

# Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4) Minutes

Thursday, Aug. 6, 2015

Development Service Building  
150 Beaver Creek Road – Auditorium

Attendance

**Members: Clackamas County:** Paul Savas (Co-chair); **Canby:** Brian Hodson (Co-Chair); Traci Hensley; **CPOs:** Marjorie Stewart (Alt.); **Damascus:** Bill Wehr (Alt.); **Fire Districts:** Bob Reeves (Alt.); **Hamlets:** Rick Cook (Alt.); **Happy Valley:** Markley Drake; **Lake Oswego:** Jeff Gudman; **Metro:** Carlotta Collette; **Milwaukie:** Mark Gamba; Wilda Parks (Alt.); **Molalla:** Jimmy Thompson; **MPAC Citizen Rep:** Ed Gronke; **Sanitary:** Terry Gibson; **Transit Agencies:** Stephan Lashbrook (Urban); Julie Stephens (Rural); **Water Districts:** High Kalani; Dick Jones (Alt.); **West Linn:** Thomas Frank (Alt.) **Wilsonville:** Julie Fitzgerald (Alt.)

**Staff:** Gary Schmidt (PGA); Trent Wilson (PGA)

**Guests:** Brenda Perry (West Linn, Council); Julie Wehling (Rural Transit – Canby); Mark Ottenad (Wilsonville); Rich Watanabe (ODOT); Annette Mattson (PGE); Zoe Monahan (Tualatin); Ed Hall (Sen. Merkley Staff); Luke Norman (Clackamas Community College); Andi Howell (Sandy); Julie Parrish (State Representative); Rick Cook (County BCS); Samantha Wolf (County BCS); Dave Barmon (guest/arborist)

## Approved MINUTES

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome & Introductions

*Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs*

Housekeeping

- o Approval of May 7, 2015 C4 Minutes
  - Markley Drake (MD): Proposed correction to May minutes about Fred Meyer in Happy Valley receiving “approval to build” in May, not “moving in.”
  - Approved as amended.

## 2. C4 Retreat Recap

- Trent Wilson (TW) outlined the C4 Retreat Action Items chart in the agenda packet, identifying the three subset sections: process items, which can be accomplished by staff; informational items, which require staff to bring together materials and guests for informational presentations; and directional/decision items, which are proactive discussions C4 would like to have and prepare recommendations for.
- TW asked that every member please rank the "information and directional decision" sections to inform the C4 Executive Committee how best to frame future C4 discussions. Results and direction from the ranking system should be seen by the September meeting.

## 3. Metro Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP)

- Paul Savas (PS) directs everyone's attention to letter by Metro. This was a C4 Metro

Subcommittee issue this morning, where we, the JPACT members, were requesting feedback on how to respond as a group. In the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation, 75% of the awards go towards Active Transportation projects and 25% go towards Freight projects.

Washington County has already weighed in calling for "geographic parity". The County's position is address the inequality in our position to compete against award funding that considers, or weighs heavily, population impact and matching funds – both of which, when considered against transportation projects, place Clackamas County at a disadvantage when we compete against Multnomah (higher population) and Washington (additional transportation dollars) counties. These separations minimize the odds that Clackamas County will ever fare well in competitive grants, leaving our projects and growth farther and farther behind. For the MTIP project, the funds can only go to projects within the UGB, which was why this discussion primarily took place in the C4 Metro Subcommittee. Is this something we can all agree on?

- Tim Knapp (TK): What will be the priorities of the BCC during this process? Is the BCC preparing to submit a project within the category mentioned in the letter from Metro?
- PS: I don't think the County is that far ahead, just yet.
- TK: I'm looking forward to review process and seeing a prioritization of projects.
- PS: I agree, and we want to make sure we are coordinating on our responses back to JPACT, as well as checking with Washington County

on their responses. Ultimately, we will want to make sure we find language that is federally acceptable, like "geographic parity, equity, distribution, or some equivalent".

