

TO: City Council for November 7, 2016, Council Meeting
FROM: Paul Bilotta, Community Development Director 
DATE: November 1, 2016
THROUGH: Mark W. Shepard, P.E., City Manager 
SUBJECT: CPA15-1: OSU-related Comprehensive Plan Amendments –
Staff Response to Council Questions



Action Requested:

The Council is asked to consider the information provided in the staff report to the City Council; the public hearing conducted on October 17, 2016; and the additional testimony and information provided in this report. The Council is asked to deliberate on CPA15-1 – OSU-related Comprehensive Plan Amendments and reach a decision at this meeting or a subsequent meeting. Should the Council reach a decision on November 7, 2016, staff have provided motions for the Council’s consideration at the end of this report.

Discussion:

The Council has conducted and closed a public hearing on CPA15-1 on October 17, 2016, and held the record open until October 24, 2016, for additional public testimony. One piece of testimony was received and is attached to this report as Exhibit CC-A. The City Council also directed staff to provide evaluation or additional information on a number of issues under consideration in this case. The remainder of this report contains staff’s response to Council’s request.

For the Council’s ease of reference, the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments recommended by the Planning Commission can be found here:

<https://archives.corvallisoregon.gov/public/0/edoc/835212/CC Att A.pdf>

CPA and Implementation Timing/Processing

Staff was asked to provide discussion regarding whether there were any advantages or disadvantages to approving the comprehensive plan amendment now versus holding off on official adoption until after the implementation phase was developed in case that process might create the need to make additional amendments. The question also seemed to express concern that delays in appeals regarding this comprehensive plan amendment could delay implementation efforts.

Staff believes the best course of action would be to move forward with this CPA case and reach a formal decision on the OSU-related Comprehensive Plan Amendments at this time if Council believes the work is complete. The decision will be subject to a 21-day appeal period, and if an appeal is filed, action cannot be taken to incorporate the findings and policies until LUBA has completed its review and sent notice to the City regarding what action, if any, is necessary.

The benefit of completing the CPA process currently underway is that within 21 days (the appeal period after the adoption of formal findings), the Council will know what issues, if any, are under appeal and have the benefit of knowing the points of contention and the areas that are not problematic. This would be valuable information as the Council seeks to move forward toward initiating the implementation phase.

If the Council chose not to formally adopt at this time, instead of having certainty in 21 days regarding whether or not there are any issues of dispute, the Council could spend a lot of time and energy developing implementation tools only to have the entire process appealed at the end of that exercise. If the Council adopts now, the Council should have a good idea of where it can focus time and energy on implementation. Although it is difficult to predict what actions will be appealed, the public hearing portion of this process has already concluded and the tone of that process can often provide clues as to the likelihood of any appeal.

Even if this CPA process is appealed, since the appellant will need to indicate its basis for the appeal, the Council would be able to use that time to work on potential LDC or Comprehensive Plan revisions or other potential implementing tools for the policies that are not in dispute, while waiting for LUBA's determination and direction on whichever portions are in dispute.

Policy 11.1.10 – Public Streets and Parking Fee Use

11.4.10 Auto parking should be allocated using the following principles:

- A. The streets of Corvallis belong to the community.
- B. On-street parking is a public resource that should be managed for the public good.
- C. The parking fee system should be self-supporting and can provide additional resources for transit and transportation improvements.
- D. Parking fees can be considered as an effective mechanism for allocating scarce parking resources and improving livability.

As has been previously discussed at both the work session and public hearing meeting, the Planning Commission requested that Council take special consideration of the Policy above, based on testimony received regarding the potential use of revenue generated from parking fees (meters, long-term parking permits, residential parking permits) for transit and transportation improvements. Testimony suggested the City has long had a policy stating that the parking program should be self-supported, and the use of revenues generated from the parking program for transit and transportation improvements would remove funding from the parking program. It was also suggested that the use of parking revenues for those improvements would place an unequal burden on those who pay into the parking program, rather than disperse that impact across all users. There was discussion about removing portions of the Policy, most specifically "C" and potentially "D," although there were also comments that "D" is appropriate and should remain.

