

To request translation or disability-related accommodations, please contact us at **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

Si quiere solicitar servicios de traducción o adaptaciones para la discapacidad, contáctenos en/al **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

Чтобы запросить перевод или приспособления, связанные с инвалидностью, пожалуйста, свяжитесь с нами по: **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

Щоб попросити переклад або спеціальні послуги для осіб з особливими потребами, зверніться до нас, скориставшись такими контактними даними: **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

如需翻译服务或残障相关的协助，请与我们联系：**C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468**

。

Để yêu cầu dịch vụ dịch thuật hoặc điều chỉnh liên quan đến tình trạng khuyết tật, vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi qua **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**



Clackamas County
www.clackamas.us



2024 Retreat



Mt. Hood Oregon Resort
68010 East Fairway Avenue
Welches, OR 97067

Day One

- 1:00 PM Session 1: Opening Session**
- C4 Co-Chairs Call to Action + Introductions
 - Facilitator led discussion on Weekend Goals and Agreements
- 1:45 PM Session 2: 2025 Transportation Package with the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Transportation**
- Guests: Senator Gorsek and Representative McLain
- 2:45 PM Break**
- 3:00 PM Session 3: Transportation Funding Values**
- Survey Overview + 2023 Values and Outcomes Process Recap
 - Naming Values for 2025 Transportation Package (Table Activity)
- 4:00 PM Break**
- Funding Preferences Activity
- 4:20 PM Session 4: Transportation Funding: Adding Outcomes to Values**
- Naming “outcomes” for each value (Table Activity and Group Discussion)
 - Consensus Discussion: Values and Preferred Outcomes Draft for a 2025 Transportation Package
- 6:20 PM Adjourn for Day One**
- 6:30 PM Dinner**

Day Two

- 7:30 AM Breakfast Opens**
- 8:00 AM Session 5: How will we work together to accommodate housing production and job growth?**
- Recap May discussion, share survey results
 - Identify Issues or Trends that Merit C4 Prioritization
- 8:30 AM Session 6: Housing and Job Growth Visioning**
- Visioning activity that asks:
 - What does a community look like where everyone is housed?
 - What does a community look like that supports job growth?
 - What does a community look like where everyone has adequate infrastructure and services?
- 9:20 AM Session 7: Housing and Job Accommodation Challenges and Opportunities**
- Growing Up, Growing Out, Growing Jobs, Growing Affordable Housing (Table Activity)
- 10:20 AM Break**
- 10:30 AM Session 8: Housing and Job Accommodation Next Steps**
- What role can/should C4 play to advance coordination on housing production or growth conversations in Clackamas County?
- 11:00 AM Session 9: C4 Priorities Planning**
- Co-Chairs host “next 12 months” dialogue. Help us set the agenda.
- 12:00 PM Adjourn**



Retreat Attendees (C4 Members and Alternates)

- Paul Savas, Co-Chair Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Ben West Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Brian Hodson, Co-Chair City of Canby, Mayor
- Traci Hensley City of Canby, Councilor (Alternate)
- Kenny Sernach Community Planning Organization, Beaver Creek CPO
- Pamela Burback Community Planning Organization, Boring CPO
- Michael Milch City of Gladstone, Mayor
- Brett Sherman City of Happy Valley, Councilor
- Tom Ellis City of Happy Valley, Mayor (Alternate)
- Joe Buck City of Lake Oswego, Mayor
- Christine Lewis Metro, Councilor
- Rebecca Stavenjord City of Milwaukie, Councilor
- Jody Newland City of Molalla, Council President (Alternate)
- Adam Marl City of Oregon City, Commissioner
- Michael Mitchell City of Oregon City, Commissioner (Alternate)
- Stan Pulliam City of Sandy, Mayor
- John Serra TriMet
- Valerie Pratt City of Tualatin, Councilor
- Mary Baumgardner City of West Linn, Council President (Alternate)
- Julie Fitzgerald City of Wilsonville, Mayor
- Caroline Berry City of Wilsonville, Councilor (Alternate)

Retreat Support

- Trent Wilson C4 Administrator, Clackamas County, Government Affairs
- Emily Shannon Facilitator, Clackamas County Resolution Services

Retreat Attendees (Non-C4 Members)

- Martha Schrader Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Mark Shull Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Gary Schmidt Clackamas County, County Administrator
- Eileen Stein City of Canby, City Administrator
- Melanie Wagner City of Estacada, City Manager
- Jacque Betz City of Gladstone, City Administrator
- Jamie Lorenzini City of Happy Valley, Policy Analyst
- Madison Thesing City of Lake Oswego, Assistant to the City Manager
- Sara Schmitt Office of Senator Jeff Merkley
- Ramona Perrault Metro
- Tyler Deems City of Sandy, City Manager
- Mark Ottenad City of Wilsonville, Director Public & Government Affairs
- Tonia Holowetzki Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs (PGA)
- Dan Johnson Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Mike Bezner Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Karen Buehrig Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Jamie Stasny Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Jane Vetto Clackamas County, County Counsel


Q1 What agency do you represent?

Answered: 23 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Canby	5/29/2024 2:14 PM
2	City	5/28/2024 3:23 PM
3	City of Sandy	5/28/2024 11:53 AM
4	City of Lake Oswego	5/28/2024 11:06 AM
5	Happy Valley	5/28/2024 10:56 AM
6	Wilsonville	5/25/2024 12:00 PM
7	City of Wilsonville and SMART	5/25/2024 9:37 AM
8	City of Canby	5/24/2024 2:05 PM
9	Clackamas County	5/23/2024 1:48 PM
10	TriMet	5/23/2024 12:30 PM
11	City of Oregon City	5/21/2024 2:43 PM
12	City of Oregon City	5/21/2024 11:30 AM
13	City of Canby	5/21/2024 10:27 AM
14	Clackamas County DTD	5/21/2024 7:12 AM
15	City of Tualatin	5/20/2024 3:51 PM
16	City of Wilsonville	5/20/2024 2:13 PM
17	City of Oregon City	5/17/2024 3:02 PM
18	Clackamas County	5/15/2024 5:44 PM
19	City of West Linn	5/13/2024 4:40 PM
20	City of Happy Valley	5/11/2024 5:26 AM
21	City of Happy Valley	5/9/2024 9:57 AM
22	City of Molalla	5/8/2024 2:27 PM
23	Canby	5/8/2024 12:06 PM

Q2 Please identify your role:


Answered: 23 Skipped: 0



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
C4 Member or Alternate	34.78%	8
Elected official, but not the designed C4 Members	17.39%	4
Supporting staff of a C4 member agency	47.83%	11
TOTAL		23

Q3 Which revenue streams does your agency have for transportation investments? Select all that apply.

Answered: 22 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Gas tax – State Shared Revenue	86.36% 19
Gas tax – Local	45.45% 10
Systems Development Charges	81.82% 18
Road Maintenance Fee – Local	63.64% 14
Urban Renewal/Tax Increment Financing	68.18% 15
Vehicle Registration Fee (county)	45.45% 10
Payroll tax for transit operations (employer paid)	50.00% 11
Other (please specify)	0.00% 0
Total Respondents: 22	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q4 What are the biggest transportation challenges you face in your jurisdiction/agency? Select all that apply.

Answered: 22 Skipped: 1




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Addressing safety concerns	45.45%	10
Improving arterials	36.36%	8
Improving state highways within jurisdiction	72.73%	16
Operations and Maintenance Funding	54.55%	12
Expanding Bike/Ped Options	45.45%	10
Funding to advance high-cost projects	59.09%	13
Congestion in key locations	68.18%	15
Inability to compete for grants or manage grant awards	13.64%	3
Escalating costs of all construction	90.91%	20
Other (please specify)	13.64%	3
Total Respondents: 22		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	I-5 Boone Bridge/Hwy 551 traffic congestion bottleneck	5/25/2024 9:39 AM
2	Tolling impacts	5/21/2024 10:30 AM
3	Boones Ferry Bridge replacement and possible tolling	5/20/2024 2:16 PM

Q5 Are the HB 2017 Bottleneck Projects (I-205 Widening and Abernethy Bridge, Rose Quarter, Boone Bridge [HB 3055]) still a priority for you?


