Clackamas County Coordinating Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4)
Agenda

Thursday, September 01, 2016
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

Development Service Building
Main Floor Auditorium, Room 115
150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

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

   Welcome & Introductions
   Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs

   Housekeeping
   - Approval of August 04, 2016 C4 Minutes **Page 02**
   - Executive Committee Update

2. 6:55 p.m. **Transportation Project Prioritization Process**
   - Members discuss preferred results to be achieved when considering transportation priorities **Page 04**
   - Members discuss preferred approach to decision making when considering transportation priorities

3. 7:20 p.m. **R1ACT Annual Review**

4. 7:45 p.m. **C4 Bylaws Discussion** **Page 06**

5. 8:00 p.m. **Monthly Updates**
   - CMAQ Letters **Page 10**
   - Metro Mayors Consortium
   - JPACT/MPAC Update

6. 8:30 p.m. **Adjourn**

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4)

<<<<<<<< DRAFT MINUTES >>>>>>>>>

Thursday, August 04, 2016
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

Development Service Building
Main Floor Auditorium, Room 115
150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

Attendance –

Members: Clackamas County: Paul Savas (Co-chair); Chair John Ludlow (Alt); **Canby:** Brian Hodson (Co-chair); **CPOs:** Laurie Freeman Swanson; Marjorie Stewart (Alt.); **Fire Districts:** John Blanton; **Gladstone:** Kevin Johnson (Interim); **Hamlets:** Rick Cook; **Happy Valley:** Markley Drake; **Milwaukie:** Mark Gamba; Wilda Parks (Alt.); **Oregon City:** Dan Holladay; **Sandy:** Jeremy Pietzold; **Sanitary:** Terry Gibson; **Transit Agencies:** Stephan Lashbrook (Urban Alt.); Andi Howell (Rural Alt.); **Water Districts:** Hugh Kalani; **West Linn;** Brenda Perry; **Wilsonville:** Tim Knapp

C4 Staff: Gary Schmidt (PGA); Trent Wilson (PGA): Chris Lyons (PGA)

Guests: Jaimie Lorenzini (Happy Valley); Megan McKibben (Cong. Schrader); Annette Mattson (PGE); Eileen Stein (West Linn); Doug Riggs (West Linn); Seth Atkinson (Sandy); John Lewis (Oregon City); Karen Buehrig (CC); Steve Williams (CC); Rick Watanabe (CC); Mark Ottenad (Wilsonville);

<<<<<<<< DRAFT MINUTES >>>>>>>>>

Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome & Introductions
Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs

Motion to move "County Road Maintenance Funding" to the first agenda item.

Mayor Knapp motioned and Councilor Perry seconded. Motion approved.

City members expressed concern about the County's process to pursue city support for the upcoming county road maintenance funding fuel tax measure that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) plan to place on the November 2016 ballot. Concerns from the cities included: frustration about the language in the Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) requiring cities to sign a resolution of support to participate in a percentage share of the revenue, equity for citizens in cities where cities might not sign a resolution of

support, concern about the word “support” within the IGA and lack of clarity about how “support” might be interpreted, and frustration about how the IGA was created.

Attending commissioners replied to the concerns by citing the reasoning behind the County’s approach, namely that the cities requested in June for an IGA to exist and that, politically, support by the cities would be required for the proposed measure to have the possibility of passing. Commissioners also responded to cities by committing to bring back to the BCC a proposal to eliminate the IGA language requiring a resolution of support, and to remove the language of the word “support” in the IGA.

Housekeeping
Approved May 05, 2016 C4 Minutes

C4 Retreat Recap
C4 staff briefly recapped the retreat and outlined the outcomes, namely:

Housing:

- Bring back an outside (non-public) panel of presenters to a future C4 meeting to increase education on available resources
- Create a C4 Land Use Advisory Subcommittee (LUASC) (comprised of staff) to review discussion and bring back to C4 options for county-wide coordination and support.