This policy has a number of elements that should be understood as they may impact implementation:

Section A sets the direction that on-street parking should be available to the entire community. Approving a direction like this clarifies that individuals do not control the parking in front of their house, for instance.

Section B sets limits on the statement above by providing the direction that on-street parking should not just be on an unregulated, first come, first served, for an unlimited time basis, but rather managed. It also states that management should be for the public good rather than some other purpose. This section allows the Council to consider different parking management programs, weighing positives and negatives, and ultimately deciding what the appropriate level of management should be for the public good. Examples of implementation processes that could support this policy are placing time limits in some retail areas to ensure spaces turn over to support customer traffic and neighborhood parking districts which are designed

to ensure that residents have a reasonable chance of parking near their home and parking doesn't become so challenging that it creates unsafe situations due to illegal parking or excessive traffic circling for spaces.

Section C provides a policy direction that could allow for changes in revenue allocation and programming recommendations in the future. Staff does not oppose the deletion of "C" if the Council does not wish to adopt this policy direction which came up through the Planning Commission process. It should be noted that this section, as written, does not obligate the Council to use any parking revenues for transit and transportation improvements but just opens the door that it could occur. It should also be noted that the current parking revenues are not adequate to staff the level of enforcement necessary for managing a parking management system of this size effectively, and resources are regularly shifted away from some areas throughout the year in order to support problem areas. Given this funding/staffing situation means that from a practical perspective, without significant changes in revenue assumptions there are not significant additional resources available to shift to non-parking purposes anyway.

Section D clarifies that when the City creates a parking management system, parking fees may be considered as an acceptable tool to use rather than just using time limits, for instance.

Master Plans Discussion

At the October 17, 2016, Council meeting, staff was asked to prepare some discussion regarding how the City treats master plans relative to land use regulations, process, and policy. The staff memo for that meeting, dated October 11, 2016, also responds to some Councilors' questions about master plans, and responded to an observation and a question made by Councilors:

- It is preferable to understand what the City's plan is related to master plans prior to agreeing there will be a master plan.
- Will the Council be dealing with the master plan issue now or is that something that happens later?

Staff also highlighted proposed Finding 1.2.k and Policies 1.2.10 and 1.2.11, and noted that the two policies are quite prescriptive about the use of master plans as a regulatory tool. That memo states that findings and policies in the Comprehensive Plan should provide policy guidance for the development of regulatory tools that are outside of the framework of the Comprehensive Plan and intended to implement those policies through specific standards and regulations. The memo also proposes that, once the policy framework is complete through the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, staff would develop a menu of regulatory approaches that could implement the established policies.

After receiving this information from staff and hearing testimony and discussion on October 17th, Councilors asked for additional clarification about non-city master plans and what tools can be used to implement policies.

Staff believes it is important and helpful to draw distinctions between City master plans and "master plans" that are developed by other organizations (non-city master plans). It is also important to understand that the term "master plan" is not defined and no standards exist for what must be included or excluded from non-city master plans.

City Master Plans:

The City develops master plans and area plans for a variety of purposes, generally for long term planning of City facilities, properties, or regulated areas. The City maintains master plans such as the Airport Master Plan, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and Transportation System Plan, as well as The South Corvallis Area Plan, North Campus Area Plan, and others. City master plans are largely City policy documents and can have very different formats, level of detail, etc. as appropriate for the policy questions the plan is attempting to address. City master plans are generally created through a public process, and are accepted or adopted by the City Council as a means to guide the City's stewardship of that facility or area. These master plans generally contain plans and policies related to process, operations, capital expenditures, and future development. If the master plan is viewed to be particularly important for informing land use, a master plan may go through an additional process which officially designates that plan as a supporting document for the comprehensive plan.

The City master plans and area plans are not regulatory tools themselves, and their contents generally only come into land use decisions where a policy or plan laid out in a master plan either supports or conflicts with a land use proposal that is under consideration by the Planning Commission and/or City Council. Policies that are adopted in a City master plan may or may not require a regulatory tool for implementation. Those tools can be developed in a number of ways, whether by Council or Administrative Policy, Land Development Code standards, budget expenditures or other implementation tools that give the City the authority to implement the policy in the master plan.