Answered: 22 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	81.82%	18
No	18.18%	4
TOTAL		22

Q6 The Governor’s pause on tolling suggests the 2025 State Legislature should find a way to fund the I-205 bottleneck project or reconsider tolling. Do you support the State Legislature considering alternative funding mechanisms (non-tolling) to fund this project?


Answered: 22 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	95.45%	21
No	4.55%	1
TOTAL		22

Q7 Does C4 want more opportunities to discuss local funding tools at future C4 meetings?


Answered: 19 Skipped: 4



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	94.74%	18
No	5.26%	1
TOTAL		19

Q8 On a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the best), how would you rate the frequency of transit service in your community?


Answered: 22 Skipped: 1



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
(no label)	0.00%	9.09%	22.73%	13.64%	13.64%	0.00%	0.00%	27.27%	0.00%	13.64%	22	5.64
	0	2	5	3	3	0	0	6	0	3		

Q9 On a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the best), how would you rate the coverage of transit service in your community?


Answered: 22 Skipped: 1



	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
(no label)	0.00%	31.82%	4.55%	0.00%	22.73%	0.00%	9.09%	18.18%	0.00%	13.64%	22	5.36
	0	7	1	0	5	0	2	4	0	3		

Q10 Please select up to three answers below that best finish this statement: "Transit in my community would benefit from..."Please note you must select one answer but no more than three.


Answered: 22 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
None of the above	4.55%	1
More frequency of existing routes	40.91%	9
More routes	50.00%	11
First and Last-mile service improvements (from home to transit center, from transit center to workplace)	40.91%	9
Shuttle service to connect to routes	18.18%	4
Transit infrastructure (park and rides, transit stop improvements)	13.64%	3
Climate efficiency for busses (hybrid/electric)	13.64%	3
Localized routes and circulation	40.91%	9
Total Respondents: 22		

Q11 Does your jurisdiction/agency have a housing production strategy?


Answered: 17 Skipped: 6



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	58.82%	10
No	41.18%	7
TOTAL		17

Q12 What housing production strategies is your community currently focusing on? Select all that apply.

Answered: 17 Skipped: 6




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Zoning changes to accommodate more housing	58.82% 10
Promoting Cottage Clusters / Middle Housing	64.71% 11
Promote Affordable housing	64.71% 11
Manufactured community preservation	17.65% 3
Increased density near transit stations	35.29% 6
Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	35.29% 6
Improve user experience with permitting systems	35.29% 6
Vertical Housing Development Zone tax abatement	41.18% 7
Revolving Loan Fund	0.00% 0
Construction Excise Tax (CAT)	0.00% 0
Increase homeownership	41.18% 7
Review System Development Charges	47.06% 8
Other (please specify)	11.76% 2
Total Respondents: 17	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	We are currently working on our HPS	5/28/2024 11:56 AM
2	Funding for infrastucture	5/25/2024 9:42 AM

Q13 How many housing units have been produced in your community over the past five years?


Answered: 17 Skipped: 6



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Zero	0.00%	0
Up to 50	0.00%	0
Up to 100	0.00%	0
More than 100	11.76%	2
More than 250	23.53%	4
More than 500	23.53%	4
More than 1,000	23.53%	4
Don't know	17.65%	3
TOTAL		17

Q14 Does your city have current and/or coming soon Affordable Housing development projects?


Answered: 19 Skipped: 4



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Yes	42.11% 8
No	31.58% 6
Non-city project: county or nonprofit agency	26.32% 5
TOTAL	19

Q15 Are you interested in working with the Clackamas County Housing Authority to identify opportunities to include affordable housing development or housing support services in your agency/jurisdiction?


Answered: 18 Skipped: 5



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	83.33%	15
No	16.67%	3
TOTAL		18

Q16 What significant infrastructure investments are needed to support housing production in your community? Select all that apply.

Answered: 19 Skipped: 4




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Transportation – roads	84.21%	16
Transportation – sidewalks, bike/ped infrastructure	73.68%	14
Transportation – transit	42.11%	8
Sewer/wastewater	68.42%	13
Stormwater	47.37%	9
Water	78.95%	15
Power/Gas	15.79%	3
Other (please specify)	0.00%	0
Total Respondents: 19		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q17 What limitations or challenges do you see that might affect your agency's/jurisdiction's ability to support housing production? Select all that apply.

Answered: 19 Skipped: 4




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Increasing construction costs	84.21% 16
Lack of local funding options	57.89% 11
Water rights limited	0.00% 0
Multi-model development costs are prohibitive (bike/ped)	47.37% 9
Land availability	36.84% 7
Alternative demands on existing land	21.05% 4
Agricultural preservation	15.79% 3
Gaps in private partnerships	21.05% 4
Other (please specify)	21.05% 4
Total Respondents: 19	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Capacity issues related to wastewater and our current discharge location	5/28/2024 11:56 AM
2	Lack of sufficient state-funded options for infrastructure	5/25/2024 9:42 AM
3	We are about to start work on the HB 2003 HPS, following our adoption of the Housing Capacity Analysis.	5/13/2024 4:47 PM
4	Lack of public transportation	5/11/2024 5:32 AM

Q18 Do you have an employment sector you are working to grow? Select all that apply.

Answered: 15 Skipped: 8




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Industrial/Manufacturing	93.33% 14
Distribution/Warehousing	60.00% 9
Medical	26.67% 4
Technology/Software engineering	46.67% 7
Hospitality and Tourism	60.00% 9
Arts/Culture	53.33% 8
Personal/Professional Services	33.33% 5
Retail	46.67% 7
Other (please specify)	0.00% 0
Total Respondents: 15	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
	There are no responses.	

Q19 What barriers do you face in attracting new employers?

Answered: 17 Skipped: 6




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Road Infrastructure	70.59% 12
Utility Infrastructure	47.06% 8
Location	11.76% 2
Brownfield mitigation	5.88% 1
Limited land availability	47.06% 8
Land use/zoning	23.53% 4
Availability of childcare	41.18% 7
Skilled workforce	11.76% 2
Public transportation	17.65% 3
Freight/Rail options	17.65% 3
Ag & forestry preservation and regulations	5.88% 1
Disaster management & recovery	0.00% 0
Safety Concerns: location and/or access to business	0.00% 0
Other (please specify)	17.65% 3
Total Respondents: 17	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Aggregating former rural properties for urban industrial development	5/25/2024 9:45 AM
2	Affordable housing	5/20/2024 2:26 PM
3	Price of land related to employment/manufacturing zoning	5/17/2024 3:10 PM

Q20 What strategies does your agency/jurisdiction use to support business and employment growth? Select all that apply.

Answered: 16 Skipped: 7



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Enterprise Zones	25.00% 4
Urban renewal/TIF district	100.00% 16
Business Oregon Grants/Loans	25.00% 4
SDC deferrals	37.50% 6
Workforce training	18.75% 3
Development agreements (agreed cost-share of City and developer)	43.75% 7
Active recruitment	12.50% 2
Partnership with local business agencies (Chamber, Business Oregon, etc.)	75.00% 12
Other (please specify)	6.25% 1
Total Respondents: 16	

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Transit commute options; high-quality infrastructure for water, wastewater and transportation	5/25/2024 9:45 AM



C4 Retreat

June 14, 2024

1:00 p.m.

Session 01

Opening Session

Summary

*Presenting: C4 Co Chairs Commissioner Paul Savas (Clackamas) and Mayor Brian Hodson (Canby)
Trent Wilson: C4 Administrator and Clackamas County Government Affairs
Emily Shannon: Facilitator, Clackamas County Resolution Services*

Retreat attendees will ease into to the retreat with opening remarks from the C4 Co Chairs, a run of show provided by C4 Staff, meeting the retreat facilitator, and discussing desired outcomes for the weekend.

