



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

**CITY OF CORVALLIS  
OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE MINUTES  
JUNE 22, 2015**

**Present**

*Planning Commissioners:*  
Jennifer Gervais, *Chair*  
Paul Woods  
Ron Sessions

*City Councilors*  
Frank Hann

**Excused Absence:**

Roen Hogg  
Barbara Bull  
Jasmin Woodside

**Staff**

Kevin Young, *Planning Division Manager*  
Mark Lindgren, *Recorder*

**Visitors:**

Dave Dodson, OSU  
Dan Brown  
Courtney Cloyd  
Gary Angelo  
Court Smith  
Marilyn Koenitzer  
Councilor Penny York

**I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

The OSU-Related Plan Review Task Force (PRTF) was called to order by Chair Jennifer Gervais at 7:30 p.m. in the Downtown Fire Station Avenue Meeting Room. Introductions were made. Written testimony submitted prior to the meeting was provided by staff (Attachment A).

**II. INTRODUCTION TO THE WORK OF THE TASK FORCE**

Chair Jennifer Gervais said that there had been some misunderstanding in the community about the work of the Task Force. She explained that the group learned from the City Attorney's office that it could not address Land Development Code (LDC) Chapter 3.36 in this legislative process. Since it dealt so specifically with OSU, review of LDC Chapter 3.36 would require a quasi-judicial process. So, instead, the group set to work on the Comprehensive Plan (which overarches the LDC) policies and findings as they relate to OSU. It is not intended to be detailed; it is broad and aspirational, and creates room for development of Land Development Code language, which will address detail.

The task force considered all public testimony and tried to work it in. She said the public still has a chance to submit testimony over the next week. She noted the current Comp Plan is based on the 2020 Vision Statement; however, there hasn't been a re-visioning in over twenty years. While some testimony was submitted regarding Chapter 3.36, the task force could not consider it, since it was outside its scope.

### III. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

**OSU Campus Planning Manager Dave Dodson** highlighted his testimony (Attachment A) regarding proposed OSU comments. The comments sought to clarify, simplify, to remove duplication, and to remove “how-to” details (the latter should be codified). Regarding Article 3, Findings, 3.2.c, he recommended deletion of “In particular, cooperation is necessary to prevent simply land use conflicts from one entity to another”. OSU felt that was judgment rather than fact.

Regarding Proposed Policy 3.2.9, the recommendation was to re-word it, to the effect that “The City supports OSU’s leadership in carbon-smart programs”.

Article 5, Proposed New Finding, 5.2.f, should be re-worded from “In an attempt to keep university students close to the campus, the surrounding neighborhoods have been zoned for higher density” to “With increased enrollment at the university, surrounding neighborhoods have re-developed at higher densities”. Regarding 5.4.l, he was it was duplicated by 5.2.g, and so proposed striking 5.2.g.

Regarding Historic and Cultural Resources, OSU recommended only referencing intent of a policy, rather than the policy itself, since numbers can change over the years.

Regarding New Finding 5.4.o, OSU recommended changing from “The City of Corvallis and the Historic Resource Commission” to “The City of Corvallis and the locally designated landmarks commission” (since the name of the body can change over time (and *has* done so)).

Regarding Article 7, OSU proposed cleaning up typos and referencing. For example, 7.2.k states “On average, 20% of the land in the city is *in streets*”; he proposed “..devoted to streets” instead.

Regarding Housing, page 3, 9.7.e, he proposed rewording it to: “Development and redevelopment in higher density zones near the university has been designed to serve students, rather than family and employee housing types, which has led to *livability concerns* in some neighborhoods”.

Regarding New Finding 9.7.h, he proposed “Rapid growth in student population” striking the preceding “Negative impacts resulting from..”. He said the point was that rapid growth in enrollment was not adequately managed by Comp Plan policies in the Code.

Regarding Findings 9.7.l and 9.7.m, they are nearly identical, so OSU recommended keeping the simpler of the two: 9.7.m.

Regarding 9.7.2 and 9.7.3, he related that OSU was confused about the policies’ intent-whether it was aimed at students living on campus, or on or near campus. OSU suggested referencing that it is ideal for students to live *on* campus, but another acceptable option is for them to at least live close to campus, as opposed to further away.

Regarding 9.7.6, page 4, OSU felt it was important that the City explore options for experimental communities- “rather than “..to cooperate to facilitate the development of..”. Regarding 9.7.7, he proposed re-wording it to “The City shall *encourage* the university to

explore public/private partnerships". He proposed minor re-wording of 9.7.9, adding that it was similar to 9.7.m, so proposed striking 9.7.m.

Regarding Transportation, he proposed wordsmithing in 11.4.m, and suggested striking the reference to the source of the information listed in 11.4.n.

Regarding the Proposed New Finding under Transit, he proposed re-wording it to "The increase in use of CTS routes by students has affected certain CTS routes, contributing to over-crowding". He highlighted minor proposed wordsmithing in 11.7.j.

Regarding Transportation issues, he highlighted OSU's proposed re-writes in 11.12.c and 11.12.h. He proposed modifying 11.12.7 to "Explore the *viability* of remote parking options".

Regarding 11.12.8, OSU proposed striking it, since it wasn't sure of the purpose or intent. The language deals with the "how" to implement the policy, and OSU wasn't able to come up with a recommendation to change it. OSU proposed a re-write of 11.12.9.

Regarding Article 13, Finding 13.2.b, OSU suggested striking it, since *all* land uses have an impact on the community.

Regarding 13.2.f, page 6, OSU suggested striking it (it simply states history). He proposed grammatical edits to 13.2.j. Regarding 13.2.k, OSU felt portions of the Finding were opinion, rather than documented fact. OSU felt that 13.2.l was also more opinion than fact. Regarding 13.2.m, he said OSU has significant impact, but asked in what way it was disproportionate.