In summary, City master plans are City-directed plans and policies that relate to a specific facility or area, but they are not regulatory tools in and of themselves. Implementation of those policies can be accomplished by establishing other regulatory measures that require specific actions or processes that meet the intent of the policies in the master plan.

Non-city Master Plans:

As with City master plans, some organizations develop their own master plans for long term planning of facilities, operations, budget expenditures, creating policy and understanding future growth and development. Those plans are also typically not regulatory tools, but are developed as extensions of that organization's policies. It is important to note that the organization's plans and policies it views as important for its internal purposes may not necessarily be the same as the City's. The City also does not generally have jurisdiction over those plans or policies, except where specific proposals require they be approved by the City to conform to the City's regulatory framework. In many cases, this occurs when an organization's master plan calls for construction or development and that proposal must comply with the standards set forth in the Comprehensive Plan and/or Land Development Code.

In past practice, the City has treated non-city master plans as having more regulatory weight than is found in other cities and this has, at times, resulted in confusion regarding the role of the OSU Plan, the Land Development Code, the OSU Zone, bilateral agreements and other implementation tools, with respect to which tool applies in which situation and how to resolve conflicts between them. In many instances, a lot of the confusion results when a non-city master plan is trying to be used as a regulatory tool rather than a policy document, particularly if the master plan includes a lot of specificity.

Non-city master plans may be useful in helping design implementation tools as they illustrate the organization's current understanding of what its desired future may be. The implementation tools

themselves, however, should be more transparent and precise so they can be clearly understood by all parties and applied consistently. Potential implementation tools could be Land Development Code standards, special zones or overlays such as the OSU Zone and University Neighborhood Overlay, specific discretionary land use approval processes such as a Planned Development or Conditional Development Permit, other requirements implemented through City standard, negotiated agreements or some other regulatory tool.

Staff recommends that the Council consider removing overly specific master plan language in Comprehensive Plan policies that might restrict the Council to continuing the practice of trying to use master plans as regulatory documents, and instead seek to develop new regulatory mechanisms through the appropriate regulatory documents or agreements. This may include Land Development Code text amendments, including revisions to Chapter 3.36. It could also include suggestions regarding ways to regulate OSU development proposals without a specific OSU zone chapter, such as a basic OSU overlay, and specific requirements for land use processes (e.g., Planned Development, Conditional Development review, etc.). The Planning Commission, City Council and the community would then have the flexibility to look at the full range of implementation tools in order to determine the most appropriate instrument for Corvallis. In addition, in testimony at the public hearing, there was a concise phrase, “consistency, transparency, and monitoring,” used that might be able to be used to arrive at some of the intent of policies 1.2.10 and 1.2.11.

A possible way to replace policies 1.2.10 and 1.2.11 to accomplish this would be as follows:

1.2.10 (staff prepared alternative)

Development of large inter-related facilities such as corporate campuses and large educational institutions should be regulated in a consistent and transparent manner including periodic monitoring and reporting of key objective impacts identified by the City Council. The regulatory tools used should include opportunities for public participation such as if a new Planned Development or zoning district requirements are created.

If the Council makes modifications to the Planning Commission’s recommendations that would provide for the potential use of regulatory tools besides the master plan, it may also want to consider whether it should make changes to proposed policies 13.2.3 and 13.2.5 which also reference using the master plan as a regulatory tool.

Transportation Demand Management

There was comment regarding the use of Transportation Demand Management strategies and the need to coordinate with OSU for strategy development, data, and monitoring. The proposed findings and policies in this CPA reference the use of TDM strategies to mitigate traffic, transportation, and parking impacts, and include new language in Article 50 – Definitions, to define what the City considers transportation demand management, as follows:

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – TDM is a set of strategies aimed at reducing the demand for roadway travel, particularly in single occupancy vehicles. The fundamental purpose of TDM is to reduce travelers’ use of single occupant vehicles and other personal vehicle-related problems. TDM strategies include changes to infrastructure (e.g. bike facilities, bus stops, on-campus housing, etc.); services (e.g. shuttles, service schedules and routes, etc.); and incentives (e.g. fare reductions, etc.).

