

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

### CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4) Agenda

#### Thursday, November 6, 2014 6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

Development Service Building MAIN FLOOR AUDITORIUM, Room 115 150 Beavercreek Rd. Oregon City, OR 97045

1. 6:45 p.m. Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome & Introductions

Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Lori DeRemer, Co-Chairs

#### Housekeeping

• Approval of October 2, 2014 C4 Minutes

Page 2

• January 1 C4 Meeting Cancelled

### 2. 6:55 p.m. Transportation Coordination Task Force (ACT Task Force) Discussion

- Do you support one ACT being formed in ODOT Region 1? Why or why not?
- Do you have comments on the overall membership proposal **Page 5** under discussion?
- Do you have input specifically related to the stakeholder seats for Clackamas County and how those representatives should be selected?
- 7:45 p.m.
  Climate Smart Communities Update

   Preparation for November 7 Joint MPAC/JPACT Meeting

  8:00 p.m.
  2015 Legislative Session Priorities
  - Potential legislative agendas of each jurisdiction
- 5. 8:20 p.m. JPACT/MPAC Update

Councilor Donna Jordan, Lake Oswego & Councilor Jody Carson, West Linn

- 6. 8:25 p.m. **Pressing Updates**
- 7. 8:30 p.m. Adjourn

#### Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C-4) **DRAFT MINUTES** Thursday – October 2, 2014

### DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BUILDING 150 Beavercreek Road – Auditorium

#### Attendance –

<u>Members</u>: Clackamas County: Paul Savas (Co-chair); Citizen Rep: Wilda Parks; Canby: Brian Hodson; Traci Hensley (Alt.); CPOs: Laurie Swanson; Marjorie Stewart (Alt.); Fire Districts: John Blanton; Gladstone: Hal Busch; Hamlets: Tammy Stevens; Happy Valley: Lori DeRemer (Co-chair); Markley Drake (Alt.); Lake Oswego: Jeff Gudman (Alt.); Milwaukie: Dave Hedges; Metro: Carlotta Collette; Sanitary Districts: Susan Keil (Alt.); Transit Agencies: Julie Stephens (Rural) & Steve Kautz (Urban); Water Districts: Hugh Kalani & Dick Jones (Alt.); Wilsonville: Tim Knapp

<u>Staff</u>: Gary Schmidt (PGA); Chris Lyons (PGA); Trent Wilson (PGA); Karen Buehrig (DTD); Martine Coblentz (Resolution Services); Don Krupp (Administration)

<u>Guests</u>: Mark Ottenad (Wilsonville); Jason Tuck (Happy Valley); Jaimie Lorenzini (Happy Valley); Warren Jones (Mulino); Stephan Lashbrook (SMART); John Lewis (Oregon City); Sean Pollack (Clackamas Community College); Seth Atkinson (Sandy)

#### 

### 1. Pledge of Allegiance

### 2. Welcome & Introductions

Meeting called to order and chaired by Co-chairs Paul Savas and Lori DeRemer. Self introductions made. 12 of 23 voting members present. Quorum established.

### 3. Housekeeping

#### Approval of August 2014 C4 Meeting Minutes

Minutes from August 2014 C4 meeting approved without change.

### 4. Transportation Coordination Task Force (ACT Task Force) Discussion

**Karen Buehrig – presenting:** Karen provided a background on Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and explained the history of the Transportation Coordination Task Force to date. The Task Force is currently examining whether to create one or two ACTs within ODOT Region 1, or to instead keep the existing STIP Committee process. Karen noted that there is a level of support for both one or two options, but that it is proving challenging to devise a two-ACT model. She also clarified that each ODOT region (rather than each ACT) receives a certain pot of funding, and noted that two ACTs would require more staff time. This is important to C4, since the coordinating committee may have a future role in the STIP process depending on which recommendation comes out of the Task Force process. Mayor Knapp raised the concern that the reason a Region 1 ACT was raised by C4 was to gain funding for a Rural Clackamas County ACT, which the one-ACT solution would not accomplish since rural areas would be outnumbered by urban interests. He would support a two-ACT model since rural needs are very different than urban needs.

There was disagreement over who gets a direct line to the OTC – if two separate ACTs would each have a voice or if they would have to come together into a Super ACT for a direct line to the OTC. Karen will work to clarify this.

Lane County is an example of a "Super ACT" model, but they are different in that their makeup only consists of one county.