He highlighted suggested edits to 13.2.p, saying it should contain the correct metrics. Perhaps we need more reasonable, or different, metrics. OSU suggested striking or re-writing 13.2.q; OSU didn't know of any public-private partnerships that were actually done.

He suggested edits to 13.2.r. In 13.2.1, OSU proposed replacing "to provide the mission activities" with "to achieve the educational objectives".

He noted the new Plan was being termed a District Plan, not a Master Plan.

Under Proposed New Policies, 13.2.6 states "how" monitoring programs should be done, not the aspirational desire, regarding the need to provide monitoring programs to provide assurance that things were being done as they were expected to be done. There were proposed minor edits to the two other Policies.

Regarding 13.2.q, on public-private partnerships, Councilor Frank Hann said what was in mind were the developments with the hospital for a medical clinic on campus; the hotel; and other private sector things, and asked what would OSU call those rather than public-private partnerships. Mr. Dodson replied that these could be characterized as uses not primarily focused on the educational mission of the university; they are ancillary or supporting uses, not necessarily core uses operated by the university. He suggested using examples such as hotels and medical facilities in order to clarify.

**Dan Brown** stated he would later submit extensive additional written testimony. His overall concern goes back to the task force's decision not to address Chapter 3.36; that work will remain to be done.

He stated that the wording of 11.2.16 “Transportation requirements associated with development must be clear, measurable, and carefully monitored for effectiveness” was clear and appropriate. He cautioned that it will be difficult for average readers, without background, to understand the document. For example, he cited 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”.

Chair Gervais responded that the City Attorney had advised that legally the task force could not touch Chapter 3.36 as a legislative process; that would have to be quasi-judicial. The Comp Plan that must be changed before the Land Development Code.

**Courtney Cloyd** highlighted Proposed Policy 11.4.10, “On-street parking provides for a wide diversity of needs for Corvallis residents and people coming through Corvallis for work, school events...”. He said auto parking should be allocated according to the following principles- “Principal A- The streets of Corvallis belong to the community. Principal B- On street parking is a public resource which should be managed for the public good”.

He highlighted Principle C- “The parking fee system should be self-supporting and can provide additional resources for transit or transportation improvements” and Principal D- “Parking fees can be considered an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improved livability”. He commented that Principal C appeared to be an opportunity to invent another revenue stream, counter to frequently expressed general public opinions expressed during hearings on the parking districts proposals last June. There’s nothing wrong with regulation of parking, but it should not be seen as a revenue generator. Principle D also appeared to be another revenue generation opportunity, undermining the principle of streets belonging to the community, for community access.

Mr. Cloyd highlighted OSU’s tiered parking pricing, which sets the value of parking closest to the core campus at the highest price. He said that proposals that the City use parking permits open to the highest bidder; or on a first-come-first served basis; or requiring residents of neighborhoods near campus to pay a fee commensurate to fees charged by OSU; would be terribly counterproductive and undermine livability and having safe and accessible streets for periodic parking for residents, visitors, contractors, and students. Easy accessibility is the primary goal, so he proposed striking Principle D, as well as the second element of Principle C. He said that you’ll find a lot of objection for using streets for revenue generation.

Commissioner Wood replied that the reasoning behind the principals was that currently there isn’t easy access to those parking spots, due to overflow parking from campus. So, the idea suggested by the public was to use price to essentially create empty spaces. Mr. Cloyd said he was in a neighborhood affected by overflow from campus, and was a proponent of parking districts, though he’d initially opposed them in 2010. He stated that overflow parking has significantly increased just this year; the City’s study in his neighborhood showed a 91% occupancy during school week days in spring term.

Mr. Cloyd said that parking districts could be fairly administered with a certain number of permits per dwelling unit (with a kitchen). Many neighborhood residents rely on on-street parking (some older houses have no on-site parking). Users should pay a fee commensurate with the cost of administering the fee. You wouldn’t need to buy a permit if you didn’t need parking. Also, two-hour, once-a-day permits in a parking district allow for circulation, visitors, students and contractors; he’s seen it work in his Zone C. Though some contend that OSU

should be paying the cost of permitted parking for parking districts, he felt that it's a City issue that the City needs to address.

Commissioner Gervais said the intent of the language was not to rule out parking districts, and the language could be revisited. The solutions were proposed by community members, and background research studies from other communities suggested that free parking could actually be a real problem, as opposed to charging some amount of money. Perhaps we need to review 11.4.10. The Comp Plan is not intended to narrow solutions; instead, it should expand space for a wide range of solutions. Mr. Cloyd said the Comp Plan should provide guidance to create equity in use of community resources; this isn't as clear as it needs to be.

**Marilyn Koenitzer** said she wrote much of the first Comp Plan; much has changed since then. She felt the draft Plan was a very good start, going in the right direction, and just needing a little fine tuning. Regarding Mr. Dodson's suggested deletions, she said the last phrase in 3.2 should be retained ("cooperation is necessary to prevent simply shifting land use conflicts from one entity to another"). That could be re-visited; OSU expansion without proper planning or notification is a huge issue in Corvallis- the biggest since the riverfront.

She stated that most of Mr. Dodson's clarifications were reasonable. 9.7.h on page 3 could be retained or re-worded. Regarding 9.7.7, page 4, the statement is not as strong with Mr. Dodson's proposed deletion. Regarding 11.12, the first Finding, OSU proposed removing "parking"; she advocated leaving it in.

Regarding 11.12.8, she said that it affects her a lot- driving from north to south, and from east to west around the university is very difficult. The more roads OSU can keep open, the better it is for the community. We need to have a conversation on this, even though OSU proposed taking this out.