Transportation:

- Work towards a more formalized process of coordination amongst Clackamas County jurisdictions to increase project competitiveness during grant cycles
- Create a more formalized project ranking list, after first discussing the subject of agreed upon criteria
- Discuss funding alternatives for local projects, which all currently compete for the same, limited funding streams

C4 staff sought approval by city members to reach out to city staff to support with the member makeup of the LUASC. C4 members voted to approve.

C4 members requested clarity about when the LUASC would report back to C4 and debated the type of work product they would produce (policy implementation vs staff recommendation). C4 staff clarified that the direction from the C4 retreat was for this group to remain a staff level body that would only be recommending possible policy options that C4 would have the option to pursue or not. The earliest the LUASC would return with a recommendation is December 2016.

Transportation Project Coordination
Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County Transportation Planning Supervisor, presented an outcome by the C4 Metro Subcommittee regarding “guiding principles” for coordination to support Clackamas jurisdictions applying for funding in the Metro Transportation Improvement Program/Regional Flex Funds Allocation (MTIP/RFFA). While seeking feedback from C4 about whether the larger C4 body agreed with principles and whether C4 would be interested in pursuing similar coordination principles for other funding opportunities, confusion occurred when members began seeking clarity about why C4 was being asked to “agree and approve” what the C4 Metro Subcommittee had already approved. Staff offered that the C4 Metro Subcommittee was a subcommittee of C4 and that only the full C4 could approve actions. Cities countered that the subcommittee level was the proper venue to make decisions as those decisions only concerned the membership of the subcommittee, not the entire C4 membership. Conversation halted when the bylaws did not provide clarity to this point, and members agreed the bylaws required attention to address this question.

Adjourn

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4)
2016 Retreat
Friday, June 24 – Saturday, June 25

Resort at the Mountain
68010 East Fairway Avenue, Welches, OR 97067

Retreat Summary

Friday, June 24

Session 1: Transportation Coordination Panel: *The Importance of Coordination!*

A panel of speakers from the ODOT, Metro, and Washington County shared information and strategies related to funding streams, tools, and coordinating models to encourage new ideas for funding regionally agreed upon transportation projects. Presenters included Elissa Gertler from Metro, Andrew Singelakis from Washington County, and Kelly Brooks from ODOT.

Session 2: Transportation Coordination Exercise: *What could coordination look like in Clackamas County?*

In response to the 2015 C4 Retreat goal to "create a general, countywide prioritization list as a review mechanism for transportation projects being submitted for STIP, MTIP, TIGER, etc.", Clackamas County teamed up with staff from other Clackamas County jurisdictions to create and rank a draft list of transportation projects that have "county-wide significance". C4 members considered the value of this tool and exercise amidst other discussions related to county-wide coordination on transportation needs.

C4 members divided into groups and discussed different elements of coordination and their experience with the prioritization exercise. Members concluded the exercise represented a step in the right direction towards a model that Clackamas County (and C4) might use to prioritize countywide projects for funding, but that more work needed to be done.

Session 3: Affordable Housing Presentation and Goal Sharing: *What are the needs and where do they exist?*

County staff shared details about the range of housing needs in and around Clackamas County, ranging from houselessness to housing services to the "missing middle" to high value, single family development. There were many questions for the presenters, which did not leave enough time to transition into the "goal sharing" component of the agenda.

Session 4: Housing Information and Coordination Session: *What can we do?*

This session provided opportunities to learn more about specific areas of interest within the "Affordable Housing" conversation and helped C4 reach consensus about achievable next steps and tools available to local jurisdictions. Breakout tables included discussions on Houselessness, Affordable Housing Needs and Services, and Development and Housing Affordability.

Session 5: Goal Setting for the 2016 C4 Agenda

C4 members reviewed the topics from the weekend and shared hopes and expectations for moving forward. These included:

Housing:

- Bring back an outside (non-public) panel of presenters to a future C4 meeting to increase education on available resources
- Create a Clackamas Land Use Advisory Committee (made of staff) to review discussion and bring back to C4 options for county-wide coordination and support.