Session Breakdown

- 15m – Welcome by the Co-Chairs and introductions
- 10m – C4 Staff, run of show and logistics
- 20m – Meet your facilitator and share desired outcomes for the C4 Retreat

Materials Provided for this Session

- C4 General Information Page
- C4 Bylaws

This page left intentionally blank.

2024 General Information



Current Voting Membership

		C4 Exec	C4 Metro	C4 Rural	JPACT	MPAC	R1ACT
Clackamas County	Commissioner Paul Savas	●	●	●	●		●
Clackamas County	Commissioner Ben West		●	●			
Canby	Mayor Brian Hodson	●		●			●
CPOs	Kenny Sernach	●	●	●			
Estacada	Mayor Sean Drinkwine			●			
Fire Districts	Matthew Silva (Estacada Fire District)	●					
Gladstone	Mayor Michael Milch	●					
Hamlets	Mark Hillyard			●			
Happy Valley	Council Brett Sherman	●	●		●	●	●
Johnson City	Vacant						
Lake Oswego	Mayor Joe Buck		●		●	●	
Milwaukie	Councilor Rebecca Stavenjord		●			●	
Molalla	Mayor Scott Keyser			●			
Oregon City	Commissioner Adam Marl		●			●	
Portland	Vacant						
Rivergrove	Councilor Doug McLean		●				
Sandy	Mayor Stan Pulliam			●			
Sanitary Districts	Paul Gornick (Oak Lodge Water Services)	●					
Tualatin	Councilor Valerie Pratt		●				●
Water Districts	Sherry French (Clackamas Water District)		●			●	●
West Linn	Mayor Rory Bialostosky		●				
Wilsonville	Mayor Julie Fitzgerald		●				

Current Ex-Officio Membership

MPAC Citizen Rep	Ed Gronke
Metro Council	Councilor Christine Lewis
Port of Portland	Emerald Bogue
Rural Transit	Todd Wood (Canby Area Transit)
Urban Transit	John Serra (TriMet)

Frequently Referenced Acronyms and Short-forms:

Related to the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

C4 Metro Subcommittee

C4 I-205 Diversion Subcommittee

CTAC: Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (C4 Transportation TAC)

Related to Metro and Metro Committees

JPACT: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (Metro)

MPAC: Metro Policy Advisory Committee (Metro)

TPAC: Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT TAC)

MTAC: Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MPAC TAC)

Related to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tolling

OTC Oregon Transportation Commission (ODOT policy decision body)

Region 1: ODOT's geographic designation for the metro area + Hood River

R1ACT: ODOT Region 1 Advisory Committee on Transportation

UMO: ODOT's Urban Mobility Office

RTAC: ODOT's Regional Tolling Advisory Committee

STRAC: ODOT's State Tolling Rules Advisory Committee

EMAC: ODOT's Equity Mobility Advisory Committee (for tolling)

General Transportation Acronyms

STIP: State Transportation Improvement Plan (ODOT)

RTP: Regional Transportation Plan (Metro)

TSP: Transportation System Plan (Local – county and cities)

HCT: High Capacity Transit

UPWP: Urban Planning Work Program

General Housing and Land Use Acronyms

H3S: Clackamas County's Health, Housing, and Human Services Department

HACC: Housing Authority of Clackamas County

SHS: Supportive Housing Services (Regionally approved funds for housing services)

OHCS: Oregon Housing and Community Services

LCDC: Land Conservation and Development Commission

DLCD: Department of Land Conservation and Development

UGB: Urban Growth Boundary

UGMA: Urban Growth Management Agreement

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

1. PURPOSE

The Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C-4) was founded by the County to promote a partnership between the County, its Cities, Special Districts, Hamlets, Villages, and Community Planning Organizations (CPOs).

C-4's primary functions are to:

- Enhance coordination and cooperation between the jurisdictions
- Establish unified positions on land use and transportation plans
- Provide a forum for issues of mutual benefit and interest
- Promote unified positions in discussions at the state and regional levels

2. MEMBERSHIP POLICY BODY

Committee membership shall consist of representatives from the following jurisdictions, communities, and districts:

Voting Body		Members	Votes
<i>* = Urban Jurisdiction</i>			
<i>^ = Urban & Rural Representation</i>			
County	Board of County Commissioners [^]	2	2
Cities	Barlow	1	1
	Canby	1	1
	Estacada	1	1
	Gladstone*	1	1
	Happy Valley*	1	1
	Johnson City*	1	1
	Lake Oswego*	1	1
	Milwaukie*	1	1
	Molalla	1	1
	Oregon City*	1	1
	Portland*	1	1
	Rivergrove*	1	1
	Sandy	1	1
	Tualatin*	1	1
	West Linn*	1	1
	Wilsonville*	1	1
Communities	CPOs [^]	1	1
	Hamlets	1	1
	Villages	1	1
Districts	Fire*	1	1
	Sanitary*	1	1
	Water*	1	1
Total		24	24

Non-Voting Body		Members
Regional	Metro*	1
	Clackamas Citizen from MPAC	1
Transit	Rural	1
	Urban*	1
Other	Port of Portland*	1
Total		5

At a minimum, Clackamas County Board of Commissioners will select its two (2) elected representatives in February of odd-numbered years and notify the Secretary of C-4 by letter signed by the Chair or a designee appointed by the Chair.

At a minimum, the cities shall provide the names of their elected C-4 representatives and alternates by letter signed by the Mayor or their designee in February of each odd-numbered year to the Secretary of C-4.

The special districts/authorities representatives shall be designated by agreement among districts/authorities represented. The Hamlet and Village representatives shall be designated by agreement among the County’s Hamlets and Villages represented. The process for designating the representatives shall be established by agreement among each of the groups of Districts/Authorities and Hamlets/Villages. Each of these entities shall submit the names of their elected C-4 representative and alternate to the Secretary of C-4 by letter signed by the Chairs of the Boards represented in February of every even-numbered year.

The CPO representative and alternate shall be determined in a process that is guided by the County and includes the opportunity for input of each of the County's recognized CPOs and the County's Committee for Citizen Involvement (CCI). That selection process shall be completed by February of each even-numbered year and the name of the representative and alternate shall be submitted to the C-4 Secretary.

Each jurisdiction with a voting membership shall have one (1) vote, with the exception of the County which has two (2) votes. The cities, special districts, and Clackamas County representatives to JPACT and MPAC are encouraged but not required to have their representative as a voting member or alternate on C-4.

The Metro Council shall provide the name of their C-4 representative and alternate by letter signed by the Metro President or his/her designee in February of each odd-numbered year.

The representatives from the Port of Portland, the transit agencies, and the Clackamas Citizen from MPAC are not elected officials, and their membership is determined by appointment from their respective organizations.

3. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall be comprised of a representative of: (a) the board of county commissioners, (b) an urban city, (c) a rural city, (d) water and sewer districts, (e) fire districts, and f) Hamlets, Villages, and CPOs. The Executive Committee will establish the agendas for meetings of C-4, including additional agenda request items that may be made as set forth in section 5(G) of these Bylaws, and may make recommendations to the C-4 body on action items as appropriate. C-4 Metro Jurisdiction cities and Rural Cities shall elect their respective Executive Committee representatives annually at the March C-4 Regular meeting. Special Districts shall annually determine their own Executive Committee representative selection process and shall submit the name of the appointment by a letter signed by the chairs of the special district boards to the Secretary of C-4 at or before the March C-4 meeting.

4. OFFICERS

The co-chairs of the Executive Committee will also serve as the co-chairs of C-4 and shall be elected annually at their March meeting by members of the Executive Committee from among its members. The County member will co-chair the Executive Committee and C-4. The secretary of the Executive Committee and C-4 shall be a county staff member designated by the Board of County Commissioners.

