



Clackamas
County
Coordinating
Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

Final Report

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4)

2016 Retreat

Friday, June 24 – Saturday, June 25

C4 Retreat Attendance	Page 02
C4 Retreat Summary	Page 04
C4 Retreat Transportation Prioritization Exercise Information	Page 06
C4 Retreat Flip Chart Transcriptions	Page 07

2016 C4 Retreat Attendance List

Facilitator: Amy Chase Herman

C4 Co-chair

Paul Savas	Commissioner	Clackamas County
Brian Hodson	Mayor	Canby

C4 Members

Traci Hensley	Councilor	Canby
Laurie Freeman Swanson	Molalla CPO	CPOs
John Blanton	Clackamas Fire	Fire Districts
Thomas Mersereau	Mayor	Gladstone
Rick Cook	Stafford Hamlet	Hamlets
Markley Drake	Councilor	Happy Valley
Jeff Gudman	Councilor	Lake Oswego
Carlotta Collette	Councilor	Metro
Shirley Craddick	Councilor	Metro
Mark Gamba	Mayor	Milwaukie
Wilda Parks	Councilor	Milwaukie
Jimmy Thompson	Councilor	Molalla
Renata Mengelberg	Commissioner	Oregon City
Julie Wehling	Canby Transit	Rural Transit
Terry Gibson	Oak Lodge Sanitary	Sanitation Districts
Stephan Lashbrook	SMART	Urban Transit
Thomas Frank	Councilor	West Linn
Brenda Perry	Councilor	West Linn
Tim Knapp	Mayor	Wilsonville

County Commissioners

John Ludlow	Chair	Clackamas County
Jim Bernard	Commissioner	Clackamas County
Martha Schrader	Commissioner	Clackamas County
Tootie Smith	Commissioner	Clackamas County

Attending Staff

Don Krupp	County Administrator	Clackamas County
Gary Schmidt	PGA	Clackamas County
Chris Lyons	PGA	Clackamas County
Trent Wilson	PGA	Clackamas County
Drenda Howatt	BCC	Clackamas County
Emily Klepper	BCC	Clackamas County

Kimberlee DeSantis	BCC	Clackamas County
Karen Buehrig	DTD	Clackamas County
Steve Williams	DTD	Clackamas County
Dan Johnson	DTD	Clackamas County
Chuck Robbins	H3S	Clackamas County
Vahid Brown	H3S	Clackamas County
Jaimie Lorenzini	Policy Analyst	Happy Valley
Ben Bryant	Deputy City Manager	Happy Valley
John Lewis	Public Works Director	Oregon City
Eileen Stein	City Manager	West Linn
Mark Ottenad	Public and Government Affairs Director	Wilsonville

Note: Highlighted names identify C4 Executive Committee members



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.

Transportation Project Prioritization

Sponsor	Proposed Project	Estimated Cost	CTAC Scoring	C4 - Number of Dots	C4 Rank
Clackamas Co	I-205 Stafford Road to OR99E	\$360,000,000	2	14	1
West Linn	OR 43 Corridor Improvements	\$18,100,000	1	12	2
Clackamas Co	Sunrise JTA Phase 2 from 122nd Ave to 172nd Ave	\$300,000,000	6	5	3
Oregon City	McLoughlin Blvd Phase 3	\$45,600,000	3	4	4
Happy Valley	172nd Ave/190th Dr Improvements	\$47,300,000	7	4	4
Lake Oswego	OR43 Pathway: Lake Oswego to West Linn	\$10,000,000	20	3	5
Molalla	OR 211 Ped/Bike Improvements	\$1,351,859	31	3	5
Oregon City	Beavercreek Road	\$10,700,000	4	2	6
Wilsonville	I-5 Bike/Ped Bridge - Town Center Lp to Barber St	\$8,500,000	8	2	6
Clackamas Co	Sunnyside Improvements OR213 to 97th Ave	\$10,000,000	12	2	6
Clackamas Co	65th Ave/Elligsen Rd/Stafford Rd Intersection	\$5,500,000	14	2	6
Happy Valley	162nd Ave Gap Completion	\$8,800,000	24	2	6
Clackamas Co	Arndt Rd Phase II	\$20,000,000	28	2	6
CCC	Clackamas Community College Transit Center	\$2,500,000	5	1	7
West Linn	Willamette Falls Drive Improvements	\$3,640,000	10	1	7
Wilsonville	French Prairie Bridge Boones Ferry Rd-Butteville Rd	\$21,000,000	10	1	7
Milwaukie	Monroe Street Greenway Project	\$8,100,000	13	1	7
Milwaukie	Railroad Avenue Multi-use Path and Bus Shelters	\$4,800,000	18	1	7
Oregon City	OR 213 @Redland Road (Phase 2)	\$9,800,000	19	1	7
Canby	Canby Industrial Park Access from OR 99E	\$8,900,000	23	1	7
Lake Oswego	Stafford-McVey Bike Lanes & Sidewalks	\$3,000,000	27	1	7
Clackamas Co	Canby-Marquam Rd Safety Improvements	\$2,700,000	29	1	7
Estacada	Cazadero State Trail	\$6,800,000	9	0	8
Wilsonville	Boeckman Road Dip Improvements	\$13,100,000	15	0	8
West Linn	10th Street Interchange Improvements	\$6,830,000	16	0	8
Clackamas Co	Monroe St. from Linwood Ave to I-205 Multiuse Path	\$4,000,000	17	0	8
Milwaukie	Lake Road Widening	\$10,000,000	21	0	8
Tualatin	SW 65th Ave	\$9,734,000	22	0	8
Tualatin	Borland Road	\$9,646,000	25	0	8
Gladstone	Bike/Ped Bridge for Trolley Trail	\$6,000,000	26	0	8
Gladstone	Multiuse Path Meldrum Bar Park to Dahl Beach Park	\$350,000	30	0	8
Molalla	OR 213 Ped/Bike Improvements	\$914,442	32	0	8
Lake Oswego	Upper Boones Ferry Rd Bike/Ped Improvements	\$11,000,000	33	0	8
Happy Valley	Sunnyside Road Extension (East)	\$17,500,000	34	0	8
Gladstone	Intersection of McLoughlin Blvd and SE Arlington St	\$500,000	35	0	8
		\$1,006,666,301		66	