### 5. Climate Smart Communities Update

**Karen Buehrig – presenting:** Karen and Councilor Collette provided an update on Climate Smart Communities, noting that a toolbox of actions is being developed to help the region meet greenhouse gas targets. These actions would not be mandates. There will be a joint JPACT/MPAC meeting in November to discuss this toolbox. There is a public comment period open until October 30, 2014, and communities are being encouraged to provide input on the draft.

In May, JPACT & MPAC jointly agreed on a proposed draft that assumes a \$24 billion investment in the region over the next 25 years. Karen also noted the obvious need for the region to attain additional funding than what it currently draws in order to achieve this \$24 billion goal.

As a means of reaching community support for the Climate Smart goals, Karen identified a shift in communication strategy, recommending moving away from, "Our green house goals are X, Y, and Z, and one of the ways we can do that is be smarter about how we take kids to school," to "Let's make transportation to and from schools safer and more efficient, which happens to coincide with our goals in reducing carbon emissions."

Mayor Knapp noted that while the cost to implement the Climate Smart goals have a high price tag, we can expect taxes to steadily rise over the next 25 years and that that \$24 billion margin won't always feel so large.

Commissioner Savas reminded the group that mitigating congestion on I-5 and I-205 would likely contribute to the greatest reduction in carbon output. He also suggested a focus on technology and road improvements to cut down on congestion and reduce idling, thereby reducing emissions.

### 6. Focus of C4 for Remainder of 2014

**Facilitated by Martine Coblentz:** Martine opened the discussion by asking C4 members to consider what they feel is the purpose of the group and what they would like to see it focus on in the future. The C4 Executive Board will use this feedback from members as they develop next steps. Comments from members are as follows:

Questions raised by C4 members:

- Who values C4's opinion and where does the feedback go? (x6)
- Is there an open ear?
- What is C4 coordinating and for who?
- What does BCC need from C4 as a resource/support? (x2)
- Does the BCC have a vision for C4?

- What would it take for C4 to be valued from others?
- Should C4 bring resolutions? To BCC?

# C4's value (from group's perspective):

- Opportunity to hear the rural voice (x3)
- Very unique group that brings rural and urban together (x2)
- Informative
- Opportunity to learn
- Connection, relationship
- Hearing differing perspectives and expertise
- Members are resources
- Receive feedback from group to bring back to respective groups they are representing
- Opportunity to elevate individual voice
- Collaboration
- Leverage limited resources
- A collective collaborative voice on roads
- A collective collaborative voice with Trimet

## Ideas for C4 focus:

- Land use (x3)
- Transportation (x3)
- Prioritize in collaboration with BCC, JPACT, MPACT
- Inform the ACT on prioritizing STIP
- Updates from various cities

# 7. JPACT/MPAC Update

Update postponed in the absence of Councilors Jordan and Carson.

## 8. Pressing Updates

Postponed retreat: The C4 Committee expressed confusion for the postponement of the C4 Retreat, originally scheduled for October 2-3. Gary Schmidt explained that the retreat was postponed – not canceled – and would likely surface again in the Spring of 2015. The retreat was postponed to allow several issues that are near completion to conclude so that the C4 Committee could openly discuss the future of C4 without being tied to a lingering project.

# 9. Adjourn

		ACT Voting Membership	elected/port/transit 50% minimum*
Multnomah County			
8 members	County Commissioner	1	1
	Portland elected	1	1
	Other City Rep elected	1	1
	4 Stakeholders selected jointly by Portland and EMCTC	4	
	Business Stakeholder	1	
Washington County			
6 members	County Commissioner	1	1
	City Rep elected	1	1
	3 Stakeholders selected by WCCC	3	
	Business Stakeholder	1	
Clackamas County			
6 members	County Commissioner	1	1
	City Rep elected	1	1
	3 Stakeholders selected by C-4	3	
	Business Stakeholder	1	
Hood Piver County			
Hood River County 4 members	County Commissioner	1	1
	City Rep elected	1	1
	1 Stakeholder	1	-
	Business Stakeholder	1	
OTHER Stakeholders 6 members			
Metro	JPACT Chair	1	1
ODOT	Region 1 Manager	1	
TriMet	General Manager	1	1
Small Transit Provider		1	1
Port of Portland	Executive Director	1	1
Active Transportation		1	
Ex-Officio Members			
DEQ			
affiliations: • Health • Agriculture • Freight • Timber • Tourism • Environmental Justice	akeholders that include the following uch as from Hamlets and Villages tives		
*At least 2 stakeholders mu Reps to reach the 50% mini	st be an added Port, Transit or City mum		
Total Reps		30	1