5. PROCEDURES

A. Meetings

All meetings of C-4 and any of its subcommittees are considered public meetings under Oregon's Public Meetings Law. Meetings will be held monthly on a day to be determined by C-4 or called as needed by the co-chairs or by a vote of C-4. The secretary is responsible for notifying members of the meeting time and place and for preparing the agenda. Meeting notices will be provided to the C-4 members, interested parties, and to the public as soon as practicable and shall include a list of the principal subjects anticipated to be considered.

B. Quorum

A quorum of C-4 shall consist of a majority of the participating jurisdictions' voting members.

C. Voting

Votes in C-4 shall carry by a simple majority of those present, provided that no action shall be taken unless a quorum is present. Only members or their designated alternate shall have voting rights.

D. Alternates

A designated alternate will sit in the absence of a member and shall have full voting rights. Alternates will be appointed by the member jurisdiction. There shall be no alternates for either of the co-chair positions.

- E. Records
All C-4 actions shall be documented in the form of minutes, memoranda and special reports. The secretary will be responsible for such documentation and distribution of such minutes, memoranda and reports.

- F. Rules
Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure.

- G. Additional Agenda Requests
Before presentation to C-4 for action, agenda items shall be presented to the Executive Committee for consideration and placement on the agenda of an upcoming meeting of C-4. Only voting members of C-4 shall be eligible to recommend agenda placement items. If the Executive Committee declines to place an item on the C-4 agenda, then any voting member may present the agenda item for consideration of placement as an agenda item to the entire C-4 body. The matter shall be presented by the voting member under "other business." If C-4 votes in the affirmative to place the matter on the agenda, then it will be placed as an agenda item on the next meeting agenda. If that agenda is full, then not later than the following meeting, unless a later agenda date is otherwise agreed to by the voting C-4 members present. Compliance with this section may be waived where circumstances warrant faster action by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of those C-4 voting members present.

6. ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEES:

- A. Metro Subcommittee
C-4 members who are within the Metro jurisdiction or serve on the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) or the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) shall be a subcommittee of C-4 named "C-4 Metro Subcommittee." This subcommittee shall be a consensus forming body for issues being addressed at JPACT and MPAC and other Metro related issues, and will forward as needed recommendations to the larger C-4 body. This subcommittee will be led by two co-chairs consisting of (1) one Clackamas County commissioner and (1) one Clackamas city member. Both co-chairs will serve as voting members on either JPACT or MPAC. This subcommittee will also be able to facilitate limited decisions through special caucus, specifically a caucus of city members to discuss the selection of the city co-chair and the selection of the MPAC Other Cities of Clackamas County seat per Metro MPAC Bylaws and, if approved by Clackamas County's largest city per Metro JPACT bylaws, the selection of the JPACT Cities of Clackamas County seat, with each seat having a primary representative and an alternate.

- B. Rural Cities Subcommittee
C-4 members who are outside of the Metro jurisdiction shall be a subcommittee of C-4 named Rural Cities subcommittee. This subcommittee shall at a minimum develop positions relative to transportation issues and related funding for presentations to the ODOT Region 1 Area Commission on Transportation (R1ACT). The Rural Cities

subcommittee shall also consider coordination with the County, State, and other jurisdictions as appropriate, on land use, planning, or other issues that may uniquely affect these cities located outside of the Metro boundaries.

C. Management Advisory Subcommittee

The administrator of each city, district, authority and county shall serve as a Management Advisory Subcommittee. This subcommittee will provide overview and advice to C-4 and support the work of the Technical Subcommittees. The subcommittee shall also have the responsibility, as directed by C-4, of constituting any ad hoc subcommittees or other groups established for information and advice on specific issues. The Management Advisory Subcommittee shall meet as needed.

D. Technical Advisory Subcommittees

C-4 shall be informed and advised by the following standing Technical Advisory Committees, as well as other ad hoc subcommittees established and chartered at the direction of the co-chairs for information and advice on specific issues, plans or projects of interest to C-4.

1. Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)

The membership of CTAC shall consist of staff representatives of all agencies on the policy body and is to review transportation plans, projects, and funding issues, and make recommendations to C-4. CTAC shall operate under the same procedures as the policy body, and will meet as needed to be determined by committee members. Member cities will have only one vote when votes are required.

2. Land Use Advisory Subcommittee

The membership of this subcommittee shall consist of the planning directors or the staff persons with lead planning responsibility for all agencies on the policy body. The subcommittee is to focus on land use issues and transportation issues that may have an impact on land use. The subcommittee shall operate under the same procedures as the policy body, and will meet as needed to be determined by subcommittee members or when scheduled by the chairman or by a vote of the subcommittee.

3. Clackamas Transit Providers Subcommittee

Staff of C-4 members who represent or operate a public transit service, or receive service, shall be members of a subcommittee named Clackamas Transit Providers Subcommittee. The Clackamas Transit Providers Subcommittee will meet as needed to coordinate on county-wide transit related issues and will provide recommendations to C-4 for adoption of official positions.

7. DEFINITIONS

Urban cities are those incorporated cities located, either fully or partially, within Clackamas County and also located within Metro's Urban Growth Boundary.

Rural Cities are those incorporated cities located within Clackamas County and also located outside Metro's Urban Growth Boundary.

The Hamlets and Villages are designated communities recognized by Clackamas County as participating in the Hamlets and Villages Program.

Housing as a topic of discussion is not specifically found in the primary functions of the bylaws, but is understood by C-4 to fall within land use and transportation issues.

Community Planning Organizations (CPOs) are officially recognized by the County and statutorily defined public bodies that consist of citizen volunteers who represent their neighborhoods on issues of importance to local communities and make decisions and recommendations to the County.

8. AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended from time to time by a majority of the members of C-4, provided that all voting members of C-4 and all fire districts, water districts/authorities and sanitary sewer districts/authorities have been sent copies of the proposed amendments thirty (30) days prior to the meeting where action on the rules is scheduled.

Adopted on September 26, 2001

Amended on March 3, 2005

Amended on February 5, 2009

Amended on January 7, 2010

Amended on November 3, 2011

Amended on April 4, 2013

Amended on December 5, 2013

Amended on January 5, 2017

Amended on October 5, 2017

Amended on February 1, 2018



C4 Retreat

June 14, 2024

1:45 p.m.

Session 02

2025 Transportation Package with the Co-Chairs of the Joint Committee on Transportation Package

Summary

*Presenting: Senator Chris Gorsek, Co-Chair, Joint Transportation Committee
Representative Susan McLain, Co-Chair, Joint Transportation Committee*

The Joint Committee on Transportation has launched a 12 meeting roadshow to hear from communities across Oregon to learn about priorities and prepare for a potential transportation package in the 2025 Legislative Session. The Co-Chairs are making a special visit to the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4) retreat for a unique chance to discuss the funding landscape following the governor's decision to pause tolling, the State Legislature's promise in 2017 to deliver solutions to bottleneck projects, and how to work together to find a path forward.

Session Breakdown

- 15m – Opening Remarks
- 45m – Q&A

Materials Provided for this Session

- Guest Speaker Biographies
- Legislative Leadership Letter
- JCT Roadshow Calendar

This page left intentionally blank.

Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT) Co-Chairs



State Senator Chris Gorsek

Senator Chris Gorsek is an educator, dad, grandfather, and former police officer serving Senate District 25. He prides himself on using his role in the state legislature to improve, reform, and strengthen Oregon communities. Senator Gorsek is the Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on Transportation; the Co-Chair of the Joint Interim Committee on the Interstate 5 Bridge; a member of the Senate Interim Committee on Veterans, Emergency Management, Federal and World Affairs; a member of the Senate Interim Committee on Health Care, a member of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Public Safety; and a member of the Joint Emergency Board Interim Subcommittee on Public Safety.