She said that 13.2.k and 13.2.l could be re-worded; we only need one statement about the changes since the last Comp Plan, and how OSU has affected livability. 13.2.m should perhaps refer to the impact on community land use, the building, and the multiplex apartments going up in neighborhoods. It should perhaps be re-worded from "disproportionate impact" to better clarify the intent.

She suggested re-wording 13.2.6 Proposed New Policies to clarify intent. Regarding 9.4.11, on page 9, she said that we need to include better architectural design criteria and better spatial relationships of buildings to one another as well as the streets to the land. She cited poor layout on a recent development on SW Brooklane.

Regarding 9.4.11, we're one of the densest cities in Oregon of our size, with smaller lot sizes. We need to increase our building standards if we're going to become more dense, such as improved soundproofing, improved insulation, and maintaining privacy in balconies and courtyards. Seniors might prefer living in apartments with such improved standards.

Regarding 9.5.j, she said that the 2014 Policy Options Study on housing prepared for the Council by EcoNorthwest proposed streamlining the annexation process. However, the major cost of housing is land; we worked hard to institute the existing annexation reforms. She also had concern about the urban renewal proposal. The study seems to have a very narrow scope, focusing on commuting rather than the kinds of housing we need. We need a better housing study and to figure out ways to make it happen.

She wished we had more single level housing for sale for seniors; there are not many available. Chair Gervais said the task force will likely meet in early July, and advocated submitting testimony at least several days before we meet. Chair Gervais thanked her for her work on the original Comp Plan.

**Gary Angelo**, of the College Hill Neighborhood Association, concurred with Mr. Cloyd's comments. Regarding parking fees, he said it would be helpful for language to distinguish between parking fees such as meters and parking district permit fees; and separate that from discussion of funding transit. Parking district self-funding models have been successful; they are a response to inadequate parking in appropriate places in older neighborhoods surrounding campus. Older neighborhoods have garages and driveways meant for smaller cars; you can't apply generic parking theory to specific cases in our older neighborhoods, which need to be protected. Currently we're in danger of losing our old neighborhoods due to our policies and development; he's heard some residents say that they might have to leave in a few years.

He noted that he was a member of the Traffic and Parking Work Group of the Collaboration. He said there is an administrative side to parking districts, annual \$15 per year needed to cover printing and issuing permits, and installing and maintaining adequate signage. The fee can be raised over time to be self-supporting. The intent was to assure that fees would fully support the cost of administering and maintaining the physical aspects of the district. Permit fees are not intended to support enforcement; the cost of paid parking tickets supports that. The Council felt there should be a guaranteed minimum fee for violations in order to support an enforcement funding stream.

**Court Smith**, on behalf of OSUPAL, advocated in favor of Policy 11.4.10. There's a good deal of evidence in looking at parking districts and fees as separate things; however, studies show that getting parking *right* is essential for communities. Studies have shown that whatever parking arrangement is in place, roughly 80% parking spaces should be filled, but some need to remain open for use. Also, you need to control parking in high traffic areas; the turnover is beneficial for businesses. The two references that OSU sought to delete in this regard provide good evidence for getting parking right, pricing it right, and not giving it away for free (which has tremendous costs for communities).

He emphasized that funds do go to transport and transit. Transport includes infrastructure, such as streets- everything used for cars. You need money for parking signs- we need a revenue source for that, and the state and the federal government wouldn't give money for that. Transit is an option to solve problems, making it easier to get to places people want to go without taking a car. For example, downtown is underused at some peak times due to inadequate parking or the means to get there without a car. The proposed use of funds was to improve the community, not taxing people unfairly. He proposed having cars pay their own way; cars consume 20% of the land in the community and there is little charge for using that land. Everyone loves free parking, but we need some kind of rules to allocate parking. Some allocations make no sense; for example, he could park on 16<sup>th</sup> Street for a week for free, while people are paying \$300 or \$400 for parking within a block of there.

Regarding parking districts, they do not pay for themselves; the big funding source is people parking illegally, (bringing in over 50%); residents only pay a very low fee. Simply painting parking lines would promote more efficient usage, but that costs money, from a revenue source. Parking regulations must be designed to fit our city.

**Councilor Penny York** commented that Mr. Dodson’s so-called minor edits in the last two items fundamentally change those proposed policies, and are not minor edits. In 3.2.7, changing “..shall be *required*” to “considered” changes the policy entirely to an idea rather than a mandate. This is a policy change, not a grammatical change.

Regarding “The City and OSU shall encourage OSU to develop a means..” she said that the intent was to encourage OSU to develop a decision-making process more transparent to the general public. She proposed the task force examine the intent of the language and clarify it.

Chair Gervais encouraged additional comments. She noted that, prior to adoption of any revisions to The Comprehensive Plan, the City Council and the Planning Commission will both review this, so there would be additional opportunities for testimony.

#### IV. DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Commissioner Woods highlighted Director Ken Gibb’s June 5, 2015 memo to the task force, Attachment E-1, from the June 8, 2015 packet. The thrust was that the LDC amendment process might be considered too burdensome to make changes in monitoring that could be required in a new District Plan. In the old Campus Master Plan, there was an LDC section on monitoring, but there was a proposal to change that. However, that process has not gone through in the official way that it should have been undertaken, and Director Gibb was seeking to making these changes in the future and avoiding the LDC amendment process. He said that Director Gibb was recommending an alternative method- the City Council creating a Council Policy. Commissioner Woods said that his concern was that a Council Policy would not have the force of law and that OSU would be under no obligation to follow it.

