that can be easily found. Create stickers to identify which cars are allowed to park in these spots.

Ms. Sheutsova mentioned that there were other ideas in the Policy Brief forwarded to the City or available on the website, osupolicy.com. There was a question clarifying that students over 23 were MORE likely to purchase a parking permit than those younger, and that graduates students were LESS likely to purchase the parking permit.

Ms. Tran noted that right now the parking permit at OSU is at a high price and consequently students are more likely to park off-campus in neighborhoods. In response, Ms. Tran suggested that residents in

neighborhoods be allowed to buy a permit at a lower price to park in front of their house, while allowing some flexibility to give students/faculty the opportunity to park in that area for a limited amount time. Something like a parking permit, but which would be less expensive than a permit at the OSU parking lots.

There was a question as to the type of class the students were involved in. Their response was it wasn't a class but a project in the School of Public Policy.

There was a question as to whether this information was also being shared with the OSU staff who design parking policies, to which the response was affirmative.

Dan Brown expressed frustration because his concerns don't fit into Articles 3-9 or 11 of the Comprehensive Plan. His recommendation is to consider Articles 1 and 50, the articles dealing with general policies. His position is that the comprehensive plan should be goal-oriented, stating a reason for doing what is recommended. His second recommendation is to handle this as a systems approach. In order to do a systems approach more than one chapter needs to be considered at any one time; for example, housing, transportation, and employment need to be considered together. His third concern deals with implementation. One version in the handout is about livability, also known in the comprehensive plan as "quality of life". His recommendation is that the Task Force decide what both mean according to the Comprehensive Plan and then it helps to understand what the goal is. He cautioned the Task Force about measuring things on campus during Spring term where information will be skewed in terms of student enrollment.

His fourth recommendation deals with monitoring, two policies, 11.2.1 and 6.3x.1 involve the term monitoring. In Chapter 1, a policy is needed about monitoring; what it means in terms of who, what, where, why, and how much.

Lastly, he offered four definitions for consideration in Article 50, which deals with definitions. BLI is not well defined. District, might mean zoning district in the campus master plan – OSU has one, Good Sam has one, - but compared side to side they don't look alike in land use decisions. His recommendation is to define what it is, the format, content and process for approving a CMP.

Finally the term 'implements', i.e. "Chapter 3.3.4.6 implements" define what that means.

Barb asked if he had any ideas as to what constituted a campus master plan more clearly, either OSU or Good Sam. His response was that OSU's was more complete. He reviewed both to see if there was any commonality to draw underlying principles that would support format and content but was unable to do that, they were entirely different. His last comment was that it would be a service to the community if there were guidelines about content, format and process in a comprehensive plan.

In response to the question about telling OSU what specific interests need to be addressed or a format to follow, his response was that there are different audiences for having guidelines. For example, one would be people who want to design a CMP (over time that list may grow). As a former City Council member, it would have been nice to know what a CMP was all about, and that's a secondary audience. The Planning Commission would benefit if they have something they are specifically looking for, clear

and objective statements that can be communicated. And finally the general public, including reporters, it would be nice to tell them what a CMP is. But, ultimately the number one audience is the applicant.

III. REVIEW OF DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FINDINGS AND POLICIES FROM APRIL 13, 2015 TASK FORCE MEETING

There were no minutes available for review.

Gervais noted that in reviewing the agenda it was shy one item and questioned about next steps to address the draft revisions to findings and policies. Items still needing to be reviewed are Woodside's work; materials submitted by Court Smith and Dave Bella, as well as Dan Brown's earlier submissions. After discussion it was decided to look at raw material since some members were missing at the last meeting.

There was more discussion about edits, "word-smithing" and work left to be done to get this ready for public review. It was agreed to have a May 14 meeting to review all the edits and agree to get a document ready for public input. The public hearing would occur on May 25, which would be a longer meeting depending on comments, followed by a meeting to discuss public input and finalize Comprehensive Plan recommendations in June.