State Representative Susan McLain

Representative Susan McLain is a lifelong Oregonian who spent over 40 years as a high school teacher and speech and debate coach. She served as a Metro Councilor for 16 years and joined the State Legislature in 2015. Representative McLain is the Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on Transportation, Co-Chair of the Joint Committee on the Interstate 5 Bridge, a member of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means, Co-Chair of the Joint Education Appropriations Committee, a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education, and of the house Committee on Agriculture, Land Use, Natural Resources, and Water.



TINA KOTEK
GOVERNOR

May 6, 2024

Senator Chris Gorsek, Co-Chair
Joint Committee on Transportation
900 Court Street NE, S-403
Salem, OR 97301

Representative Susan McLain, Co-Chair
Joint Committee on Transportation
900 Court Street NE, H-493
Salem, OR 97301

Senator Brian Boquist, Co-Vice Chair
Joint Committee on Transportation
900 Court Street NE, S-311
Salem, OR 97301

Representative Shelly Boshart Davis, Co-Vice Chair
Joint Committee on Transportation
900 Court Street NE, H-389
Salem, OR 97301

Co-Chairs Gorsek and McLain, Vice Chairs Boquist and Boshart Davis:

We want to thank you for your leadership and commitment to crafting a transportation package that will ensure the safety of Oregonians as they utilize our state's transportation systems now and into the future. The work you are leading is vital to maintaining a safe, functional, and efficient multimodal transportation system, particularly as we respond to a changing funding landscape. We support and commend the plan you have built together to set the stage for this important discussion, including the efforts you will make to directly engage with communities on this critical issue during your statewide tour.

We want to highlight our shared priorities as you prepare to build public understanding of the structural funding challenges Oregon faces and to gather input from communities about preferred solutions. First and foremost, we must provide stable and predictable funding for the Oregon Department of Transportation so the agency can provide the essential maintenance and safety services that Oregonians deserve. Our solution needs to be equitable, sustainable and sufficient to provide a safe and reliable multimodal transportation system that connects people and helps Oregon's communities and economy thrive. We must consider a mix of solutions, but our final package must incorporate community input and be true to Oregon's values and priorities.

Creating and maintaining safe transportation systems is critical. Oregonians must be able to trust that they and their families can use our transportation network for work, school, or play safely.

Finally, the 2025 transportation package should ensure that we remain focused on meeting our existing maintenance needs while fulfilling the state's commitment to high priority House Bill 2017 projects that have not been completed. Finishing these critical projects will leverage significant federal funds, create family-wage jobs, and set Oregon up for future growth. This means we must prioritize completing existing projects before future projects can advance.

254 STATE CAPITOL, SALEM OR 97301-4047 (503) 378-3111 FAX (503) 378-8970

WWW.GOVERNOR.OREGON.GOV

Joint Committee on Transportation
May 6, 2024
Page 2


Our expectation is that the Joint Committee on Transportation will engage with community leaders and other important stakeholders in the months leading up to the 2025 session, including in communities across the state over the interim. This outreach should allow for communities to hear about the structural challenges facing the statewide transportation system, and for legislators to hear about both Oregonians' preferred solutions to this problem and transportation safety concerns in local communities.

We look forward to working closely with you over the coming months to develop a plan to build a safe, multimodal transportation system and deliver a plan for future success.

Sincerely,



Governor Tina Kotek



Senate President Rob Wagner



House Speaker Julie Fahey

Chair:
Sen. Chris Gorsek
Rep. Susan McLain

Vice-Chair:
Sen. Brian Boquist
Rep. Shelly Boshart Davis

Staff:
Patrick Brennan, LPRO Analyst
Beverly Schoonover, LPRO Analyst



82nd LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
JOINT COMMITTEE ON Transportation

State Capitol
900 Court St. NE
Salem, OR 97301
503-986-1674

Members:
Sen. Lynn Findley
Sen. Lew Frederick
Sen. Aaron Woods
Rep. Paul Evans
Rep. Kevin Mannix
Rep. Nancy Nathanson
Rep. Khanh Pham
Rep E. Werner Reschke

State Transportation Conversations Across Rural and Urban Communities for 2025 Package

Purpose

- The Joint Committee on Transportation (JCT) will be holding 12 meetings and local tours around the state for the purpose discussing the need for stable and sufficient transportation funding in anticipation of the 2025 legislative session. sufficient transportation funding in anticipation of the 2025 legislative session. The goal of convening these meetings around the state is to:
 - Build public understanding of transportation funding challenges and potential funding tools to address those challenges
 - Build legislative understanding of statewide transportation needs and shared priorities
 - Build local, regional, statewide support and a sense of urgency for a transportation funding package focused on maintenance, operations, and safety
 - Gather input from the public and community leaders about preferred methods for addressing the transportation funding challenge

Invited Participants

- The JCT will invite the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Oregon Transportation Commission, local senators, and representatives to join the JCT at the community meetings.

Potential Luncheons/Roundtables with Local Officials

- Each stop will include a conversation with local officials, including community leaders, local elected officials, local legislators, and local business leaders. Conversation focused on what suggestions local officials are interested in discussing as potential policy tools to be considered (local needs assessment, weight mile, CPI on the gas tax, etc.)

Planned Site Tours


- ODOT will be asked to work with local communities to identify 2-3 locations that demonstrate the type of ongoing maintenance needs that the local community may want to share with the legislators at each meeting location.
- From the ODOT provided list the JCT Chairs and Vice-Chairs will select one location to tour.

Meeting Agendas

- High Level Report on Needs Assessment
 - ODOT
 - 10 minutes
- Potential Policy Solutions
 - ODOT
 - 10-15 minutes
- Public Testimony
 - Public testimony informed by the needs assessment and potential policy solutions outlined in meeting
 - 90 minutes

Locations

Location	Notes	Proposed Date(s)
Downtown Portland	Group 1 - First Stop	Tuesday, June 4
Tillamook	Group 2	Tuesday, June 18
Albany	Group 3	Tuesday, July 16
Eugene	Group 3	Wednesday, July 17
Coos Bay	Group 4	Wednesday, August 7
Medford	Group 4	Thursday, August 8
Bend	Group 5	Wednesday, August 28
The Dalles	Group 5	Thursday August 29
Ontario	Group 6	Thursday, September 12
Hermiston	Group 6	Friday, September 13
Happy Valley	Group 1 - Last Stops	Thursday, September 26
Hillsboro	Group 1 - Last Stops	Friday, September 27





C4 Retreat
June 14, 2024
3:00 p.m.

Session 03

Transportation Funding Values

Summary

In 2023, an outcome of the C4 retreat was the crafting of values and outcomes to address concerns about proposed tolling programs. With the pause on tolling now in effect and the state legislature poised to seeking funding solutions in 2025, C4 has the opportunity to amend and update their values and outcomes to focus on transportation topics they can potentially support.

Session Breakdown

- 05m – Localize Transportation Work, Survey Results
- 10m –Activity Introduction
- 20m – Transportation Funding Values Exercise
- 20m – Table Share
- 10m – Consensus

Materials Provided for this Session

- 2023 Values and Outcomes Document on Tolling
- 2023 Retreat Transcripts

This page left intentionally blank.

Joint Values on the Proposed Regional Congestion Pricing and Toll Projects within the Portland Metro Region

December 5, 2023

The jurisdictions named here support a functional regional transportation system that prioritizes safety, equity, a vibrant economy, healthy and active communities, climate action, disaster resilience, and the reliable movement of people and goods.

We acknowledge that additional transportation funding is needed to address maintenance and capital projects on the interstate system. We recognize ODOT has been directed to pursue pricing in some form, but also that toll collections have been paused until 2026 in order to better address local concerns. As ODOT continues to advance tolling and explore other funding strategies, the jurisdictions listed here will advocate for the following values to be reflected in any proposed policy or project.

