CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Study Session Worksheet

Presentation date: Dec. 15, 2015 Approx start time: 10:30 a.m. Approx length: 30 min

Presentation title: Driving to Zero on The Safer Road Ahead

Departments: Public & Government Affairs, Transportation & Development

Presenters: Gary Schmidt, Director, PGA; Barbara Cartmill, Director, DTD

Other invitees: Randy Harmon, Warren Gadberry and Grant Williams, Transportation

Maintenance; Mike Bezner, Joe Marek and Diedre Landon, DTD; Ellen Rogalin, PGA/DTD; Amy Kyle, PGA; Karen Tolvstad, Fish

Marketing

WHAT ACTION ARE YOU REQUESTING FROM THE BOARD?

The purpose of this session is two-fold:

- 1) To update the Board of Commissioners on the progress of the expanded, safety-focused efforts on The *Safer* Road Ahead, and
- To propose an interim measure for Board consideration to help kick-start the road maintenance projects that are needed to keep County roads safe and smooth for residents, businesses and visitors.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In June 2015, after reviewing the latest survey results and recommendations from consultants, the Board of County Commissioners agreed to the following:

- 1. To *not* put a road funding measure on the ballot in November 2015;
- 2. To continue to pursue the possibility of putting either a countywide gas tax or a countywide vehicle registration fee on the ballot sometime in 2016;
- 3. To *not* pursue the options of a street utility fee or a roads district;
- 4. To *not* pursue the option of general obligation bonds at this time, and
- 5. To ask staff to return with a plan for moving forward that takes into account the new information and results of the BCC discussion.

In July 2015 the Board directed staff to move forward on the following three paths:

- Increase outreach and education activities about road maintenance needs to help our residents, businesses and partners understand the ongoing need for additional road maintenance funds to continue to provide a safe road system for all travelers and dramatically reduce future costs of road reconstruction;
- 2. Work with cities and other partners to seek funding increases at the state and federal levels.

 Continue to explore the options of a countywide gas tax and/or a countywide registration fee, including holding several public meetings to gauge public input about these fee options, and

Progress has been made in the first two areas, as briefly described below.

1. Increased outreach and education related to safety.

Traffic safety staff is working closely with transportation maintenance, engineering and Public & Government Affairs (PGA) to develop educational materials to emphasize the importance of everyone helping to make roads safe – the County (by keeping roads well-maintained) and the public (by avoiding dangerous behaviors on the road). This is being achieved by merging *The Road Ahead* with the *Drive to Zero* safety program. A broad variety of outreach strategies will be utilized following a revised action plan targeted at employee, community partner and broader public engagement.

2. Work with partners to seek state and federal funding increases.

A new federal highway funding bill was recently passed and staff have been working with other jurisdictions and legislative partners to help ensure that transportation funding will be addressed during the 2017 State Legislative session.

Proposal

For the third area -- explore options of a countywide gas tax or vehicle registration fee (VRF) -- staff has a proposal. Staff suggests that the Board consider a countywide VRF described below and that a robust public outreach effort be implemented in early 2016 to give the community an opportunity to learn about and comment on the proposal. This public input plan would include, but not be limited to, monthly Board Town Halls throughout the County from January through May focused on this topic; public hearings at BCC business meetings; outreach with community and business organizations, cities and jurisdictional partners; and online and scientific surveys. The results of this outreach would be presented to the Board in June 2016 for further discussion and a decision on whether to move forward.

Staff proposes a seven-year, countywide VRF of \$25/vehicle/year. This would bring in approximately \$36 million in revenue to the county (and approximately \$24 million for cities in Clackamas County), for a total of approximately \$60 million.