Manager Young replied that he’d discussed the issue with the City Attorney and the Community Development Director. A Council Policy does not have the same force of law; the LDC has the force of law, but the intent expressed was to allow more flexibility to make adjustments to monitoring. The LDC process is not very nimble, and takes time. The recommendation was for a means, such as a Council Policy, that could be utilized, in relation to monitoring. The mechanism would need to be binding on both parties through adoption of the District Plan. A Council Policy can be changed through committee review process, along with Council process and a public comment opportunity.

Commissioner Woods said he was hearing confirmation that a Council Policy does not have force of law. He cited a case in which a statement in The Campus Master Plan was not being performed by the university, but there was nothing in the LDC that implemented that policy, and the university declined to do so, saying it was not in the LDC. The LDC amendment process, while it can take a while, is not much worse than the Council Policy process, just requiring two public hearings rather than one.

Chair Gervais asked Manager Young to present a contrast between Council Policy review versus LDC process. Manager Young replied that the LDC is a minimum three-month process; it may take longer, and is subject to appeal. Commissioner Sessions noted that Council Policy still took six weeks or so; while changing the LDC can be a piecemeal process, it is not onerous. Manager Young said staff weren’t opposed to utilization of the LDC amendment process if that is the desire of the Task Force. It is just not a very flexible tool; there may be other tools, as well. Chair Gervais asked staff to bring back a list of possible tools, but we don’t have the information tonight to respond to this. Commissioner

Sessions said we want a set of minimum standards for reporting for OSU, but circumstances may change, and other reporting criteria may be mutually agreed upon by both OSU and the City. Chair Gervais asked that this be put on the next agenda.

Commissioner Woods said he wanted to respond to Director Gibb's proposal to use Council Policy. He said he hadn't had a chance to read testimony received today. Manager Young said one option is to step back in terms of the specificity of the Comp Plan policy. It may be enough to say that OSU monitoring requirements should be binding, but should include some means for adjustments if monitoring fails to measure issues of concern. The details could be worked out later; The Task Force concurred with this approach. Manager Young will bring back draft language.

Regarding questions from public testimony, Chair Gervais said that testimony regarding the quad and the Women's Building appeared to be unrelated to the task force's work, and seemed to be more like a code enforcement issue. Commissioner Woods said it may depend on interpretation of how to regard the Olmstead Plan. Manager Young said it could be viewed several ways. The writer cites provisions of the existing Master Plan; they relate to design considerations for campus planning, so it could be viewed as a violation of the current framework or in terms of whether we need to craft policy on quads and the historic plan for the campus and preserving that pattern of development. Chair Gervais replied that we've stayed away from telling OSU what to do on its property.

Commissioner Woods said there is not a legal violation of the Master Plan. This underscores that any code we suggest should be translated carefully into the law through the LDC- the only thing the university has demonstrated that it will follow. Manager Young noted that in the area in question, both the new Business School building and the Classroom Building were reviewed by the HRC and found to be compatible.

V. DETERMINE NEED / AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Chair Gervais anticipated at least one more meeting. A Doodle poll would be sent out to schedule the next meeting. Councilor Hann suggested avoiding another Housing conflict; Manager Young said the first and second weeks in July were being considered.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.



**Capital Planning and Development**  
100 Oak Creek Building  
3015 SW Western Blvd., Corvallis, Oregon 97333  
Main Line: 541-737-5412 | Fax: 541-737-4810

June 22, 2015

Members of the Plan Review Task Force:

OSU appreciates all the work the Task Force has done to update the OSU related Articles of the City's Comprehensive Plan. We respectfully request that you consider some additional edits as noted below in blue. As always, we will be available to answer questions during your meeting this evening.

## **Article 3. Land Use Guidelines**

### **3.2 General Land Use**

#### **Findings**

*3.2.c Continued cooperation among Corvallis, Benton County, Linn County, and Oregon State University is important in the review of development. This should help to ensure compatibility between uses on private and public lands. In particular, cooperation is necessary to prevent simply shifting land use conflicts from one entity to another.*

#### **Proposed New Policy**

*3.2.9 The City supports OSU's should consider being a community leadership in carbon smart programs and transportation demand management that benefits the larger Corvallis community.*

## **Article 5. Urban Amenities**

### **5.2 Community Character**

#### **Proposed New Findings**

*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 increased enrollment numbers at the University, the surrounding neighborhoods have redeveloped to at higher densities.*

Note: the finding below is identical to 5.4.1 below and should be deleted.

~~5.2.g City zoning allowed for the redevelopment of single family homes in the neighborhoods surrounding OSU and, accordingly, the growth of student-oriented complexes. While these student-oriented complexes help reduce vehicle trips to campus, they can also alter the character of the older single-family neighborhoods.~~

## 5.4 Historic and Cultural Resources

### Proposed New Findings

Note: making reference to specific finding and policy numbers is not advisable, as they are subject to change and difficult to track.

~~5.4.n The lack of progress on historic inventory and preservation work, as reflected in Policy 5.4.8 has failed to protect older neighborhoods in the vicinity of Oregon State University and downtown.~~

~~5.4.o OSU maintains an inventory of historic resources on campus for the review and use of the City of Corvallis and the locally designated landmarks commission.~~

## Article 7. Environmental Quality

### Proposed New Findings

~~7.2.i Car ~~D~~dependence increases pollution, reduces air and water quality, causes public health problems, raises safety issues, and adds to global climate change.~~

~~7.2.k Car dependence requires land for infrastructure. On average, 20% of the land in cities is ~~in~~ devoted to streets, not including land in parking lots, driveways, and garages.~~

## Article 9. Housing

### 9.7 Oregon State University Housing

#### Findings

~~9.7.d The student population is not expected to increase significantly during the planning period. The percentage of the total population who are students will decrease as the non-student population increases.~~

~~Historically, Long range forecasts of student enrollment growth have not always proven to be accurate, therefore, In addition, these forecasts are not have not been a reliable measure of impacts to the community.~~

~~9.7.e There are approximately 140 acres of land zoned medium density residential and 85 acres of land zoned medium high residential within a 1/2 mile of the main OSU campus, all of which has some potential for rezoning to a higher density.~~

~~Development and redevelopment in higher density zones near the University has been designed to primarily serve students, rather than family and employee housing types, which has led to reduced livability concerns in some neighborhoods.~~

## **New Findings**

~~9.7.h Negative impacts resulting from rRapid growth in the student population between 2009 and 2015 were not adequately managed by Comprehensive Plan Policies and Land Development Code requirements in place at the time.~~

Note: finding 9.7.l and 9.7.m are nearly identical. OSU recommends using 9.7.m as it provides the same facts with fewer words.

