



Final Report

2017 Retreat

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

Friday, August 11 – Saturday, August 12

C4 Retreat Attendance

Page 01

C4 Retreat Summary of Agenda Discussions

Page 03

C4 Retreat Flip Chart Transcriptions

Page 05



Retreat Attendees (C4 Members)

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Jim Bernard, Co-Chair | Clackamas County, Chair |
| 2. Brian Hodson, Co-Chair | Canby, Mayor |
| 3. Traci Hensley | Canby, Councilor |
| 4. Paul Savas | Clackamas County, Commissioner |
| 5. Hugh Kalani | Clackamas River Water |
| 6. Laurie Swanson | Community Planning Organizations |
| 7. Sean Drinkwine | Estacada, Mayor |
| 8. Rick Cook | Hamlets Alternate |
| 9. Markley Drake | Happy Valley, Councilor |
| 10. Jeff Gudman | Lake Oswego, Councilor |
| 11. Mark Gamba | Milwaukie, Mayor |
| 12. Wilda Parks | Milwaukie, Councilor |
| 13. Elizabeth Klein | Molalla, Councilor |
| 14. Dan Holladay | Oregon City, Mayor |
| 15. Carl Exner | Sandy, Councilor |
| 16. Andi Howell | Sandy Transit |
| 17. Dwight Brashear | SMART, Director |
| 18. Brenda Perry | West Linn, Council President |
| 19. Teri Cummings | West Linn, Councilor |
| 20. Tim Knapp | Wilsonville, Mayor |

Retreat Attendees (Non-C4 Members)

1. Sonya Fischer Clackamas County, Commissioner
2. Ken Humberston Clackamas County, Commissioner
3. Don Krupp Clackamas County, Administrator
4. Dan Chandler Clackamas County, Assistant Administrator
5. Drenda Howatt Clackamas County, Commission Staff
6. Mary Jo Cartasegna Clackamas County, Commission Staff
7. Emily Klepper Clackamas County, Commission Staff
8. Tracy Moreland Clackamas County, Commission Staff
9. Stephen Madkour Clackamas County, Counsel
10. Cindy Knudson Clackamas County, Economic Development
11. Terra Wilcoxson Clackamas County, Economic Development
12. Chuck Robbins Clackamas County, Housing & Community Development
13. Gary Schmidt Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs, Director
14. Chris Lyons Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs
15. Trent Wilson Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs
16. Amy Herman Clackamas County, Resolution Services
17. Barb Cartmill Clackamas County, Transportation & Development, Director
18. Karen Buehrig Clackamas County, Transportation
19. Stephen Williams Clackamas County, Transportation
20. John Miller Haven Consulting
21. Andrew Plambeck ODOT Region 1 Government Affairs
22. Tom Markgraf TriMet Public Affairs Director
23. Nancy Kraushaar Wilsonville Community Development Director

C4 Retreat: Summary of Agenda Discussions

Friday, August 11

Session 1: Bylaws Discussion

Stephen Madkour, Clackamas County Counsel, shared the recommendations from the C4 Bylaws Subcommittee, which sought to clarify the role of the C4 Executive Committee and agenda formation. C4 members also discussed the role of Housing discussions at C4, the role of the C4 Metro Subcommittee, and suggested a new form of parliamentary procedure to run meetings. The recommendations from this discussion were for C4 members to approve the bylaw amendments as presented at the retreat, be provided with a copy of Sturgis Rules of Order, and for the C4 Metro Subcommittee to discuss the role and agenda setting process of the Metro Subcommittee at a future meeting(s) and provide a recommendation back to C4.

Session 2: Economic Development

Cindy Knudsen and Terra Wilcoxson from Clackamas County Business and Community Services presented on the efforts and areas of opportunity for economic development in Clackamas County. C4 Members engaged in discussion about vacant industrial properties and ways to improve opportunities for businesses growing or seeking to locate in Clackamas County.

Session 3: Housing in Clackamas County

John Miller for Haven Consulting led C4 members through a discussion to refine a draft scope of work for a county-wide Housing Needs Assessment. C4 members made several recommendations to the draft scope of work provided at the retreat and recommended the County move forward with an RFP on behalf of C4 so that cities would have a concise understanding of the potential costs from a bidder. C4 members also expressed an interest to not let the work of a county-wide Housing Needs Assessment halt other opportunities to address housing needs.

Saturday: August 12

Session 4: Endorsement of the 2018 RTP Project List & Metro Pilot Project Discussion

County staff shared the recommendations from the Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) for the 2018 RTP Project Lists from Clackamas County and its jurisdictions. C4 endorsed the project lists and also learned about the project lists from ODOT, TriMet and SMART. Additionally, county staff introduced Metro's pilot project discussion regarding RTP project evaluations. C4 members discussed the details of criteria impacts on projects and requested that more opportunities arise in future C4 and C4 Metro Subcommittee meetings to discuss these project evaluations.