Both the City and OSU currently employ various levels of all of the strategies listed in the examples above, and they are implemented through regulatory instruments such as LDC requirements, infrastructure development requirements through Public Works, negotiated agreements, and City or OSU policies and programs. The proposed findings and policies identify TDM as a desirable strategy for mitigation, direct the use of TDM on OSU's campus and in the community, and direct that data should be gathered and results monitored to evaluate whether the strategies employed have positive impacts on campus and in the community. Transportation Demand Management is referenced in findings and policies 3.2.9, 8.9.6, 11.2.j, 11.2.17, 11.3.k, 11.3.9, 11.12.6, 11.12.11, 13.2.p, and 13.2.7. The Council may wish to evaluate these findings and policies to determine whether the language meets the intent of Council, and whether the findings support the policies that are proposed.

Finding 9.7.k – Off-campus vs. On-campus Housing and Property Tax Revenue

9.7.k University-provided on-campus housing does not generate property tax revenue, while privately-owned housing elsewhere in the community does generate property tax revenue. On-campus housing developed by a public-private partnership would produce property tax revenue based on improvement value.

The Council heard testimony regarding the proposed finding and asked staff to clarify the intent of the finding or develop potential alternative language to address the concerns raised. The origin of this finding was discussion in the Planning Commission's deliberations where the Commission expressed an intent to encourage public-private partnerships between OSU and developers as a potential alternative to the provision of only university owned student housing because the latter would result in buildings that do not generate any property tax. Staff does not think that the finding was intended to provide insight into the overall economic impact of students being housed on campus vs. off campus, but was an acknowledgment that on-campus development is not subject to property tax in most cases. The finding notes that public-private partnerships could be a way to capture some property tax revenue from on-campus development.

It should be noted that this finding supports Policy 9.7.7 which states "***The City shall encourage the University to utilize public-private partnerships to provide additional, on-campus housing that would be more attractive to upper-division students, graduate students, and University staff than traditional on-campus housing options.***"

Policy 9.7.3 and the use of the word "near"

The current language in 9.7.3 that is proposed to be replaced states:

"The City and OSU shall work toward the goal of housing 50% of the of the students who attend regular classes on campus in units on campus or within ½ mile of campus."

The proposed policy 9.7.3 recommended by the Planning Commission states:

"The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of housing students who attend regular classes or work, on campus, in dwelling units on or near campus."

In the public hearing before the Council, a community member testified and requested that the word "or near" be stricken from this policy.

Policy 9.7.3 is a policy that could be written in many ways and the choice of words can have significant impact on the community form. There are many layers of complexity in this policy. How this policy is written and implemented could impact zoning, redevelopment, transportation, parking, the municipal budget and other issues.

Currently, the OSU main campus has approximately 24,000 students, with about 20,000 of those students being undergraduates. The average occupancy in OSU housing has been approximately 5,000 students since 2016. To put it another way, every year, approximately 19,000 students are looking for housing somewhere off-campus. Corvallis has 11,000 – 12,000 multi-family units available for housing its residents including the student population.

The intent of 9.7.3 is to answer the question “where should housing be provided that can house the OSU student demand?” This sort of policy should never be framed in the negative such as “which places should not have students” because the latter approach could have Fair Housing implications since any private housing in the community should be available to students as well as other community members in accordance with State and Federal law.

The Planning Commission’s recommended language does not contain the specificity of the existing policy which had a discrete percentage and distance goal. The existing policy called for a lot of concentration of students within ½ mile of the campus and implementation tools were created to regulate that. The byproduct of the existing policy is that those neighborhoods within ½ mile of campus experienced more pressure for land use change than other portions of the community.