~~9.7.l Between January 2009 and March 2015, the City's demolition permit data suggest that approximately 69 detached single family dwellings were demolished in Corvallis. Many of these units were replaced by student-oriented housing, characterized by five-bedroom dwelling units, with one bathroom provided per bedroom, and multiple floors within units.~~

~~9.7.m Characteristics of student-oriented housing have more recently included a preponderance of five-bedroom units, with one bathroom per bedroom, and multiple floors within units.~~

## **Policies**

**9.7.2** The City shall encourage OSU to establish policies and procedures to encourage resident students to live on or near campus.

**9.7.3** ~~The City and OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the students who attend regular classes on campus in units on campus or within a 1/2 mile of campus.~~

~~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 to live in dwelling units on or near campus.~~

## **New Policies**

9.7.6 The City and OSU shall ~~consider exploring options for cooperate to facilitate the development of~~ experimental communities that are not dependent upon the single-occupant automobile.

9.7.7 The City shall ~~encourage promote the utilization by~~ the University ~~to explore 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.

9.7.9 The City shall consider a ~~A~~ amendments to the Land Development Code ~~shall be considered~~ to address the negative impacts resulting from the development of student-oriented, off-campus housing, ~~as described in Finding 9.7.m.~~

## Article 11. Transportation

### 11.4 Auto Parking

#### Proposed New Findings

11.4.1 Many residences lack adequate off-street parking, ~~resulting in increased 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, ~~and~~ 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).~~

### 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, contributing to overcrowding.

11.7.j The limited frequency of service and inconvenience of connections ~~has limited transit ridership.~~

## 11.12 Oregon State University Transportation Issues

### Findings

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

### Proposed New Findings

11.12.h ~~Loss of parking in Sector C of the OSU Campus makes it more difficult for members of the public to access the core of campus for events open to the public events.~~

### Proposed New Policies

11.12.7 OSU shall work with the City and other community partners to explore ~~the viability of~~ remote parking options.

~~11.12.8 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.~~

11.12.9 OSU and the City shall work together to accommodate short-term visitor ~~parking nears to~~ the campus core.

## Article 13. Special Areas of Concern

### 13.2 Oregon State University

#### Findings

~~13.2.b The location and function of University land uses have a major impact on the community.~~

*13.2.f In 1986, the City adopted the Oregon State University Plan which updated the Physical Development Plan for the main campus. This made the Oregon State University Plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with State law.*

## **Proposed New Findings**

*13.2.j Enrollment projections under the 2005 Campus Master Plan were exceeded by 1,883 students, or 7.7%. In 2004 ~~t~~There were 3,422 beds on campus within residence halls and co-ops, with a ~~f~~Fall ~~t~~Ferm on-campus undergraduate enrollment of 15,196. In 2014, on-campus ~~f~~Fall ~~t~~Ferm undergraduate enrollment was 20,312, and there were 4,846 beds provided in on-campus housing.*

*13.2.k Oregon State University added 5,316 students and 1,775 faculty and staff between 2003 and 2014 – 201.5, resulting in changes to the community. OSU’s impact on the community with respect to the percentage of the overall community exceeds any other entity.*

*13.2.l The disproportionate contribution made by OSU to the community’s resident and employee composition results in a disproportionate impact by land-use decisions made by OSU relative to any other entity.*

*13.2.m Because of the disproportionate impact OSU has on the community as a result of its relative size and economic impact, land-use decisions made by the university require a great degree of ongoing communication, coordination, and monitoring by the city.*

*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 ~~reasonable~~~~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.*

*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.r Some members of ~~t~~The public ~~haves~~ expressed concern that there has been inadequate public review of development on campus.*

## **Policies**

**13.2.1** The University and City should work cooperatively to develop and recognize means and methods to allow the University to achieve its educational objectives~~provide the mission activities~~.

**13.2.3** The City shall continue to work with Oregon State University on future updates of the 2004 Oregon State University Campus Master Plan, or successor university master plan document and amendments to the 1986 Oregon State University Plan. Coordination shall continue between the City and Oregon State University on land use policies and decisions.

### **Proposed New Policies**

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-OSU development 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.~~

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 considered required.

13.2.8 The City and OSU shall encourages OSU to develop a means of development-a decision-making process that is that is more transparent.

We appreciate your time and effort and look forward to your final recommended changes for the City Council to consider.

Sincerely,

*David Dodson*

David j. Dodson, AICP  
University Land Use Planning Manager

June 22, 2015

OSU-RELATED PLAN REVIEW TASK FORCE

Thank you for your extensive, time consuming work on the Comprehensive Plan Findings and Policies related OSU. This is a complex and confusing topic for citizens and I am sure that few citizens will weigh in. That does not mean that we are not interested or concerned, but rather that we lack confidence in our ability to understand the documents and to contribute effectively.