Session 5: Response to State Transportation Package

Chris Lyons from Clackamas County Public and Government Affairs was joined by Andrew Plambeck from ODOT to share a formal summary of the 2017 state transportation package (HB 2017 -10) passed by the Oregon state legislature. Primary discussion topics included local funding increases, I-205, and tolling. Barbara Cartmill, Director of Transportation & Development for Clackamas County, also shared about new reporting requirements issued through HB 2017 -10 and Chair Bernard led a discussion on the possibility of advancing a vehicle registration fee in the county.

Session 6: Near-term Transportation Funding Strategy

Tom Markgraf, TriMet Director of Public Affairs, shared with C4 the current plans to pursue the 2018 regional bond. Andrew Plambeck (ODOT) also shared about efforts to fund I-205 and Sunrise Phase II, and Stephen Williams from Clackamas County Transportation and Development shared a calendar of upcoming grant funding cycles. This discussion targeted future funding cycles and areas where Clackamas jurisdictions might strategically advance projects.

Session 7: Goal Setting for 2017-2018 C4 Agendas

C4 members discussed the goals they hope to accomplish over the next year. Issues were related to Transportation, Housing, and clarifying the bylaws. The summary of goals for the 2017/2018 C4 calendar include:

- Prioritization discussion
 - Bylaws:
 - Send Sturgis forms to C4 members for consideration
 - Approve Subcommittee Recommendation
 - Add “housing” to C4’s primary function in the bylaws
 - C4MS to discuss “role and agenda setting” of C4MS and report to C4 for bylaws recommendation
 - Transportation
 - Pilot Criteria Discussion
 - Transit Discussion: First and last mile connections and funding
 - Local funding discussion
 - Regional Bond (as needed)
 - VRF
 - Track information on R1ACT discussion and Tolling Committee (once formed)
 - Housing
 - Housing Needs Assessment
 - SDC, CET, and other funding ideas
 - Share/develop toolkits

C4 Retreat: Flip Chart Transcription

Section 1: Bylaws Discussion

- Add amended bylaws to September 7 meeting
- Email Sturgis Rules to C4 membership
- Add housing to Purpose of C4 (add as a footnote, not as an actual item with Transportation and Land use)
- C4 Metro Subcommittee to discuss how C4MS should read in the bylaws, and then propose a recommendation to C4 at following meeting.

Section 2: Economic Development

- Developable Lands
 - Milwaukie: N. Milwaukie Industrial Area (looking for a new home for ODOT)
 - Wilsonville: Coffee Creek Employment Area, Basalt Creek Employment Area
 - Wes Linn: Access Issues
 - Sandy: 40 acres of commercial land across from Fred Meyer (Need education of property owners and plan that is compatible for parties. Perhaps a Regional Solutions project.
 - Sunrise Corridor Opportunities: Inaccessible until developed.
 - Canby: Industrial Park (need I-5 connections)
 - Oregon City: build out of 213 needs to be addressed, mixed use areas Riverwalk area, Beaver Creek employment area
 - Molalla: Highway 212 main street (Molalla Ave improvements)

Section 3: Housing in Clackamas County

- Add to the Housing Needs Assessment
 - Add information about where people work compared to where people live
 - Include information about how sharing data between jurisdictions will occur, perhaps through zones, cities, zip codes, etc.
 - Goals and Objectives Section:
 - Costs for development/rehabilitation
 - How to find new dollars, or target existing dollars, to address social service needs
 - Avoid displacement and counterproductive methods
 - Add workforce/farmworker housing
 - Identify “high opportunity areas” for strategic housing efforts
 - Data Elements
 - Rents (amount per month)
 - Mobile Home Parks (manufactured, mobile homes, RV parks)
 - Displacement patterns
 - Number increases working from home

- Coordinate with Metro’s Housing Needs Assessment efforts
 - Numbers in short-term housing
 - Number of jurisdictions that allow tiny homes/ADUs
 - Research Questions:
 - Possibility of converting Single Family Resident to Multi Family Resident
 - # of houses, square footage, etc.,
 - Services needs for working families (i.e. daycare, grocery, medical)
 - Capacity for adding (or expanding) development of ADUs
 - Metro grants for this project?
 -
- Policy Issues to Address
 - Gentrification, and government policy impact on displacement
 - Affordability
 - Will strategy formed in Clackamas also incorporate ways to partner with Multnomah County?
 - Aging places
 - Homeless population numbers (doubled up because of couch surfing?)
- Housing Strategy
 - What worked in other jurisdictions? Best Practices
 - Share toolkits (readily available on the internet)
 - Purchase existing (for sale) apartment complexes?
 - Tracking market rent apartments rent levels
 - Habitability standards
 - Transit corridor incentives
 - Regional coordination
 - Habitat for Humanity Tiny Houses – capacity of ADUs
 - Freezing zones to restrict overdevelopment in areas.