The proposed 9.7.3 removes some of the specificity of the earlier text. The proposed language does not quantify “near” nor does it provide guidance regarding how much of the student enrollment is expected to be near or how much is supposed to be accommodated on campus. Finally, there is also some ambiguity in the reference to “or work” such that it is not fully clear whether the policy is also seeking to have enough housing to also accommodate university employees on or near campus. As it stands now, these questions would need to be resolved in the implementation phase unless the language is revised.

One way this proposed policy could be rewritten without resolving the “near” or “percentage” issues is:

“The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of providing enough housing that students who attend regular classes may live in dwelling units on or near campus if they desire to do so.”

To understand the importance of the wording choice by Council and the range of policy options, staff has created a few hypothetical policies that would likely direct very different implementation outcomes. These are not intended to be viewed as true alternative proposals, but rather just provide examples to inform the Council of the wide range of policy direction that could be selected on this topic.

1. (Transit Oriented Development focus) ***The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of providing enough housing that students who attend regular classes may live in dwelling units in walking distance of campus or a transit stop.***
2. (Minimized housing footprint focus) ***The City and Oregon State University shall work toward the goal of providing enough very high density housing that students who attend regular classes may live in dwelling units that minimize the demolition of existing structures.***

3. (Equal distribution focus) *The City shall work toward the goal of providing adequate supplies of rental multifamily housing throughout all sections of the community.*
4. (Mixed use focus) *The City shall provide for multifamily housing in locations where it can be located above commercial space.*
5. (Site specific focus) *The City should work with the owners of the _____ property to explore the feasibility of constructing multi-family units on the site.*
6. (Address in future actions) *The City shall initiate a study to evaluate alternative locations for additional multi-family housing in order to accommodate the needs of its student and other populations.*
7. (Preservation focus) *The City should generally use “upzoning” as an implementation tool focused on undeveloped areas or identified redevelopment areas while minimizing its use on stable, developed neighborhoods.*
8. (OSU focused) *The City and Oregon State University should work toward the goal of providing enough housing on campus that ___% of its main campus enrollment may be housed on the OSU campus.*

Any of these eight hypothetical policies would have their own sets of positive and negative impacts and would likely result in very different ways that implementation tools would be used to implement them. In land use policy decisions, there is rarely a policy that provides only community benefits without some sort of negative impacts. These hypothetical examples are just to provide examples of how the language chosen for policy 9.7.3 could have an impact on the form of the community and assist the Council in anticipating what some of the positive and negative impacts of any policy may be.

OSU Letter dated September 12, 2016

Council requested that staff review the letter from OSU included in the October 17, 2016, packet and provide feedback.

The OSU letter covers three main topic areas (housing, process and parking), as follows:

Housing:

OSU outlined many of the efforts it has been taking in the past few years related to increasing the supply of on campus housing for its students as well as attempting to provide more affordable options for its students with more financial need.

OSU notes that one of the key factors in understanding if there is compatibility between its understanding of what is being proposed and the City’s understanding of policy intent likely pivots on the two parties’ understanding of what is “adequate” OSU housing identified in policy 9.7.11. If this policy is adopted with this wording, staff would agree that during the implementation phase, defining a mutually agreed upon understanding of the word “adequate” will be important early in the process to avoid ongoing misunderstanding. OSU also indicated that it has periodic housing market studies performed and it appears this tool is used to help it determine “adequate” from the perspective of OSU.

OSU’s letter also seems to indicate efforts to attract more non-freshmen students into its housing which would seem to be in the spirit of proposed policy 9.7.7 which calls for on-campus housing that would be more attractive to upper-division students, graduate students, and University staff than traditional on campus housing options. As noted in the previous paragraph, the level at which the University’s efforts

are in alignment likely pivots on what each party believes will be “adequate” in terms of additional supply.

Staff would characterize this section of the letter as being in general agreement with the spirit and intent of the proposed policies with the same caution identified by OSU that during the implementation phase, there may need to be some significant efforts on the part of both parties to arrive at a common method for arriving at an understanding of the word “adequate”.