C4 Retreat – Flip Chart Transcription

Session 1: Transportation Coordination Panel: The importance of coordination!

No flip chart notes taken.

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

Question 1: What are the Pros and Cons of the Prioritization Exercise?

- Not enough time
- Lack of information
- Not enough data
- [Part of the prioritization exercise perceived as] subjective
- Project not created equally, many won't be pursuing the same funding sources
- How to compare a city project to an ODOT project; different modes
- Need to be broken up by funding sources
- [members felt] lack of familiarity with areas and projects
- Interesting to learn the various city values through their projects
- Averaging all scores washes out uniqueness of project
- Written notes from table discussion:
 - Would have preferred a single map to see where the projects are located
 - Appreciated the "all-star" voting concept, felt more objective

Question 2: what do you think are the positive outcomes of improved coordination? How does/could coordination look different in Clackamas County versus other regional counties?

- Districts provide a framework where areas can see investments in their surrounding areas
- County has been divided into commissioner outreach districts [areas of outreach]
- Improved coordination helps people understand that transportation is a system. Helps get outside of narrow focus
- Create fund to help with match
- Continue to improve staff coordination
- Written notes from table discussion:
 - Learning that more applications does not equal success, need to be more narrow in submissions and focused on support.
 - Consider shared staff support for creating ideal grant applications

Question 3: Recognizing that these are large dollar projects, how can/should C4 work together to move projects forward?

- Understand “who is next”; know where investments have been made
- More consistency & coordination with ODOT
- Refine and discuss criteria; weighting
- Prioritize funding source
 - Spend more staff time on matching funding sources to projects; develop strategy for projects
- Look deeper at project readiness and learn how C4 can be involved

Question 4: What should be a next step? How does Clackamas County unite around projects?

- Bonding new money to engage larger projects
- Lower cost ROW [right of ways]
- Cities to look at other funding sources
- Partnerships
- Fund project development
- Recognize regional connections
- Focus funding on particular corridors
- Take turns
- Note Washington County’s long history of working together
- Consider how to balance urban/rural needs
- Districts/areas
- Well known, long term champions

Question 5: From the list of projects, we can see that the state highway system is very important. How can we better coordinate with ODOT to better influence ODOT funding?

- [C4 can produce] Formal recommendations [which will have to be] earned by gaining the trust of regional agencies/partners
- Legislative agendas/positions
- Regional agreement on projects (amongst coordinating committees)
- Increase education regarding ODOT process
- Show more local investment in projects to show project readiness

Session 3: Affordable Housing Panel: *What is the need and what are the tools?*

No flip chart notes taken.

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

Houselessness Breakout Table

- Causes/Problems:
 - Market shortage of affordable housing
 - Cost of childcare
 - Returning vets
 - Lack of living wage jobs
 - Compounding issues resulting from being houseless (i.e. trespassing, expensive services)
- Fixes:
 - City/county zoning to allow accommodating more people without causing negative consequences like gentrification
 - Finding buildings to transform to house folks
 - Vacant buildings, foreclosed houses, habitat for humanity model, fix-ups rather than new builds
 - Resource with schools for technical assistance
 - Learn if houselessness is criminalized, and fix boundaries and/or look at alternatives for enforcement
 - Tiny homes/cottage clusters
 - Mobile showers
 - Mobile staff that connect with houseless where they are at to connect them to services

Housing Needs and Services Breakout Table

- Needs:
 - Houseless students; how to work with schools?
 - Continuum of care – homeless in schools
 - West Linn: Retirees want to downsize but stay in area, new home owners priced out, masterplan arch bridge area, affordable rentals & ownership
 - Molalla: Double/triple housing, trailer housing, farms-low income, some/limited affordable housing, singles living together to afford housing, squatting
 - Canby: Transit dependent people, seniors priced out, low rents going up, non-English speakers/translators, large commuting out of town for work