Transportation:

- Work towards a more formalized process of coordination amongst Clackamas County jurisdictions to increase project competitiveness during grant cycles
- Create a more formalized project ranking list, after first discussing the subject of agreed upon criteria
- Discuss funding alternatives for local project, which all currently compete for the same, limited funding streams

Note: For more details on the Housing and Transportation Goals, please see the "2016 C4 Retreat Flip Chart Transcriptions" located in this summary packet.

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

The voting membership shall consist of one (1) elected representative and an elected alternate appointed by the City Council of the Metro Jurisdiction Cities of: Damascus, Gladstone, Happy Valley, Johnson City, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie, Oregon City, Rivergrove, Tualatin, West Linn and Wilsonville; and the non-Metro/Rural Cities of: Barlow, Canby, Estacada, Molalla and Sandy. The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners shall be represented by two (2) voting members. The voting membership shall also include one (1) elected representative of fire districts, one (1) elected representative of water districts/authorities, one (1) elected representative of sanitary sewer districts/authorities, one (1) representative of Villages, one (1) representative of Hamlets and one (1) representative of CPOs. A Metro councilor, one (1) representative from the Port of Portland, one (1) representative from a rural transit agency and one (1) representative from an urban transit agency are included as non-voting members. The representatives of the Port of Portland and the transit agencies do not have to be elected officials to serve in this non-voting capacity.

The cities shall provide the names of their elected C-4 representatives and alternates by letter signed by the Mayor or his/her designee in December of each even 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 by established by agreement among each of the groups of Districts/Authorities, Hamlets, and 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 December of every odd-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 December of each odd-numbered year and the name of the representative and alternate shall be submitted to the C-4 Secretary in January of the following year.

Each jurisdiction with a voting membership shall have one vote, with the exception of the County which has two (2) votes. The cities, special districts, and Clackamas County representatives to JPACT and MPAC will be on the policy body but shall not have an additional vote.

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. This committee shall set the agendas for meetings of C-4 and to 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 January 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 January 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 February 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

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.

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.

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.

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 Roberts' Rules newly revised.

G. Agenda Items
Before presentation to C-4 for action, agenda items shall be sent to the member jurisdictions and to all fire districts, water districts/authorities and sanitary sewer districts/authorities for discussion by the governing body. Compliance with this requirement may be waived where circumstances warrant faster action by a majority vote of C-4.

6. ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEES:

A. Metro Subcommittee
C-4 members who are within the Metro jurisdiction shall be a subcommittee of C-4 named Metro subcommittee. This subcommittee shall at a minimum be the body which nominates and elects cities' representatives to: Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT); Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and associated technical committees: Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC); and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) respectively. These nominations and elections shall occur in November of each even numbered year in accordance with Metro Charter requirements.

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 ODOT Region 1. 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. Transportation Advisory Subcommittee

The membership of the Transportation Advisory Subcommittee 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. The Transportation Advisory Subcommittee shall operate under the same procedures as the policy body, and will meet as needed to be determined by subcommittee members.

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.

7. DEFINITIONS

Urban cities are those incorporated cities within Clackamas County that are within Metro's Urban Growth Boundary.

Rural Cities are those incorporated cities located outside the Metro's Urban Growth Boundary.

The Hamlets of Clackamas County include: Beavercreek, Molalla Prairie, Mulino and Stafford; and one Village: the Villages at Mt Hood (collectively Brightwood, Rhododendron, Welches, Wemme and Zig Zag).

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

CLACKAMAS COUNTY

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING
2051 KAEN ROAD | OREGON CITY, OR 97045

August 9, 2016

Matthew Garrett, Director
Oregon Department of Transportation
355 Capitol Street
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Mr. Garrett:

We are concerned about the potential reduction in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to the Portland metropolitan area as a result of the inclusion of new areas in Oregon that are eligible to receive CMAQ funding. We specifically believe it is essential to take into account the level to which an area has developed plans to reduce air pollution related to mobile source emissions and have adopted performance measures that are able to demonstrate the effectiveness of the projects funded by the CMAQ funds.