These values are not an endorsement of any proposal to implement tolling or congestion pricing.

To rebuild trust with local communities, ODOT must...

- Be influenced by local voices and jurisdictions ahead of implementation
- Deliver clear benefits to the drivers, communities, and businesses affected by toll corridors
- Prioritize robust and inclusive community engagement
- Incorporate and track commitments made with local and regional partners through transparent and consistent communication

To ensure the transportation system works for Oregonians, the OTC and the State Legislature should direct ODOT to...

- Extend the existing revenue sharing models with local jurisdictions to apply to toll revenues
- Prioritize the completion of the bottleneck projects identified in HB 2017 (2017) and HB 3055 (2021)
- Explore alternative funding mechanisms beyond pricing to address transportation funding needs
- Provide adequate public transit infrastructure within proposed toll corridors

To ensure the efficient and equitable movement of people and goods, tolling or congestion pricing programs should...

- Decrease diversion into local communities
- Increase safety on and off the interstate system
- Ensure that all tolling or congestion programs are designed with regional implementation and collaboration in mind to avoid disproportionate economic impacts or unfair burdens on people and communities
- Support a regionally balanced transportation system that provides reliable travel times for commuters and employers on and off the tolled corridor
- Establish viable travel alternatives to accommodate mode shifts, including bicycle and pedestrian networks and accessible transit programs in areas with inadequate or no service
- Provide considerations for local trips with few or no alternatives
- Improve transportation system resiliency to natural disasters, such as earthquakes and wildfires
- Improve regional air quality and reduce vehicle pollution, both on and off the interstate system
- Establish a long-term oversight and accountability committee to provide transparency
- Consider recommendations from the Low-income Toll Report and the Equity Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC)
- Address the land use implications inherent with how tolling will affect local communities



City of Tualatin



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

2023 C4 Retreat – Transcription of Transportation Exercise

Transportation Pages

Brainstorm Session

What does success look like in 2026 under the following topics?

Engagement/Local Involvement

- More positive benefit than negative impacts on EVERY community member
- Show your work. Where is the data?
- Accountability and local involvement via work group or legislative subcommittee
- Bring the rural areas into the conversation
 - Woodburn, aurora,
 - Marion, Clack, Yamhill, Hood River
 - CPOs, Hamlets
- OTC members visit the communities and drive the roads
- Strickler at C4 and on local tours
- Empower a local task force to inform the legislature (and provide staffing for it), not ODOT
- Where does IP4 come in?
- Reengage R1ACT – 6 DOTS
- AOC+LOC need to be involved
- How to engage the freight lobby

Equity and Access

- Women should be considered within the equity analysis
- Low income families trying to get to work should be included
- Toll the “entire” region – 2 DOTS
 - Could mean – toll all at once
 - Could mean – Toll 84, 26, 217 in addition to I-5 and I-205
- Restore “fareless square” (trimet)
- Remove barriers to equal access to transportation infrastructure
- Reengage how low income exemptions further reduce the already infeasible funding stream from tolls to complete projects
- Most vulnerable communities do not have a choice about when to travel. They cannot go to work at different times. Need better solution for hourly workers.
- Don’t pick off communities with pet projects – 5 DOTS
- Worry that only rich will be able to afford tolls – 1 DOT
- Equity reports cannot sit on shelf
- Too many unknowns, show the data
- Determine how to engage those who have barriers to engage
- Need to figure out how to get away from current assumptions/presumptions. Need to understand the exact cost on drivers, families, businesses.
- Must have larger voice where tolls will be implemented.

Economic Impacts

- Equity for income restricted folks is a good idea, but it will make tolling a “zero sum game” Use other methods besides tolling
- Statutory revenue sharing with local governments (like 50/30/20)
- Study micro-economic impacts
 - E.g. saying that tolling creates “construction jobs” is not an economic analysis
- Business communities need a solution for how tolling is going to impact how and where people shop, dine, and recreate
- Free up federal and state funding for local projects with less process
- Develop more “15 minute” cities where everything is close and people rarely need to travel on tolled roadways
- Push an Environmental Impact Statement that evaluates accurate and agreed upon economic impacts – **13 DOTS**
- Study effects on retail and how prices are affected by shipping, pre-manufacturing, and deliveries.

Alternative Modes of Travel – 1 DOT

- Effective Metro ride-share
- More transit coverage + services
- Transit that address the needs of the community – **3 DOTS**
- Funding for alternative mode infrastructure
- Transit system in place that includes shuttles, last mile service, improved connectivity between TriMet and local providers, and founding to the “small providers” for stable operations
- Financial incentives for utilization
- On-demand micro transit (example: uber-shuttle) – **2 DOTS**
- How to make people feel safe using transit?
 - How to design spaces success (example: women waiting at bus stop at night)
- “point to point” public transportation in the rural areas
- Problem: Stafford has no transit system and is too hilly for bikes as a primary method for its residents

Climate

- Improved Air Quality
- Electric car charging stations
- How do we make light vehicles obsolete?
- Mode shift requires “real” other options
- Diversion = reduced air quality and idling
- Need to think outside of the box
- Complete the local bike/PED/trail network
- How does backyard build policies (like ADUs) affect rural/urban air quality

Diversion

- ODOT fund replacement of trolley trail bridge, connect OC to Gladstone
- Funding for REAL solutions
- Diversion free solutions – **2 DOTS**
- If tolling, then gantry locations that minimize the diversion trends

- System upgrades to improve transit efficiency – 1 DOT
- Toll Free Lanes – 6 DOTS
- Involve the rural areas on diversion discussions – 1 DOT

Safety

- Less fear of sharing the road with “big rigs”
- Improve safety for crossing roads, not only driving along them.
- Improved safety on the local system as well as the main lines
- Invest in local shuttles and transit, demonstrate safety and dependability.
- Safety improvements DOT NOT equal diversion mitigation
- Safe system approach. We need to eliminate ALL the fatalities and serious injuries, maintain current roads, fix potholes
- Diversion solutions to discourage cut-through traffic
- Keeping diversion off local roads and out of neighborhoods. Frustrated drivers will cut through local communities
- Educate how to properly merge
- Give cities the authority to set speed limits
- How do we help people feel safe accessing + using transit
- More people “like me” on transit, less fear of scary people

Different Funding Ideas

- ODOT thoughtfully considers other tolling strategies besides JUST toll all lanes at all times, such as express lanes or free lanes, cordon pricing, and/or vehicle miles traveled – 7 DOTS
- Funding by reworking DEQ emissions by bonding fees revenue to pay for 3rd lane – 1 DOT
- McClain no longer transportation co-chair
- Use Kicker to fund ODOT projects
 - \$8B kicker shows there is money to budget for transportation projects
- Better freight transportation infrastructure and single driver transit alternatives – 2 DOT
- No tolling
- Funding from EV charging stations fees
- Mileage fees
- More Vehicle Registration Fee – 1 DOT
- Better use of highways around the clock with commercial transportation incentives for driving off-peak hours.
- VMT (Vehicles Miles Traveled) – could have actual data on which roads are used, justifies where dollars can go, more specific than 50-30-20
- Parking fees in high impact areas are more equitable than tolls?
- Make the freight lobby tell local governments what they tell ODOT/legislature re their support for tolls
- Retune the Oregon land use laws and practices



C4 Retreat
June 14, 2024
4:20 p.m.

Session 04

Transportation Funding: Adding Outcomes to Values

Summary

Retreat guests will work from a provided menu of “outcomes” related to various transportation topics and seek to match those outcomes to the values they support from Session 3.


Session Breakdown

- 10m – Table Activity Introduction
- 30m – Naming Outcomes for Agreed Upon Values
- 20m – Table Reporting on the Draft Outcomes
- 20m – Group Consensus Discussion
- 20m – Preferred future topics on 2025 Transportation Package

Materials Provided for this Session

- Materials Provided at the Retreat

This page left intentionally blank.