Section 4: Endorsement of the 2018 RTP Project List & Metro Pilot Project Discussion

- Regarding Criteria
 - New criteria appears faulty from the outset
 - Where do assumptions about bike/pedestrian impacts come from?
 - Need to build ped/bike infrastructure to create safe biking places
 - Adding lane miles to freeways adds congestion
 - The math behind the estimates [of criteria impact] is very complicated
 - “I-205 project does not provide an air quality reduction” – C4 member
 - Mass transit has huge benefit in Air Quality, but other modes also provide other benefits [for other criteria]
 - Need to be cautious when considering model outcomes
 - There is a problem with comparing bikeways against transit projects, or comparing either of those against a highway project
 - We need to build bikeway infrastructure
 - We need to think about regional projects
 - Focusing on local projects will help regional systems

- We need to be wise about where we put our bikeways
- Looking at jobs near I205 doesn't provide the information we need to know to properly evaluate the value of I-205 criteria
- This criteria discussion should be looked at as a continuum.
- We need to look at investments that are "passed over"
- There needs to be criteria that recognizes past decisions
- Look closely at air quality issues, but other criteria may be okay.
- Criteria should consider that the future of automobiles is trending towards e- and hybrid vehicles
- Consider multi-modal approaches

Session 5: Response to State Transportation Package

Informational, no notes.

Section 6: Near-term Transportation Funding Strategy

- Regional Bond
 - Projects that benefit the voters and get their support. Complete more projects for the money.
 - Recognize roads that are experiences significant commute congestions, such as Hwy 212 through Happy Valley and (formerly) Damascus.
 - Quantify acreage involved in \$150 million to purchase Right of Way for Sunrise Phase II.
 - Regional bond will only include boundaries of TriMet and Metro
 - Partners funding he projects need to be identified and specific plans built out in order to move forwards with Bond support from voters.
 - Regional package needs to "solve the problem".
 - Multiple transit options can help to relieve congestion from automobile traffic on major commuting routes.
 - TriMet will be working on a Package Concept that can be widely supported.

Session 7: Goal Setting for 2017-2018 C4 Agendas

- Brainstorm:
 - Seismic Retrofits
 - C4 role in county VRF discussion
 - Leverage transportation grants
 - Discussion to create transportation funding stream (similar to or like MSTIP in Washington County)
 - Finish bylaws
 - Housing conversations:
 - SDCs
 - How to fund for housing strategies?
 - Construction Excise Tax
 - Dig into "Criteria" for Metro Pilot discussion
 - Include Metro and CTAC staff

- Add seismic retrofits
 - Add metro versus rural dissemination distinctions in criteria
 - Could be usage and/or boundary
 - Transit discussions:
 - 1st and last miles discussions
 - How to use state funding strategically
 - Housing Needs Assessments
 - Still fragmented. How to look at big pictures and work together?
 - Increase coordination
 - Area for bylaws?
 - Have “role of c4” discussion for help finalize bylaws
 - Use poverty indicators as a metric for grant funding. Look for funding opportunities
 - Updates on 2018 Regional Bond (as it develops)
 - C4 meetings could be specific to subject (ie. Transportation specific)
- Prioritization discussion
 - Bylaws:
 - Send Sturgis forms to C4 members for consideration
 - Approve Subcommittee Recommendation
 - Add housing to c4 bylaws
 - C4MS to discuss role/agenda setting of C4MS and report to C4 for bylaws recommendation.
 - Transportation
 - Pilot Criteria Discussion
 - Transit Discussion
 - Local funding discussion
 - Regional Bond (as needed)
 - VRF
 - Track information on R1ACT discussion and Tolling Committee (once formed)
 - Housing
 - Housing Needs Assessment
 - SDC, CET, and other funding ideas
 - Share/develop toolkits
 - Economic Development:
 - Does not need to be a fixture of C4
 - EDC reports can be shared in “updates” of Agenda
 - Share EDC minutes with C4 members
- C4 Retreat Evaluation
 - Include previous years’ goals in future packets to track success
 - Encourage all cities and special districts to attend
 - Include contact information of participants and speakers
 - Include a mix of speakers and topics presented, as well as information provided
 - Have a rotating mic
 - Facility is good

- **More social time/happy hour opportunities**
- **More vegetarian options on menu**