IV. CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF REVISIONS TO FINDINGS AND POLICIES NOT ADDRESSED ON APRIL 13, 2015

Article 5, Urban Amenities

Discussion began regarding this section. The first concern was regarding the last sentence "the City shall work closely with OSU to develop on campus recreational opportunities for the City of Corvallis citizens". Concerns were whether it was something to ask OSU to do, it sounding presumptuous. One suggestion was to approach the issue from a level of service angle, giving OSU more flexibility about the level of service. Suggestion was to re-word to "the City will work with OSU to provide the POTENTIAL for recreational opportunities to the community on campus" which will also address any liability issues. Gervais suggested one edit rather than saying "OSU campus is plush with recreational" to "OSU campus offers MANY recreational opportunities" to address the concerns mentioned. Kevin summarized the edit to be "the City shall work with OSU to develop the POTENTIAL for recreational opportunities to serve the community on campus".

Barbara suggested a requirement to maintain a level of service tied to parks and open spaces and recreation on OSU so students don't have the need to leave campus to reduce the impact on surrounding communities. Task Force agreed to keep the suggestion in mind, possibly in Housing or Open Spaces.

In looking at the second paragraph of Commissioner Woodside's review, "an attempt to keep the University's students close to campus the neighborhoods have has received..." delete *has*.

Consensus was that the last sentence "The City shall look at zoning patterns as related to OSU and the surrounding neighborhoods as an attempt to preserve the existing character" was already addressed.

Staff commented that it was included at the top of the page of Attachment B.3. Staff noted that most of what is in the packet are changes discussed and authorized to date. It does not include changes to Articles 3 or 5 and Commissioner Woodside's comments concentrated on these Articles have not been

discussed by the Task Force yet. The recommendation has not yet been captured in the proposed revisions. They were in Dodson's edited testimony and those were discussed. Barb stated that an initial conversation was started about Woodside's work but overlapped with other input. Staff's notes were concentrated on Article 8, Economy; Article 9 Housing. Staff asked if the desire of the Task Force was to say "we have reviewed Woodside's recommendations for Article 3 and 5 and we move that forward as body" that can be done. There was some discussion about the OSU document that came in as testimony and not having the benefit of that information previously. It was agreed to go over Gervais' review, followed by Woodside's then David Bella's comments.

Article 3, Land Use

The Task Force began review of Gervais' work, (Attachment B-12, April 13, 2015 packet) Chair Gervais noted that on page 13, there were some revisions to findings.

Finding 3.2.c "continued cooperation among Corvallis and Oregon State University is important..." There was general consensus to add the suggested language "*in particular, cooperation is necessary to prevent simply shifting land-use conflicts from one entity to another*".

Finding 3.x1 "unexpected growth in OSU enrollment and employment has led to increased congestion in key intersections..." General agreement to look at this first then decide how to handle Dave's edits to this finding.

Finding 3.x2 "enrollment projections under the 2005 CMP were exceeded..." needs to reflect data from the 2005 CMP.

Finding 3.x3 "...OSU's impact on the community with respect to the percentage of the overall community dwarfs any other entity." an edit was suggested to change dwarfs to *exceeds*.

Finding 3.x4 is okay they way it's written.

Finding 3.x5 was discussed in terms of encouraging communication between the City and the University about the campus master plan and not having it lay dormant without any monitoring for 10 years. It was agreed to add the following wording at the end of 3.x5 "*communication, coordination and monitoring with the City*."

Finding 3.x6 was listed twice, deleted the first one and make that statement in another way. Discussion on the second, "Decisions regarding enrollment and development on campus" centered on trying to capture the impact on the community. There was some disagreement as to how to include this finding and also make sure it was implemented and monitored. Consensus was to leave the wording as is, and then review with David's input and word smith if necessary at that point.

Article 5, Community Character

Finding 5.x1 “recent growth by OSU resulted in the loss X amount of single-family houses...” Suggestion was to strike this finding because of David’s edits and look at those to make the finding.