C4 Retreat

June 15, 2024

8:00 a.m.

Session 05

How will we work together to accommodate housing production and job growth?

Summary

C4 will embark on a conversation about how it plans to work together to address incoming state directives to increase housing production, where job growth fits into its scope, and how to capture state dollars aimed at infrastructure funding to advance the Governor's executive orders on housing.


Session Breakdown

- 5m – Topic Introduction, Housing Infrastructure Reminder, Goal for the day
- 25m – Survey Responses on Housing
 - 5m - Survey review
 - 20m - Room Discussion

Materials Provided for this Session

- May C4 Presentation
- May MPAC DLCDC Presentation on Housing Production

This page left intentionally blank.



OREGON

Department of
Land Conservation
& Development



Oregon Housing Needs Analysis (HB 2001)

Washington County Coordinating Committee

Sean Edging, Senior Housing Planner

Methodology Process

What's the process for determining the OHNA methodology?

House Bill 2001/2889 (2023 Session)

Department of Administrative Services

- OHNA - Estimate* and allocate need
- Production targets


Oregon Housing and Community Services

- Housing Production Dashboard
- Housing Equity Indicators
- Methodology recommendations to DAS

Department of Land Conservation and Development

- Goal 10 Implementation
- Housing Acceleration Program
- Methodology recommendations to DAS

*OHNA functions differently in the Metro



*Metro has a different approach in state law

Statewide Methodology

Includes cities outside of Metro


DAS Estimate → Allocation
→ Production Targets

Metro Methodology

Metro Estimate → DAS
Allocation → Production
Targets

DAS must consider:


- Population Growth
- Regional Job Distribution
- Equitable Distribution



House Bill 2001/2889 (2023 Session)

May 3 – Statewide Methodology Webinar ([recording](#))

May 20 – [Metro Methodology Webinar](#) (recording will be published to [OHCS OHNA webpage](#))



*survey link for feedback on methods will be sent post-webinar

HCS.OHNA@hcs.oregon.gov to provide public comment

Goal 10 – Housing

“To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state. Buildable lands for residential use shall be inventoried and plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.”



OHNA Policy Implications

How will the methodology be used? How will this affect local planning?




State coordination, investment, and partnership

Local decision-making, implementation, and solutions

Goal 10 – Housing

“To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state. Buildable lands for residential use shall be inventoried and plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.”

Metro estimate*; State allocation;
Local policy decisions



Track progress towards outcomes



The Goal 10 Process


State | Local

Housing Acceleration Program


What if a city/county falls behind on progress towards outcomes?

DLCD will periodically audit some cities above 10,000 population to evaluate **local and state barriers** to production, affordability, and choice.

Legislative Intent: State and local governments take **actions within their control** to address need



OHNA Rulemaking (DLCD)



Learn more & get involved:

<https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/housing/pages/rulemaking.aspx>



OREGON HOUSING *and*
COMMUNITY SERVICES



DLCD

Washington County Coordinating Committee

Sean Edging, Senior Housing Planner

Questions

RECENT HISTORY OF STATE FUNDING FOR HOUSING PRODUCTION AND INDUSTRY INVESTMENT

C4 Meeting

May 2, 2024

WHY ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THIS?

- Growing interest in Housing in Clackamas County
- Governor Kotek's goal to add 36,000 new units every year
- CHIPS Act Funding Reaction of “why not us?” and “what is our role?”

C4 RETREAT OPPORTUNITY

- Have independent goals with multiple strategies
- Have mutual goals with coordinated strategies



HOUSING

- Executive Order 23-04
- There are 25 members on the Housing Production Advisory Council (HPAC) that bring a broad set of disciplines and represent Oregon's diverse demographics and geography. This includes OHCS Director, Andrea Bell, as an agency member of the council. ***This council will direct and guide the state to reach the annual housing production goal of 36,000 additional housing units at all levels of affordability.***

36,000 / CLACKAMAS

- What is our role?
- What is required?
- Whose job is it to meet the demand?
- Are there enough resources?
- Is there interest?
- What are the hurdles?
- What is the methodology?

STATE FUNDING

- 2023
- \$1 billion
 - Home Ownership - \$20m
 - Affordable Housing - \$721m
 - Homelessness - \$396
- 2024
- \$375 million
 - State Agency Support - \$89.5
 - Housing and Homelessness - \$131m
 - Housing Infrastructure - \$123m
 - Healthy and Safe Homes - \$24.5m
 - Direct Allocations - \$7.1

\$123.55 MILLION

Breakdown

- \$94.3 million for housing infrastructure and production
- \$29.25 million for land acquisition

Intent

- Advance site-specific infrastructure
- Focus on non-transportation infrastructure
- Should contribute toward housing production

SO WHAT / NOW WHAT?

Lingering questions:

- Will there be more money?
- Will you/we be ready to ask for it?
- Is C4 a group that can enhance support for future requests?

WHAT ABOUT INDUSTRY?

CHIPS for America Fund

\$54.2 Billion

DOC Manufacturing Incentives

\$39.0

DOC Research and Development

\$11.0

CHIPS for America Defense Fund

\$2.0

Public Wireless Supply Chain Innovation Fund

\$1.5

CHIPS for America International Technology
Security and Innovation Fund

\$0.5

CHIPS for America Workforce
and Education Fund

\$0.2

WHAT HAPPENED IN 2022

- Oregon Senators acted swiftly
- Regional partners in the industry were invited to a work group
- State legislature created a committee specific to semiconductor investments

SB 4, HB 2009 (2023)

- Authorized \$210 million in incentives
- Created zoning allowances specific to the semi-conductor industry

SO WHAT / NOW WHAT?

Lessons learned from Rep. Janelle Bynum

- Do more work up front
- Identify your “story”

Opportunities and/or questions

- Does Clackamas have a story, or want to work to create one?
- Where does C4 come into play?
- Is there a difference between this and the housing production conversation?

DISCUSSION



C4 Retreat

June 15, 2024

8:30 a.m.

Session 06

Housing and Job Growth Visioning

Summary

In the wake of needing to thinking about what communities will have to do to accommodate growth, Session 6 will allow C4 members to work together to showcase what they want to do.

Session Breakdown



- 05m – Introductions
- 25m – Room Activity
 - What does a community look like where everyone is housed?
 - What does a community look like that supports adequate job growth?
 - What does a community look like where everyone has adequate infrastructure and services?
- 20m - Report Out and Discussion

Materials Provided for this Session



- Image Collage

This page left intentionally blank.

C4 Retreat Visioning Collage











C4 Retreat

June 15, 2024

9:20 a.m.

Session 07

Housing and Job Accommodation Challenges and Opportunities

Summary

Recognizing that communities within Clackamas each have individual traits, retreat attendees will spend time diving deeper into the challenges of opportunities of specific types of growth, and begin to identify where they may wish to prioritize future work and information gathering.

Session Breakdown

- 05m – Introductions, expectations/instructions for this time
- 20m – Table Activities
 - **Growing Out**
 - To grow out, my community needs ...
 - To grow out, developers are asking for ...
 - To grow out, these policies are in my way ...
 - Working together to grow out could look like ...
 - **Growing In/Up**
 - To grow in/up, my community needs ...
 - To grow in/up, developers are asking for ...
 - I want to grow in/up, these policies are in my way ...
 - Working together to grow in/up could look like ...
 - **Growing Jobs**
 - To grow jobs, my community needs ...
 - To grow jobs, businesses/industries are asking for ...
 - I want to grow jobs, but these limitations are in my way ...
 - Working together to grow jobs could look like ...

- **Growing Affordable Housing**
 - To grow affordable housing, my community needs ...
 - To grow affordable housing, developers are asking for ...
 - I want to grow affordable housing, but these policies are in my way ...
 - Working together to grow affordable housing could look like ...

- 20m – Table Reports

Materials Provided for this Session

- 2023 SWOT Answers

This page left intentionally blank.