I have attempted to wade through the Proposed Revisions posted at the City's web site and I find many improvements and things to like. I feel that you have listened to comments made by citizens and have proposed many needed changes. I offer the comments or observations below not expecting many additional changes but hoping that everyone continues to be vigilant and alert to potential issues.

- 1) 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.

I wish to address the highlighted phrase. This would seem to imply that all agricultural and forest lands either in the UGB or inside an area considered Urban Fringe remain in agricultural and forest uses. I assume the Urban Fringe is a specific boundary and some of OSU's agricultural and forest lands are within this boundary. For instance, some of the land between 35<sup>th</sup> and 53<sup>rd</sup>. This wording then seems to imply that these lands cannot or should not be converted within the planning period to other uses such as housing, parking or instructional buildings. I do not know if that is the intent or not.

I would like to suggest either a clarification or a revision to this phrase. It should be clear that OSU needs to have access to agricultural and forest lands in proximity to the campus. However, some lands that are currently in agricultural or forest uses may need to be converted to other uses such as housing or institutional structures. Of course, OSU may need to replace these converted lands with other lands suitable for agricultural and forest research. The idea of having large tracts of agricultural and forest lands inside the Urban Fringe without them ever being able to support urbanization seems counterintuitive. Or perhaps these lands (if your intent is to permanently designate them agricultural and forest) should be removed from the Fringe designation.

Personally, I think some of OSU's agricultural and/or forest lands may need to be converted to housing uses and that this wording has been inserted to prevent or block any such conversion. Added note: Later in the document I did find some wording that implied some openness to future conversion of lands, although it still seems a rather low emphasis.

- 2) Regarding Article 5. Urban Amenities; 5.2 Community Character.

It seems to me that there could or should be an additional finding related to how the character of the City has morphed or changed with growth of OSU. After all, it is the amenities that have been impacted and changed the character of our community. OSU's enrollment has impacted City

services including transportation and traffic; library; parks and recreation; and others. We have experienced increased tax levies and service cuts while OSU growth has put pressure on services. At least to some degree, this change in character can be connected to growth at OSU. The OSU community (students and staff) now constitutes a bigger percentage of community population and OSU's growth exceeded the City's ability to sustain levels of service. I do not have specific wording to offer at this time but hope that you discuss this before advancing your findings to Council.

3) New Parks and Recreation Finding 5.6.w : The University offers many recreational opportunities.

Perhaps this should read "The University offers many recreational opportunities while the City, at tax payer expense, augments University activities with City-funded programs. Obviously this true and is more accurate in stating the condition of recreation related to OSU and its student population.

4) Proposed new finding 5.6.x:

This new finding should point out that the unexpected and unplanned enrollment increases over the last 10 years have placed a significant burden on the City's capital and operational needs for park facilities and recreational programs. Property tax revenues support P&R activities and OSU pays no property taxes. Yet students housed on campus make regular use of parks and recreational facilities.

5) 8.2 Employment and Economic Development.

One of the problems (as your findings point out) is that Corvallis has a high percentage of non-tax paying entities. Uncontrolled (unregulated) growth in the tax exempt category results in service problems for the City. Perhaps we should consider a Policy that indicates that growth should not exceed the community's ability to pay taxes and fees to support services. I suspect this would be hard to do, but to have no Policy about this problem doesn't seem to be adequate either.

6) 8.4.d.

This finding under Economy/Education lists many of the contributions OSU makes to the community, not just Education contributions. This item also ignores the adverse impact from the fact that OSU pays no property taxes to support local government services. Are Findings only intended to point out positive aspects while ignoring the negative?

7) Policies 8.4.1 and 8.4.2

These Policies both call for the City to "support" OSU. I am wondering what support means, particularly when it is preceded by "shall". I have no problem with "encourage" or "cooperate".

8) Housing Affordability Finding 9.5.e

Why does this Finding refer to "ownership" only? It seems to me that there is an "increasing need for housing types which offer lower cost rental and ownership possibilities.....". The cost-of-housing problems in Corvallis are not limited to ownership.

9) Finding 9.7.d regarding the inaccuracy of enrollment growth forecasts.

I was pleased to see this added, although one could argue that it should say “OSU forecasts”, since it was OSU’s campus forecasts being referred to. One could also note that the City failed to recognize the error in forecasted figures for many years, thus compounding the problem. My point here is that unless the City recognizes that forecasts must be tracked and measured, then the City will never know if it is on track or not. Perhaps this could be added as Finding 9.7.h: “The 2004 OSU Campus Plan had inaccurately low projections of student and faculty populations which went unrecognized by the City for over a decade”. It isn’t enough to say that the projections were wrong, it needs to be said that they were overlooked or ignored.

10) OSU Housing Finding 9.7.i.

This finding should be re-worded. The current wording implies that needed seismic upgrades was the reason for converting the housing to office use. While that may be the excuse used, in reality, OSU wanted to “re-purpose” the structures for office use. They are still seismically at risk and still occupied by people.

11) OSU Housing Finding 9.7.j.

The way this is worded seems to imply that there is a bigger demand in Corvallis for multi-family housing than there is for single family housing. Is there a basis for this? Is there a higher vacancy rate in single family housing than apartments? I would say that there is high demand for all types of housing in Corvallis and that there is an undersupply of almost every type of housing. There is particularly a dramatic under supply of single level, single family homes for senior citizens. Now, if the current wording is simply trying to say that in Corvallis there is a higher percentage of apartments to single family homes (than typical communities) because of student populations, then ok. But that isn’t how it reads to me. I would hate to see the wording here used to justify conversion of every single family zoned parcel to multi-family to accommodate student housing.