Process:

The section on process seemed to be a general acceptance of the principles outlined in the Planning Commission recommendation. OSU did express some need for additional insight regarding “monitoring programs can occur anywhere in the community” and how “new conditions of interest” should be tracked. Staff believes these are also issues that can be further clarified during an implementation phase, but in general believes that “monitoring programs can occur anywhere in the community” just means that the areas that should be monitored are those that are experiencing significant impacts and different issues have different impacts. Any monitoring regime would have to have some sort of rational nexus to the impact created and it is expected that all or most monitoring would still occur in areas near the university. Larger impact items, such as traffic management for football games, naturally look further than just the immediate university area because their impacts reach further.

It should be noted that the policy mentioned by OSU (13.2.6) as well as 13.2.7 contain very specific language regarding how it should be implemented including developing metrics, annual reporting, establishing thresholds and directing that exceeding the thresholds will have regulatory consequences established in the LDC. This policy also seems to assume that the regulatory method that should be applied to OSU is through the use of a master plan. 13.2.7 also outlines particular issues that must be monitored and reported on an annual basis which provides some guidance as to the conditions of interest that the Planning Commission sees at the present time. It should be noted that 13.2.6 and 13.2.7 will have budgetary consequences as the City will need to keep consultants busy on an ongoing basis to provide annual monitoring of some of these systems which will often involve complex studies.

If the Council wants to preserve more flexibility to define the monitoring metrics, process, cost and review cycle in the implementation phase, it may want to consider replacing 13.2.6 and 13.2.7 with a policy that states something like the following:

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 should be established to determine whether conditions and assumptions underlying the regulation of OSU’s land use are valid and the monitoring results shall be reported to the Council on a periodic basis. Where practicable, binding regulatory mechanisms should be developed to respond to situations which may exceed key planned metric thresholds either through the LDC or some other means.

Parking:

OSU indicates it concurs with the amendments proposed related to parking. OSU also notes that university area parking challenges are addressed most effectively if both the city and the university are working transparently and cooperatively. Staff agrees with this sentiment.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Council consider the recommendations from the Planning Commission and the information presented in the record, deliberate and decide whether to approve the proposed amendments, make modifications and approve the amendments, or refer CPA15-1 back to the Planning Commission with specific direction for additional work.

Staff notes that the record contains findings that support the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve CPA15-1 as forwarded by the Planning Commission to the City Council.

For the Council's reference, staff offers two motions for consideration at the conclusion of the Council's deliberations on this case; one motion to approve CPA15-1, and one motion to refer CPA15-1 back to the Planning Commission. A motion to deny was not provided since this is a Council goal.

Motion to Approve

I move to tentatively approve the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments in CPA15-1. This motion is based on the reports, testimony, and deliberations before this body as well as the Planning Commission recommendation and associated Planning Commission public record, subject to adoption of an Ordinance incorporating the Council's formal findings at a subsequent City Council meeting.

Motion to Refer

I move to refer the proposed CPA15-1 to the Planning Commission for additional deliberation and recommendation.

(The City Council should provide specific direction regarding what it would like the Planning Commission to deliberate further if this motion is made.)

Budget Impact:

There is no significant budget impact related to this amendment. However, substantial monitoring and reporting requirements that may be included in the final Comprehensive Plan changes could have significant budgetary impacts. It is anticipated there will be an unknown future budget impact during the implementation phase of the policies.

Attachments:

Attachment CC-A: Testimony Received Prior to the Close of the Record, October 24, 2016.

October 23, 2016

TO: City Council

FR: Court Smith, 471 NW Hemlock Ave, Corvallis, OR

RE: October 17, OSU-Related Comprehensive Plan Amendment Public Hearing Response on Policy 11.4.10

Policy 11.4.10 offers options for parking management that have worked successfully in other cities.¹ It is not directed at parking districts or their residents. Applying new thinking and linking transportation and transit would enable Corvallis to reduce the total number cars. The Corvallis parking problem is “a tragedy of the commons,” where lack of adequate management creates a free-for-all that is not in the best interests of the community.