2023 C4 Retreat – Transcription of Notes and Wall Boards (from Housing Day)

Housing Day

C4 Housing Action Items

- Outreach opportunities/info sharing.
 - Present more to cities
- Identify dirt for development and/or willingness to development (re cities, property owners)
- Could this work live in its own subcommittee?
- Can we create an inventory or dashboard of this work?
- Where can ClackCo TV help in this work?
 - Re communication, positive outreach/information
- Re Behavioral Health, can we do a gap analysis?
 - What resources do we have?
 - What is lacking?
- Can we take stronger legislative positions on this work?

Table A SWOT: Availability of Developable Lands - 3 DOTS

- Strengths
 - Building OUT existing land
 - We have the BEST staff
 - We plan for growth
- Weakness
 - UGB + Usable lands – 3 DOTS
 - Cost of permits
 - Growth pays for development
 - Disproportionate growth in the county
- Opportunities
 - 99 corridor
 - Sunrise gateway
 - Focus on areas w/ public services
 - Middle housing retrofits + homelessness – 4 DOTS
- Threats
 - Infrastructure - 7 dots
 - Community receptiveness
 - Short term rentals
 - Mandates vs innovation – 1 dot
 - Interest rates

Table B SWOT: Financial Incentives – 1 DOT

- Strengths
 - Metro Bond – 2 DOTS
 - SHS Money – 2 DOTS
 - State Money
 - Public/private opportunities
- Weakness

- Lack of funding
- Constrained funds
- Opportunities
 - Land – 3 DOTS
 - SDC waivers
 - Tax exemptions
 - Planning Departments
 - Predictability
 - Communication – 1 DOT
- Threats
 - NIMBY – 1 DOT
 - Political landscape
 - Zoning
 - Clear scope/target (don't fit all of the issues into one deal)
 - Cost/Interest Rates – 1 DOT

Table C SWOT: Street Outreach, Navigation, and Shelters – 1 DOT

- Strengths
 - \$\$\$
 - Coordination of CBOs responsive to increased need + pressure
 - Coordinating with Cities + City Police
 - WL, Wils, OC, Milw. Behavioral Health Officer/Case Manager – 2 DOTS
 - Single COC
 - Good county coordination
 - Milw. + OC have city level coordinating meetings
- Weakness
 - Lack of rural area outreach and knowledge (e.g. private property, can't see from road)
 - Not enough shelter, sheer # of beds in enough places – 1 DOT
 - WL no designated projects
 - More coverage in rural areas – 2 DOTS
 - Gap in personal connections
- Opportunities
 - Relatively small population = high touch + individualized treatment plans
 - Greater coordination between cities and county – 1 DOT
 - Coordination for foster youth
- Threats
 - SHS funds end in 8 years, then what? – 2 DOTS
 - Some shelter might close and population will further centralize in OC – 1 DOT
 - NIMBY
 - Public perception
 - Obsessed with data, not results
 - Location, zoning, willingness

Table D SWOT: Rapid Rehousing + Supportive Housing

- Strengths

- Good staff w/helpful information and programs.
 - But... (arrow pointing to weakness)
- Weakness
 - Cities don't know what programs/resources the county offers – 2 DOTS
 - Phone tree = lost in the abyss
 - 24/7 doesn't exist
- Opportunities
 - County could present to city councils – 4 DOTS
- Threats
 - Doesn't address root cause of crisis
 - More of a band aid

Table E SWOT: Behavioral Health + Addiction Recovery – 1 DOT

- Strengths
 - Engaged together, focused on improvements
 - Recognized statewide crisis
- Weakness
 - Resources not distributed geographically
 - Lack of overall capacity
 - Transportation challenges
 - Diversity from treatment
 - Lack of awareness as a cause of homelessness
- Opportunities
 - Diversify locations – 7 DOTS
 - Services integrated with law enforcement and public safety
 - Fostering more community support and resources – 1 DOT
- Threats
 - Measure 110 – 1 DOT
 - Proliferation of illicit substances
 - High rates of youth substance use
 - Easy access

Table F SWOT: Self Sufficiency, Childcare, Workforce (1 DOT)

- Strengths
 - Supporting what is already being done
 - Community Colleges
- Weakness
 - Lack of Childcare networks – 3 DOTS
 - Providers
 - Funding (lack of) – 1 DOT
 - Integration with school system - 3 DOTS
- Opportunities
 - Roadmaps for Kids/Workforce – 3 DOTS
 - Public/Private Partnerships on Childcare
- Threats
 - People not wanting to work in the sector
 - High turnover

- High stress/workload

Day 1 “Family Meeting”

- Oregon City: Can the county adopt our 3 concept plans?
 - Need county help with that?
 - Do property owners need to annex into the city for that?
- Happy Valley: We need improved transportation facilities
 - Low city property tax, unable to create incentives
- Lake Oswego
 - How to bring more of the unincorporated areas into the cities?
 - Is there a coordinated effort on that?
- County:
 - Do cities have “dirt” to build more affordable housing?
- Happy valley:
 - Trying to meet CFEC rules, create walkable communities
 - How can the county help with the fringes?
 - Is the county thinking about Housing Bond 2.0?
 - Transit is a hurdle for us
- Wilsonville
 - Are there dollars to buy down land?
- Metro: The bond dollars are allocated, no money to dip into at this point
- West Linn: Wants to connect more with cities, education on what is happening with housing
- County:
 - If there is city buy-in... call us. We want to partner
- Molalla:
 - Welcome more information/visits with staff at our work sessions
 - Don’t forget about the cities that don’t have Metro money
- Milwaukie:
 - How do we preserve affordability?
 - Are there legislative opportunities, such as addressing tax credits and caps, funding future housing needs assessments and tax data
- Happy Valley
 - How do we mutually lift up grant applications, how do we share expertise if a city doesn’t have it – like with affordable housing projects?
 - What market innovations are we looking at?
 - How to equip property owners to reconsider or reconfigure their space?
- County:
 - How do we streamline, get creative and fund “NOW” ways to address housing
 - Example, home-share
- Milwaukie
 - Want to prioritize work/live developments
 - Interested in environmental reuse
 - Focused on workforce improvements
- Wilsonville
 - Can the county create a dashboard of the work going on?

Day 1 Parking Lot

- Low hanging fruit #1: provide supplemental funding and supplies so that senior centers are community centers can operate as warming/cooling shelters. Note: cooling shelters don't require overnight accommodation, so school gyms could be used for this too.
- Low hanging fruit #2: Many churches want to serve as emergency shelters. Create funding for improvements such as sparklers and egress windows. And create staff positions to help churches navigate conversations with neighbors
 - And what about churches with excess land that could be developed as affordable housing? How can we help them facilitate conversion in those instances?



C4 Retreat
June 15, 2024
10:30 a.m.

Session 08

Housing and Job Accommodation Next Steps

Summary

Retreat attendees will now focus their discussion on the lingering question of “what is C4’s role” on the topics of housing production and job growth.


Session Breakdown

- Group Discussion
 - What is C4’s role:
 - To advance housing production coordination in / around the county?
 - To coordinate legislative strategy around housing production?
 - As it relates to housing production, jobs, affordable housing, how does C4 want to engage in these topics?

Materials Provided for this Session

- Notes Pages

This page left intentionally blank.





C4 Retreat
June 15, 2024
11:00 a.m.

Session 09

Closing Session, C4 Priorities Planning

Summary

Retreat attendees close the retreat with a chance to review the preferred outcomes that were named during the retreat, and identify issues and topics that merit additional consideration for future C4 meetings.

Session Breakdown

- 30m – Goal Setting, next 12 months
- 10m – Next steps on Transportation Topics
- Retreat Wrap Up
 - Did you accomplish your goals?
 - What worked well, what could improve for next year?

Materials Provided for this Session

- Notes

This page left intentionally blank.