- Need to increase choices
- What type of community do you want to be? [cities need to answer]
- Need to preserve/protect current affordable housing projects (livable, affordable, weatherized)
- Rental rehab
- Fewer mobile home parks
- Services:
 - Need capacity for advocacy/affordable housing
 - Legislative changes
 - Civic infrastructure
 - County is service provider
 - How to build capacity of non-profits to “carry water” (i.e. be advocates)
 - Need inventory of services
 - Housing needs assessment/gap analysis
 - Faith based community organizations

Development Table

- Zoning hindrances willing builders
- Low cost manufactured homes
- Land shortage vs. housing shortage / “vertical housing”
- Tool: planned mix use
- Project/product flexibility
- Form based zoning/code
- Flexibility in codes
- Incentives:
 - Density bonus
 - SDCs; scaled by access to transit and need for car/parking
- Proportional impact fees

Summary discussion notes

- Aspirations and Goals
 - Perform a “needs assessment”
 - Services to those who are seeking assistance under very challenging circumstances (i.e. domestic violence, women w/children seeking services; why are 9 of 10 turned away?)
 - Consider various structures of government involved in addressing these issues. Is C4 the venue for these discussions?

- Zoning conversations/Annexing
- Housing authority + cities working together
- Possible Priority Topics
 - County owns housing and there is still a shortage. How can the county and cities work together?
 - Springwater Trail: solving the problem of camping and involving partners like Mult. Co.
 - Partnering with churches to house target populations in temporary houses
 - Transportation ideas to reach populations
 - C4 can work with the county to continue this conversation and dialogue around these challenging issues. Structure and process to be address these issues.

Session 5: Goal Setting for 2016-2017 C4 Agenda

Housing Next Steps:

- C4 Should reach 2 mutual goals:
 - Ideas include discussing SDCs
 - convertible zoning
- Need more education on Federal and State regulations
- Return to a future meeting with the originally proposed speaking panel
- C4 should focus on the service gaps:
 - Only 1 in 10 applications for housing support are accepted
 - More can be done to address homeless community experiencing domestic violence as a cause of homelessness
- C4 Recommendation to reform the Land Use Subcommittee
 - Committee should produce technical information
 - Committee should identify low hanging fruit
 - Committee should create or seek out resources for “housing inventory”
 - Who should be included?
 - How should the committee report back to C4, and when?
- Questions about the opportunities presented by the 2016 State Legislature to impose local Construction Excise Tax
 - C4 would like more education
- C4 wants to identify tools, including:
 - Workforce agencies doing support work
 - Education and outreach
 - Consider how to support faith organizations willing to meet the need
- C4 wants to identify resources (inventory and data), including:
 - GIS and Assessor tools
 - Location of zombie houses

- C4 wants to know better how to engage state legislature
 - Will there be more efforts on inclusionary zoning
 - What type of building code changes could be seen at the state?
- Regard transportation as a support service and work with providers
- C4 wants to look at Washington County’s fees as an example/exercise to learn about SDC costs in neighboring jurisdictions for consideration about making decisions to raise or lower costs. To learn “where we are” in the region with our fees.
 - Does LOC have this information already?
- C4 recognizes limitation of city resources in “services” discussion.
- C4 wants city alignment to communicate back to communities
- C4 agrees there should be “language education” away from “trailer parks” to “manufactured housing”
 - May require an update to signage
- Regarding the Land Use Advisory Committee, what is the role/capacity of county staff?
 - Can break the discussion down into pieces
 - Can seek policy clarifications regarding:
 - SDCs
 - Domestic violence solutions
 - Service tools
 - Etc.
 - Regarding makeup: planning directors, building officials, and community development
 - First steps to:
 - Review C4 lists of interests
 - Bring back city and county roles
 - Report back to C4 in 3 to 6 months

Transportation Next Steps

- C4 wants to figure out how to engage the capital construction need, including ideas like:
 - Washington County’s MSTIP program
 - Washington County’s Transportation Development Tax
- Create an inventory of funding ideas
- Create a funding bucket list from the prioritization exercise
- C4 recognizes their capacity for regional transportation should be focused on “countywide benefit”, but note that the funding streams will also require “county wide benefit” as a type of criteria.
- C4 should address the question of how to approach “coordination” and “equity”
- C4 should address the question of how to create an “actionable” prioritization list
- C4 wants to:
 - Have more data “throughput”
 - Have comparable lists by mode (multimodal opportunities)

- Focus on projects requiring county investment
- Focus on project readiness
- Consider taking action with the “exercise” prioritization list
- Create a ranking list within funding sources
- Establish a pool of funds for project readiness
- Have the goal of reaching stakeholder support moving forward
- Formalize areas or districts that would help establish “turns” in a prioritization list (similar to Washington County).