Parking Management: OSU states a desire to work with the City on transportation demand management planning (TMDP). Policy 11.4.10 points to tested approaches for addressing the parking tragedy of the commons. The goals of Policy 11.4.10 are to reduce traffic in neighborhoods, improve air quality, mitigate climate change, reduce the need for car travel, increase fairness, and develop a sustainable, self-sufficient approach to parking. Corvallis’ parking problem is much broader than the areas around OSU. Following guidance provided with the Policy, the goal should be have parking utilization at peak times in all areas of the city below 85%.² Effective parking management would address OSU’s parking pricing that is too expensive because it only achieves 74% peak hour utilization. On the other hand, City parking is too inexpensive in that over 95% utilization is achieved in many areas.³ By linking transportation and transit, the goal is to create a transportation system that offers more options for accessing places in the City.

Equitable: Costs for the current City parking management system are greater than the fees and fines collected by as much as 25%.⁴ With such a deficit, free City parking is neither equitable nor fair. Valuable short-term free parking on City streets adjacent to OSU and other city areas is occupied by cars stored there for one or more days. Why are some residences provided on-street parking while portions of Van Buren, Jefferson, Kings, 9th, 29th, Walnut, Circle, Western, and many other locations where residences have constrained parking conditions not allowed on-street parking? This is because parking is not the most beneficial use for all streets. Free, on-street parking is broadly desired, but it creates safety problems, increases air pollution, slows down traffic, and is not an equitable or effective way for allocating parking.

Leadership: Transportation has a significant role to play in mitigating against climate change. Imagine Corvallis 2040, the Climate Action Plan, budget and housing considerations all show Corvallis residents value equity and the environment. With leadership and collaboration, innovative solutions can improve the efficiency, livability, and quality of our community. Policy 11.4.10 is an effort to contribute to these goals and this process.

Why not consider a neighborhood benefit district that includes OSU, the City, sororities and fraternities, apartment dwellers, and neighborhood residents to craft a solution together? Why not work to develop incentives and fund better transportation and transit from fees obtained from parking management?

¹ Litman, Todd. 2016. [Parking Pricing Implementation Guidelines](http://www.vtpi.org/parkpricing.pdf). Victoria Transport Policy Institute. [online] <http://www.vtpi.org/parkpricing.pdf>. 35 pages.

Riggs, William. 2014. Dealing with Parking Issues on an Urban Campus: The case of UC Berkeley. *Case Studies on Transportation Policy* 2(3):168–176. This analysis shows that providing less parking can result in more accessibility.

Shoup, Donald C. 2011. The High Cost of Free Parking. Chicago: American Planning Association. 763 pages.

Speck, Jeff. 2013. Walkable City. See Step 3 “Get the Parking Right,” California Bookwatch. See TED Talk with nearly one million views [online] https://www.ted.com/talks/jeff_speck_the_walkable_city?language=en.

² “For on-street parking, we consider the system to be at its ‘effective capacity’ when it is 85 percent occupied” (Mill Valley, California, Chapter 3, Parking Utilization Analysis, 2008, p 3-26). See also for Seattle, WA



ASSESSMENT METRICS FOR PARKING UTILIZATION.

[online] (<https://www.theurbanist.org/2015/07/28/a-data-driven-and-technological-approach-to-parking-management-seattles-2015-fall-pay-parking-rates-and-regulations/>).

³ Kittelson & Associates, Inc., 2015. Memorandum: Neighborhood Parking Study Findings. Project #: 18130 [online] http://fa.oregonstate.edu/sites/fa.oregonstate.edu/files/cpd/land-use/neighborhood_parking_study_findings_november_2015_0.pdf.

OSU Capital and Planning Development. 2015. OSU Parking Utilization Study 2014-2015 Fall Term. University Land Use Planning. [online] <http://fa.oregonstate.edu/university-land-use-planning/campus-master-plan/parking-utilization-studies>.

⁴ In FY13-14, the latest data that I could find, the parking enforcement program was supported by fines (68%), parking district permit holders (6%), and 26% was the deficit that year. These data do not count the innumerable hours spent in expanding and managing parking in Corvallis. This appears to be a very expensive program supported by those paying fines and local residents who pick up the deficits.