The CMAQ distribution strategy should focus on the reduction of mobile source related pollution. It also should be directed to areas that have adopted proven strategies that reduce emissions and meet requirements by focusing on transportation related issues.

It will be important for the distribution policy to consider transportation–related air quality factors in the allocation of CMAQ funds. Examples of these factors are:

- The source and severity of air pollution and the ability of transportation projects to make a significant impact on reducing the pollution;
- The identification of performance measures that report on the effectiveness of the projects to reducing pollution;
- How an area's local air quality management plan aligns with the local transportation plan;
- Population and employment; and
- Traffic congestion

Given the heavy congestion that exists in the Portland urbanized area, as well as severe limits on funding for new road capacity, Clackamas County has sought funding from all sources for projects to reduce idling and enable reliable traffic movement. Using CMAQ funds provided by Metro and ODOT, Clackamas County has been very successful in implementing Intelligent Transportation System projects to reduce delay at critical bottleneck locations throughout the county and improve air quality. Non-CMAQ funds have been used for projects like Sunrise Phase I which reduce freight congestion and truck idling. Clackamas County and its partners in the Portland urban area have committed to funding projects that reduce air pollution through a variety of strategies. The proposed reduction of CMAQ funds will hamper our ability to continue implementing such strategies.

CMAQ funds should be focused in areas where there will be the greatest impact of reducing transportation related emissions. This strategy will best address reducing transportation emissions statewide. As the federal level moves to a stronger focus on performance-based outcomes, our state should focus on policy and funding decisions that improve our statewide performance, rather than hurt it.

Thank you for the opportunity to share our comments on this very important issue.

Sincerely,

John Ludlow, Chair
On behalf of the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners

August 5, 2016

Matthew Garrett, Director
Oregon Department of Transportation
355 Capitol Street
Salem, OR 97301

RE: **Concern over proposed CMAQ funding redistribution**

Dear Director Garrett:

As Mayor of the City of Wilsonville, which operates South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART), and as the Clackamas County Cities Representative to Metro's Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), I am writing to express concerns regarding a potential reduction in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the Portland metropolitan area.

CMAQ funds are a major component of the region's flexible transportation funding resources and have long been used by the region to leverage significant local and federal matching investments in projects directly benefitting air quality in the most populated and congested area of Oregon. A substantial reallocation of these funds to other jurisdictions would irreparably damage the region's ability to pursue a comprehensive, multi-modal transportation investment strategy that meets the state and federal air quality mandates placed on the region and pending "Climate Smart" carbon-reduction strategies.

I would advocate for a strategic approach to the allocation of CMAQ funds that reflects the original purposes for which CMAQ funding was created; namely, the need to reduce mobile-source air pollution levels that either currently cause or in the past have caused areas to receive a federal nonattainment designation, such as the greater Portland area. CMAQ funds should not be allocated to areas of the state due to the presence of pollutants that are largely or wholly unrelated to mobile-source emissions. Similarly, areas that have not implemented their own local efforts to address and monitor air pollution from mobile-source emissions and rely predominately on the actions of the state (DEQ) or federal government should not be eligible for receipt of CMAQ funds.

The Portland area qualifies for the receipt of CMAQ funds as it is still under a management plan after being designated as a nonattainment district in 1991. In response, the region has adopted a funding plan under which CMAQ funds are allocated to projects and programs designed to ameliorate the specific mobile-source pollutants that precipitated the area's nonattainment designation. On a practical level, this means that CMAQ monies spent in the Portland region result in a planned, specific, intentional reduction in Oregon's mobile-source air pollution emissions while seeking to maintain economic activity that greatly benefits the region and state.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Tim Knapp

Tim Knapp, Mayor
City of Wilsonville

cc: Wilsonville City Council; Clackamas County Coordinating Committee; Washington County Coordinating Committee; Metro Council