12) OSU Housing 9.7.n

Did anyone check the numbers? The item reads “...increases in overall enrollment haven’t ***necessarily*** resulted in an increase in the freshman class...”. Either it did or didn’t. This appears to be a justification for why OSU build fewer on-campus units than might otherwise be expected. But in fact this simply points out the tremendous burden that OSU’s policies and practices placed on the community’s private housing infrastructure.

13) Article 11 Transportation, Policy 11.2.17

I am concerned that this policy only requires measureable TDM measures. It does not require that the TDM measures accepted in lieu of improvement actually be effective. If a TDM measure is approved at time of development, there should be some monitoring over time to assure that the TDM measure actually worked. There needs to be a mechanism to insure that the developers and their hired engineers are responsible for correcting deficiencies when TDM measures prove to be ineffective. Perhaps this can be simply achieved by inserting the words “enforceable” and “effective”.

#### 14) Auto Parking Finding 11.4.i

This finding is somewhat misleading to me. Paved parking lots can easily be removed and the property converted to development-ready status. It is true that a paved lot cannot easily be returned to pristine open space or plant-based uses, but neither can a gravel lot. So what is the point? If parking is required, why is there any thought to eliminating the required parking? I am not sure what the point of this finding is or who proposed it. If it is desired to allow gravel lots for OSU (and others?), then why not a finding that says that gravel lots may be an option rather than coming up with some bogus excuse. I am not opposed to (some) gravel lots for OSU, but this just seems disingenuous.

#### 15) Pedestrian

I didn't see any policies in the report regarding pedestrians. That seems somewhat strange given the importance of pedestrian access to campus. And then I remembered the Campus Crest development when OSU refused to grant either a pedestrian or bicycle easement across OSU property to Campus Way. Obviously, such access to campus would have been easier, safer and faster for campus bound students living in this development. Can there not be a Policy that says "OSU shall cooperate with the City to establish safe and effective pedestrian routs to and through campus"? It isn't good enough that the City cooperate with OSU; OSU must also cooperate with the City.

#### 16) OSU Transportation Issues Finding 11.12.i

This suggests that lack of regional transportation options influences student's decision to bring cars to campus, but would it not influence their decision to bring cars to Corvallis also? What I have observed (I think) is that some students bring cars to Corvallis but don't necessarily take them to campus.

#### 17) OSU Transportation Issues

I notice that 11.12.2 requires OSU to develop and implement a parking plan. But the Policy does not indicate that the City shall review or in any way accept or approve the plan or receive reports on effectiveness. Since parking is one of the major issues in the community, would it not be advisable to include some role for the City?

Thank you for reading and considering.

In the final analysis, I think it is the LDC that regulates OSU development and is where our efforts need to be centered. These findings and policies have little impact unless the LDC incorporates mechanisms and controls that insure the outcomes the community desires.

Rolland Baxter

**From:** [Jeff Hess](#)  
**To:** [Young, Kevin](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Input for OSU-Related Comp plan review task-force  
**Date:** Saturday, June 20, 2015 9:56:44 AM

---

Amended and corrected...

I'm afraid I'll be out of town during the public input opportunity. Please consider the comments below and thanks to everyone who's worked on this document.

Regards,  
Jeff Hess

5.2.g ... This process also resulted in an exodus from neighborhoods of families and established communities resulting in many un-planned moves and hardships. It also removed the 'self-policing' impact of established, mostly non-student, communities.

5.4.n change from "has failed" to "contributed to the failure"... An additional contributing factor was the lack of leadership to quickly address the lack of protection for these neighborhoods via the same (already proposed), LDC amendments that ultimately arrested it.

5.4.o OSUs recent growth spurt catalyzed a housing crisis in Corvallis whereby fewer people who work or attend classes in Corvallis can purchase homes here.

7.2.9 People attending Oregon State University athletic events make a significant contribution to green house gas emissions.

7.2.10 Using recently completed transportation studies OSU and the city shall develop a quantified environmental impact measure for student housing located on-campus vs. off-campus based on commuting habits, housing density, concentration of services and runoff.

7.2.11 In response to OSUs recent growth spurt the city has developed significant amounts of wetlands and threatened species habitat.

8.2.d Change to "The stability of Corvallis and Benton County's economy is unhealthily dependent on ....

8.2.p Corvallis has a population component that is not benefited economically by OSU's presence or growth (seniors, work at home individuals, non-student oriented businesses, etc.). Concentrating solely on the overall numbers of OSUs economic impact to Benton County or the city of Corvallis when weighing city-altering decisions misses the significant negative impact OSU decisions can have upon these populations.

8.2.q Student debt is a national crisis. OSU is one of the largest generators of student debt in the PNW. Each year there are more university graduates then there are comparable jobs in the market.

8.2.r The significant percentage of non-tax paying entities in Corvallis requires that Corvallis funds a disproportionate amount of non-city related services. These added costs are visited upon businesses and individuals in the form of new taxes and fees that make Corvallis less attractive to businesses that are unrelated to OSU which would help diversify the local economy.

8.2.s The significant conversion of 'own-able' housing to 'rental' housing, coupled with the many neighborhoods now dominated by the influence of student housing, has reduced Corvallis' attractiveness to diversifying businesses that would seek to attract skilled employees interested in a more traditional, family oriented lifestyle.

8.2.t The housing crisis created by OSUs recent growth makes Corvallis less attractive to diversifying businesses that would seek to attract skilled employees interested in avoiding a commute-based lifestyle.

8.4.1 Remove the verb "support" (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

8.4.2 Delete altogether (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

9.7.b According to OSU spokesperson Steve Clark, Cauthorn hall (267 rooms) was closed from 2004-2005 for renovations thus using 2004 as a comparison falsely inflates the capacity OSU has added. A more accurate baseline to compare against would be 2003 or 2006.

9.7.h Negative impacts resulting from unforecasted rapid growth in the student population...