The funds would be spent as follows:

- \$32.3 million on seven paving packages (including safety and ADA improvements)
 representing maintenance on more than 115 miles of roadways around the county
 (see attached). These project packages were carefully chosen after a great deal of
 analysis and study by Transportation Maintenance and Engineering staff,
 considering road condition, safety, average daily traffic and other relevant factors.
- 2. \$3.7 million on safety improvements, including curve warning signs* on rural roads and intersection notification signs. (*These will not only help make roads safer, but are required to be in place by 2019.)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (current year and ongoing):

The proposed vehicle registration fee would cost residents approximately \$2/month/vehicle for seven years. The revenue would be less than the county needs to catch up on maintenance, but would be valuable in moving forward on much-needed projects that would make a positive difference for our residents and businesses. With the new federal highway bill and the prospects for a new state transportation bill in 2017, this modest VRF would help jump-start our enhanced maintenance and safety program, and provide an opportunity to evaluate the funding need after seven years.

<u>LEGAL/POLICY REQUIREMENTS:</u> There are legal requirements and deadlines related to approving any ordinance and approving any ballot measure.

<u>PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPATION:</u> Extensive outreach and education has taken place over the past two years including presentations to community groups, a website, billboards, social media, sharing information at events, public surveys, articles in *Citizen News* and presentations at BCC study sessions and business meetings.

OPTIONS:

- 1. Support consideration of a seven-year, \$25/vehicle/year, countywide VRF, and direct staff to arrange for public outreach and input opportunities with the Board beginning in January 2016.
- 2. Support consideration of a VRF, but at a different level and/or length, and and direct staff to arrange for public outreach and input opportunities with the Board beginning in January 2016.
- 3. Do not support consideration of a VRF.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff respectfully recommends that the Board of County Commissioners support Option 1: consideration of a seven-year, \$25/vehicle/year, countywide VRF, and direct staff to arrange for public outreach and input opportunities with the Board beginning in January 2016.

Attachment:	List of Proposed Paving Packages Map of Proposed Paving Packages				
SUBMITTED	BY:				
Division Dire	ctor/Head Approval				
Department Director/Head Approval					
County Admi	nistrator Approval				

For information on this issue or copies of attachments, please contact M. Barbara Cartmill @ 503-742-4326.

PROPOSED PAVING PACKAGES*

December 15, 2015

Package A: Beavercreek

ROAD NAME	FROM	то	MILES	COST
Beavercreek Rd	Hwy 211	Henrici Rd	13.3	\$4,722,300
TOTAL			13.3	\$4,722,300

Package B: Highland

ROAD NAME	FROM	то	MILES	COST
Carus Rd	Lower Highland	Beavercreek Rd	1.7	\$186,210
Ferguson Rd	Beavercreek Rd	ECM**	2.4	\$298,080
Lower Highland Rd	Beavercreek Rd	Upper Highland	5.8	\$1,508,040
Upper Highland	Hwy 211	Beavercreek Rd	8.2	\$2,153,610
TOTAL			18.0	\$4.145.940

Package C: Oatfield

ROAD NAME	FROM	то	MILES	COST
Aldercrest Rd	Oatfield Rd	Thiessen Rd	1.9	\$646,816
Concord Rd	River Rd	La Bonita Rd	1.2	\$444,048
Hill Rd	Oatfield Rd	Thiessen Rd	1.2	\$537,544
Oak Grove Blvd	Oatfield Rd	Rupert Rd	0.6	\$308,676
Oak Grove Blvd	Rupert Rd	ECM**	0.7	\$418,528
Oatfield Rd	Bridge	Gladstone/ECM*	3.4	\$2,075,750
Roethe Rd	River Rd	Oatfield Rd	0.9	\$390,688
View Acres Rd	Hill Rd	Oatfield Rd	0.6	\$71,100
TOTAL			10.5	\$4,893,150