#### 4. Clackamas County Land Use Update

- PS: Directs everyone to the two letters sent by the BCC regarding 1,100 acre land supply need in Clackamas County.
- Gary Schmidt (GS): Described the BCC process to establish the land use needs, these letters came as a result of the Johnsons Economics & Mackenzie study combined with the a study from the City of Damascus. The BCC is continuing through the process to determine what types of lands are needed and where best to balance those lands needs. Keep an eye out for future BCC meetings on this topic. Feedback is welcome.
- Ed Gronke (EG): If Metro added 1,100 acres, where would they add it?
- PS: That is exactly the questions the BCC will try to answer.
- TK: [Passes out document prepared by Wilsonville] Wilsonville does not agree with County's analysis of land needs. We would rather see redevelopment of underutilized industrial lands. We feel this is being driven by property owners who want to be brought into the UGB. We would like to see less green-fields be developed during this process of growth.
- PS: I don't feel this is as politically driven as Mayor Knapp suggests. We have 20 years of studies and input. The population rate is growing faster than the job rate. Yes, we could do better work on existing lands, like Milwaukie is trying to do with the North Milwaukie Industrial Area. We are looking at a 20 year pipeline and 1,100 acres is what is needed.
- Mark Gamba (MG): We would all love to see high paying jobs come into the County, but 1,100 acres of green fields may not be the best way to do it. I believe we should continue to develop densely. We, the County, have prime farm land and the drought in other areas will continue to increase the value of those lands and the food that is produced on them.
- PS: I think you will find that we are making great strides to utilize the farm lands in Clackamas County.
- MD: Why is there a discrepancy in the numbers that Wilsonville provided today (2,300 acres available) and what Clackamas County is suggesting (1,100 acres needed)?
- TK: The County just suggested that they have been short on land supply for 20 years, but in 2011 they had the chance to go through the reserves process. Why didn't they voice their concerns at that time? Also, regarding economic development in other areas, which is what

you are trying to facilitate with these “new lands”, cities, not the County, are supposed to shoulder the responsibility of servicing those lands. We should not be talking about urban development outside of cities if the County is not willing to service those lands, and they have said they don't want to.

- Carlotta Collette: On the discrepancy Councilor Drake just mentioned, Wilsonville is quoting numbers from peer reviewed reports and the County is referencing a report that was not peer reviewed. The County's numbers are aspirational.

#### 5. Clackamas County Road Funding Update

- GS: At the C4 Retreat I provided for you an update on the Road Maintenance Survey conducted by the County. You may remember that 75% of the people felt the roads were in good condition and there was no interest in a fee increase or effort to improve the roads. BCC has since met and agreed to not put forward a road funding measure in 2015. Staff will likely put together a study to assess a possible 2016 request. The County will not pursue a general obligation bond. The County will not pursue a road utility fee. The County will continue education and outreach efforts.
- EG: Does the County have a response for the number and condition of the bridges in the County?
- GS: Staff can get that information, but we don't have it now.
- TK: What is the discrepancy between what the County says and what the poll says? How do we focus on the problem of the roads?
- PS: I don't know the discrepancy between the poll and the County, but there is a difference of opinion on the BCC about how to address that question. So point taken.
- EG: I remember at one point the County was identifying local roads and asking about pursuing road districts. Is that still an option?
- PS: Road districts were brought up in the polls and actually came back the lowest.
- Jeff Gudman (JG): If you are taking suggestions, I recommend really focusing on specific roads to help your campaign. Also, a recent report by Portland announced that unfunded road maintenance will soon be at \$1 billion, so this is a regional problem, as well.

#### 6. State Transportation Funding Update

- Not addressed for time.

#### 7. ACT Updates

- PS: The third meeting is in August and it seems like the committee is gaining good traction. The 31 members have been identified. The members from Clackamas County include: Mayor Lori DeRemer, Councilor Jeff Gudman, Mayor Brian Hodson, Julie Wehling, and me. I have been appointed as Vice Chair.