9.7.o University-provided on-campus housing is policed by state officers at no cost to Corvallis, off-campus housing has required a new tax levy to fund special policing requirements.

9.7.p University-provided on-campus housing is protected from free-market housing fluctuations and demand-based pricing while privately-owned housing elsewhere in the community does not.

9.7.q OSU has found that students living on-campus do better in classes and are more likely to earn a degree than those living off-campus.

9.7.r Given the ability of OSU decisions to impact the housing market, and the impact their statements have on investor-based developers, OSU should work with the city to develop housing plans prior to announcing or implementing any changes.

9.7.3 OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the faculty, staff and students work work and attend regular classes on campus in on-campus housing.

9.7.10 OSU shall undertake a donor campaign to provide "debt free" on-campus housing for students where dorm rates only cover upkeep & replacement costs (no bonds).

9.7.11 In response to OSUs recent growth spurt the city has moved to develop land

that voters had previously set aside for much-needed 'own-able' single family housing, for student oriented rental housing.

9.7.12 Studies\* have correlated improved psychological health, physical health, parenting and children's academic achievement & behavior and social and political participation in homeowners over renters. \*Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University [www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/hbtl-04.pdf](http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/hbtl-04.pdf)

11.4.11 Zonal parking districts instill an economic gradation to campus access as students from higher-income households can afford access students from lower-income households cannot. Among students, OSU should consider making all zones a single price but distributed by lottery (or some form of random assigning), allowing all students an equal opportunity for preferred parking spaces.

13.2.t Changes OSU implements to parking fees and program structure affect parking habits (as demonstrated with OSUs current zonal parking plan). Similarly past changes were also likely to have affected parking behavior and should have nullified parking utilization goals that were set based on a different, original, structure and fee base.

13.2.6 The 2004-2015 Campus Master Plan stated ..."if conditions change significantly or other unanticipated events occur, it may be necessary to update the CMP before the end of the planning period." As the enrollment growth realized was not anticipated in the projections of this CMP it should have triggered an update which then could have addressed the housing and parking needs of this new growth. This update did not occur to some great detriment. ... Then on to proposed policy.

On Sat, Jun 20, 2015 at 12:32 AM, Jeff Hess <[jeffhess100@gmail.com](mailto:jeffhess100@gmail.com)> wrote:  
I'm afraid I'll be out of town during the public input opportunity. Please consider the comments below and thanks to everyone who's worked on this document.

Regards,  
Jeff Hess

5.2.g ... This process also resulted in an exodus from neighborhoods of families and established communities resulting in many un-planned moves and hardships. It also removed the 'self-policing' impact of established, mostly non-student, communities.

5.4.n change from "has failed" to "contributed to the failure"... An additional contributing factor was the lack of leadership to quickly address the lack of protection for these neighborhoods via the same (already proposed), LDC amendments that ultimately arrested it.

7.2.9 People attending Oregon State University athletic events make a significant contribution to green house gas emissions.

7.2.10 Based off recently completed transportation studies OSU and the city shall develop a quantified environmental impact measure for student housing located on-campus vs. off-campus based on commuting habits, housing density, concentration of services and runoff.

8.2.d Change to "The stability of Corvallis and Benton County's economy is unhealthily dependent on ....

8.2.p In spite of OSU's economic dominance, increased taxes/fees visited upon Corvallis residents to pay for OSU induced expenses unfairly impact those residents who do not benefit from OSU's presence. Cost externalizations upon the city result in increased taxes making Corvallis less attractive to businesses unassociated with OSU which would help to dilute the local economy.

8.4.1 Remove the verb "support" (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

8.4.2 Delete altogether (the word "support" is ill-defined and could be taken to imply future expectations of action on the city's part).

9.7.b According to OSU spokesperson Steve Clark, Cauthorn hall (267 rooms) was closed from 2004-2005 for renovations thus using 2004 as a comparison falsely inflates the capacity OSU has added. A more accurate baseline to compare against would be 2003 or 2006.

9.7.h Negative impacts resulting from unforecasted rapid growth in the student population...

9.7.o University-provided on-campus housing is policed by state officers at no cost to Corvallis, off-campus housing has required a new tax levy to fund special policing requirements.

9.7.p University-provided on-campus housing is protected from free-market housing fluctuations and demand-based pricing while privately-owned housing elsewhere in the community does not.

9.7.q OSU has found that students living on-campus do better in classes and are more likely to earn a degree than those living off-campus.

9.7.r Given the ability of OSU decisions to impact the housing market, and the impact their statements have on investor-based developers, OSU should work with the city to develop housing plans prior to announcing or implementing any changes.

9.7.3 OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the faculty, staff and students work work and attend regular classes on campus in on-campus housing.

9.7.10 OSU shall undertake a donor campaign to provide "debt free" on-campus housing for students where dorm rates only cover upkeep & replacement costs (no bonds).

11.4.11 Zonal parking districts instill an economic gradation to campus access as students from higher-income households can afford access students from lower-income households cannot. Among students, OSU should consider making all zones a single price but distributed by lottery (or some form of random assigning), allowing all students an equal opportunity for preferred parking spaces.

13.2.t Changes OSU implements to parking fees and program structure affect parking habits (as demonstrated with OSUs current zonal parking plan). Similarly past changes were also likely to have affected parking behavior and should have nullified parking utilization goals that were set based on a different, original, structure and fee base.

13.2.6 The 2004-2015 Campus Master Plan stated ..."if conditions change significantly or other unanticipated events occur, it may be necessary to update the CMP before the end of the planning period." As the enrollment growth realized was not anticipated in the projections of this CMP it should have triggered an update which then could have addressed the housing and parking needs of this new growth. This update did not occur to some great detriment. ... Then on to proposed policy.