Finding 5.x2 “downtown neighborhoods have characteristics that include large streets...” Agreement to was to get more property specific information as the age of these neighborhoods, structures.

Finding 5.x3 “the lack of progress on Policy 5.4.8 has failed to protect the older neighborhoods in the vicinity of OSU and downtown. “ After some discussion, Staff suggested wording, “*the lack of progress on historic inventory and preservation work as reflected in Policy 5.4.8...*” and continue the same language just being more precise as to what is being addressed. There were some questions about the UNO zone. Staff stated UNO is a precise boundary and it’s an example of how the Land Development Code implements Comprehensive Plan Policies regarding neighborhood character. Gervais saw this finding as speaking to the UNO zone and other tools that could be used to address the loss of character in neighborhoods.

Article 5 Urban Amenities

The Task Force moved on to discussing Commissioner Woodside’s proposed revisions to Article 5. Gervais commented that the 1st paragraph has already been addressed. In the 2nd paragraph , Gervais suggested it could be a policy to fit in with her findings. The paragraph that reads, “ In an attempt to keep the University students close to campus....” That would be a policy but need to craft into a finding. Staff concurred that first two sentences in paragraph are factual. Staff noted that the Neighborhood Planning Group has already made a recommendation to consider a zone change in these areas due to concern. After some discussion the group agreed on a new policy as follows: “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.”

Onto paragraph 3 on Commissioner Woodside’s work “OSU shall create and maintain a historical inventory of resources on campus for review and use of the City of Corvallis and the Historic Resources Board”. The first question asked was whether this was currently happening. Staff affirmed that this was occurring within the OSU Historic District. Discussion ensued as to whether there was any part of the OSU property expanding beyond the OSU historic district. It was noted that the portion of campus that is within city limits is 540 acres. The historic district boundary primarily includes those structures that are 50 years or older at the time of the district was formed and constitutes about 180 acres within the larger 540 acre OSU campus. Staff suggested revising the finding to state “*City of Corvallis and the HRC*”.

Article 7, Environmental Quality

After much discussion the Task Force agreed to the following findings and policies:

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.*

Proposed New Policy

7.2.7 OSU and the City shall explore options for reducing carbon emissions.

Article 11, Transportation

After much discussion the Task Force agreed to the following findings and policies:

Proposed New Findings

11.2.j *Transportation decisions depend on desired activity and options available. Choice of mode depends on price (money and time), distance, convenience, reliability, safety, comfort.*

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

11.2.l *Policies addressing transportation must address price, convenience, and desirability in order to be effective in addressing behavior, system needs, and overall goals.*

11.2.m *Transportation requirements associated with development have a significant impact on the built environment, on the transportation system, and on the cost of development. These in turn affect livability and the ability to do business in a timely way.*

11.4.h *Use of parking depends on accessibility of the parking, convenience to the final destination, and price.*

11.7.i *Use of transit depends on convenience and desirability. Convenience includes proximity to origin and destination, frequency, speed compared to other modes, and reliability. Desirability is affected by comfort, appearance, crowdedness.*

Proposed New Policy

11.2.16 Transportation requirements associated with development must be clear, measurable, and carefully monitored for effectiveness.

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.

11.4 Auto Parking

Proposed New Findings

- 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.*
- 11.4.i *Parking lots cannot easily be converted back to less-intensive uses if they are paved and developed to existing city standards.*
- 11.4.j *The City Council's plan to expand residential parking districts, which was considered through the referendum process, did not gain widespread support from voters in 2014.*
- 11.4.k *Most people would like to park on the street adjacent to their residence.*
- 11.4.l *Many residences lack adequate off-street parking and place parking demand on adjacent streets. While many major traffic generators provide off-street parking, they also create on-street parking demand. The generators include OSU, LBCC, District 509J, City and County government, multi-household dwellings, businesses, offices, and churches.*
- 11.4.m *People have various needs for parking on streets to reach a job, obtain services, purchase goods, visit or provide services to businesses and residences, get to places for recreation, attend events. Thus, parking rules must accommodate a variety of needs of Corvallis residents, businesses, and transients to the community.*
- 11.4.n *Parking fees can benefit communities when used to develop transit and transportation options (Shoup 2011, Speck 2013).*

Proposed New Policies

- 11.4.8** Temporary lots that 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.
- 11.4.9** Park and ride lots and alternative transportation linkages shall be explored cooperatively with major employers if adequate on-site parking does not exist for employees, clients, or students.
- 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 provide resources for transit and transportation improvements.
- D. Parking fees should be considered as an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improving livability.