Package D: Johnson Creek/South County

ROAD NAME	FROM	то	MILES	COST
Johnson Creek Blvd	82nd Ave	Mult Co Line	1.9	\$1,104,750
Macksburg Rd	Hwy 211	Hwy 213	3.1	\$775,890
McCown Rd	Vaughn Rd	Macksburg Rd	1.0	\$123,480
Molalla Ave	Hwy 213	Sawtell Rd	2.6	\$1,027,064
Sprague Rd	Molalla Ave	Macksburg Rd	0.9	\$139,316
Vaughn Rd	Hwy 211	Molalla Ave	1.3	\$141,120
Wilsonville Rd	Yamhill Co Line	Willamette Way	4.5	\$1,522,616
ΤΟΤΔΙ			15.2	\$4.834.236

Package E: Canby/Estacada

Package E. Camby/Estacada					
ROAD NAME	FROM	ТО	MILES	COST	
Bremer Rd	Haines Rd	Central Point Rd	1.6	\$245,108	
Coupland Rd	Divers Rd	Porter Rd	1.8	\$457,380	
Coupland Rd	Currin Rd	Cemetery Rd	1.4	\$390,780	
Currin Rd	Eagle Creek Rd	Snuffin Rd	3.0	\$396,000	
Currin Rd	Snuffin Rd	Coupland Rd	1.4	\$196,740	
Haines Rd	99E	Mulino Rd	1.3	\$352,440	
Lawrence Rd	Coupland Rd	ECM**	1.0	\$122,400	
Moss Hill Rd	Coupland Rd	Surface Rd	1.5	\$167,040	
Mulino Rd	1st Ave	Hwy 213	6.7	\$1,756,350	
Surface Rd	Hwy 224	Tumala Mtn Rd	1.2	\$151,560	
Township Rd	Central Point Rd	Mulino Rd	1.6	\$418,320	
TOTAL	_		22.4	\$4,654,118	

Package F: Canby Marquam

ROAD NAME	FROM	то	MILES	COST
Barnards Rd	Hwy 213	Barlow Rd	6.2	\$1,623,600
Canby Marquam				
Hwy	Hwy 211	99E	7.7	\$2,458,530
Gribble Rd	Bolland Rd	Dryland Rd	2.4	\$364,472
Harms Rd	Macksburg Rd	Kraxberger Rd	0.8	\$81,270
	Canby			
Kraxberger Rd	Marquam	ECM**	1.8	\$195,660
Miller Rd	Barlow Rd	Meridian Rd	1.5	\$205,320
TOTAL			20.3	\$4,928,852

Package G: 122nd/Boring

			0	
ROAD NAME	FROM	то	MILES	COST
122nd Ave	Sunnyside Rd	Hubbard Rd	1.0	\$362,500
132nd Ave	Sunnyside Rd	Hubbard Rd	0.9	\$294,000
142nd Ave	Hwy 212	Sunnyside Rd	1.0	\$416,625
152nd Ave	Sunnyside Rd	Hwy 212	1.1	\$401,875
312th Dr	Hwy 26	Kelso Rd	0.8	\$161,550
Church Rd	Richey Rd	312th Dr	1.7	\$218,250
Hubbard Rd	122nd Ave	Hwy 212	0.9	\$263,000
Kelso Rd	Richey Rd	Hwy 26	2.8	\$1,164,240
Richey Rd	Kelso Rd	Hwy 212	0.8	\$124,740
Tickle Creek Rd	Hwy 211	Kelso Rd	4.6	\$696,696
TOTAL			15.5	\$4,103,476

Total - All Packages

PACKAGE NAME	MILES	COST
Package A Beavercreek	13.3	\$4,722,300
Package B Highland	18.0	\$4,145,940
Package C Oatfield	10.5	\$4,893,150
Package D – Johnson Creek/South County	15.2	\$4,834,236
Package E – Canby / Estacada	22.4	\$4,654,118
Package F – Canby Marquam	20.3	\$4,928,852
Package G – 122 nd / Boring	15.5	\$4,103,476
TOTAL	115.3	\$32,282,072

^{*}Exact numbers subject to change as numbers are refined.

^{**}ECM: end of county maintenance