## 8. Urban Lumber: Clackamas Forestry Product Cooperative

*Representative Julie Parrish and Rick Gruen, Clackamas County*

- Guests Julie Parrish (State Representative) (JP) and Rick Gruen (County Parks and Forestry) (RG) presented on HB 2984, Clackamas County Forestry Product Cooperative (AKA: Urban Lumber). Presentation lasted 30 minutes. They were later joined by Dave Barmon (DB), a private arborist company owner.
- PS: Is the program voluntary?
- JP: Yes
- PS: Why you are here today and what is your timeframe?
- JP: We are here today to kick-off the pilot project, which mandates us in HB 2984 to coordinate and work with local cities and jurisdictions. We need your help and input to provide the most up-to-date information, address any concerns, and create the blue print for this program. HB 2984 requires several progress reports on the pilot project, but the final product of the pilot needs to be reported back to the legislature in two years, during the 2017 session.
- EG: What do you see as source materials? People's trees?
- DB: Most people's trees are very low in value because they are not the correct species and haven't been kept well to produce quality lumber. The trees that would be posed in the pilot would need to be specific hard woods that can thrive in this area, and kept/trimmed a specific way so as to maximize the cut.
- Julie Wehling (JW): What is the private owner component?
- RG: First of all, the pilot project, these first two years, will be thinking of private land owners in a hypothetical sense. The first goal is to see if the project is sustainable at the local government level. Certainly, the question of private owners will be discussed with each city/partner in the coop, but I think the primary goal of the pilot project is to see if this can be successful with the local government/publicly owned lands. Once that is established, then greater consideration would be given to the private owners, but under the same guidelines. Trees would need to be enrolled under the condition of what the pilot project creates and the trees would need to be kept properly.

- MG: This is interesting, but I am worried about how long of an investment period this is and I am worried about citizens just mowing down their trees to make a few bucks.
- PS: That makes sense, but as Rick mentioned, currently planted trees would not be taken down because they would not be part of the coop. Owners can enroll with newly planted trees, or “possibly” enroll a diseased or hazardous tree – pending the findings of the pilot project and any agreements determined by the cities.
- Marjorie Stewart (MS): Can a property owner cut their tree if their city does not participate in the coop?
- JP: No.
- TK: We voiced some concerns with the program when it was introduced as legislation. We are part of Tree City USA, work to comply with certain DEQ standards, and we have a pretty efficient and effective tree ordinance. Naturally, we are concerned about some of the technical aspects, like clearing stumps and roots, especially roots that grow close to sidewalks and roads as we talk more about needing transportation funding. Also, we have concerns about property owners who begin in unincorporated areas who are enrolled in the coop, and then are annexed into the city. If the city is not a coop participant, is that citizen grandfathered in?
- JP: Those are all good concerns, and for the questions of the rooting and stumping I would defer to the tree experts as the pilot project gets underway. As for the annexation question, my initial thought would be yes, they are grandfathered in, but it will depend on the city's agreement with the coop, and probably the city's agreement with the property owner. These questions are all great reasons why we want to meet with you individually and address these concerns and work together to create a good framework for the pilot project.

#### 9. JPACT/MPAC Update

*Mayor Tim Knapp, Wilsonville & Mayor Mark Gamba, Milwaukie*

- TK: JPACT meetings we cancelled for August, and there is a presentation on equity initiatives coming up. Something else on the agenda will be the “project of the month”, but I really don't know what that is.
- CC: I think it is just highlighting different projects around the region to raise awareness.
- MG: MPAC August 12 meeting was cancelled, and the two upcoming meetings will discuss the Powell/Division project and the Urban Growth Management decision.

- PS: Just a heads up, that Commissioner Martha Schrader is the County's MPAC rep, and Commissioners Jim Bernard and Martha Schrader are both the points for land use discussions in the county. If you have specific questions about what we discussed earlier or the Urban Growth Management decisions Mayor Gamba just introduced, please connect with them.

10. Adjourn