11.6 Pedestrian

Findings

11.6.d The 1990 Census identifies the pedestrian mode as the second highest mode used in Corvallis to get to work, while Oregon State University has identified it as the most common mode for students accessing the campus. OSU's 2014 Campus-wide Parking Survey, which was distributed to 5,000 students and 4,241 faculty and staff members, found that 53% of respondents drive a personal vehicle to campus, 21% walk, 16% ride a bicycle, 5% ride the bus, 3% arrive by carpool, and 2% use other means to travel to campus. The 2013 American Community Survey (US Census) estimates that 56.7% of Corvallis residents commute to work in a single occupant vehicle, 7.8% carpool to work, 2.9% take public transportation, 12.2% walk (the highest rate in the nation), and 13.1% travel by other means (bicycle, etc.).

11.7 Transit

Proposed New Findings

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

Proposed New Policies

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.

11.12 Oregon State University Transportation Issues

Findings

11.12.a The existing traffic pattern serving Oregon State University has an impact on the community. These impacts include additional through traffic in neighborhoods and higher-speed traffic in residential areas.

11.12.b Existing non-university traffic patterns include traffic flow through the campus which has an impact on the campus community.

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

Proposed New Finding

11.12.d Concerns have increased regarding the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists travelling to the University due to increased student enrollment, increased vehicle traffic, public improvement limitations (e.g. crossings and lighting), and visibility constraints.

Policies

11.12.1 The University and the City shall work together to improve traffic patterns through and around Oregon State University which will reduce negative impacts on existing residential areas and the campus.

11.12.2 The University shall develop and implement a transportation and parking plan that reduces the negative traffic and parking impacts on existing residential areas.

11.12.3 All-day parking of University-related vehicles on streets in proximity to the University shall be discouraged.

11.12.4 The City shall work with the University to minimize Oregon State University-related off-campus parking problems.

11.12.5 The City shall work with OSU to develop a plan to decrease traffic and parking impacts in and around the University during major events.

Proposed New Policies

11.12.6 Zoning for OSU-related development will take into account the associated transportation demand created (trip generation), proximity to associated activities, convenience to existing transportation systems (transit, pedestrian, bike, parking), and measurable impacts to the transportation system.

11.12.7 Remote parking lot options shall be assessed for the OSU campus. A feasibility study shall be conducted as the basis for recommendations.

11.12.8 The City and OSU shall partner in providing remote parking lot options. OSU and the City shall work together to provide a means of transportation from the remote parking to campus.

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

V. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

David Bella commented that he enjoyed the group deliberate on these important issues. He also complimented Staff on providing the broadest sense of comments and information. He said the City is fortunate to have this dedication, he is satisfied that his own interests will be heard, and he complimented the Task Force for dealing with difficult issues.

David Dodson stated that the evening's submissions included findings and policies presented at the last meeting and those that OSU had suggested. He noted three suggested findings that deal with TDMs in his testimony, which is included in the meeting packet. Lastly, as Dan Brown mentioned tonight, comp plan policies are goal oriented, they are inspirational. He cautioned the Task Force that some of the things discussed were "how to," so that's not really an appropriate comp plan policy. A comp plan policy can speak to the desire to consider those things, but getting into specifics about how to it's going to get done, would be overly specific.

Lastly, Gervais encouraged Task Force members to respond to the doodle poll to schedule a next meeting. Staff stated that once a quorum was established through doodle poll, the meeting date and time would be announced. There would also need to be a meeting in early June.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.