



Clackamas
County
Coordinating
Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4) Agenda

**Thursday, August 6, 2015
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 May 7, 2015 C4 Minutes Page 02
2. 6:50 p.m. **C4 Retreat Recap**
 - Action items from 2015 C4 Retreat Page 09
3. 7:00 p.m. **Metro Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP)** Page 10
4. 7:15 p.m. **Clackamas County Land Use Update**
 - Letters sent to elected leaders and businesses Page 14
5. 7:20 p.m. **Clackamas County Road Funding Update**
Gary Schmidt
6. 7:25 p.m. **State Transportation Funding Update**
7. 7:35 p.m. **ACT Updates**
8. 7:45p.m. **Urban Lumber: Clackamas Forestry Product Cooperative**
Representative Julie Parrish and Rick Gruen, Clackamas County Page 16
9. 8:15 p.m. **JPACT/MPAC Update**
Mayor Tim Knapp, Wilsonville & Mayor Mark Gamba, Milwaukie
10. 8:30 p.m. **Adjourn**

paying attention to unfunded mandates. Also supportive of multimodal transportation options, strategies and plans that handle traffic capacity, the stretch of I-5 on Boones Ferry Bridge, investment to reopen Willamette Locks, affordable transit, transit service extension, sustainable land use/growth, repairing brownfields, strategic industrial development, new economic development tools, economic enterprise zones, STEM education and post-secondary education, and protection of the environment.

- Diana Helm (DH), Damascus: There are three Damascus bills currently in the legislature. Two have passed in the House (HB 3084, HB 3085). After the third bill (HB 3086) passes in the House, the bills will be bundled and sent to the Senate.
- Markley Drake (MD), Happy Valley: Currently opposing HB 2938 and HB 3505; monitoring HB 2984, HB 3543, HB 2668, SB 542, HB 3518, HJR 12, and SJR 27.
- County Update
 - Chris Lyons (CL), Clackamas County: The Board adopted their legislative agenda in January. The top priority is transportation, but unsure if a larger transportation package will pass in the legislature to support these goals. County is specifically advocating for Sunrise Phase II as the top local transportation priority and I-205 expansion as the top regional transportation priority.
 - Clackamas County is not coalescing around a specific land-use ask, but Rep. Clem has signaled that he will reconsider Clackamas County reserves during the 2016 short session if local stakeholders are unable to resolve issues.
 - Clackamas County is very supportive of brownfield legislation (HB 2938/ HB 2734); HB 2984; industrial land infrastructure; and legislation pertaining to the Willamette Locks (SJM 10) and the Willamette Legacy Project. County continues to work with Rep. Fagan on Damascus issues.
 - County remains neutral on HB 2938, but desires to assist affected parties such as Happy Valley and Milwaukie.
- Regional Update
 - PS: No one is present to give update. (*Metro absent*)
- State Transportation Package

- PS: JPACT recently returned from lobbying trip from Washington, D.C. We met with NAOC and EPA to discuss brownfield legacy site. JPACT met with congress and senators from Oregon on transportation issues. Rep. DeFazio was both knowledgeable and critical about Oregon Clean Fuels Bill. JPACT will be discussing the Clean Fuels Bill at next JPACT meeting when DEQ will make a presentation on the bill's rules. Clean Fuels program should be administered by the Federal Government, not individual states. Transportation funding is in jeopardy due to a legislative stalemate at both state and federal levels of governance. There is a bleak possibility of accomplishing a package by June.

3. 7:30 pm

C4 Retreat

- Goal of Retreat
 - *No information shared.*
- Agenda Overview
 - PS: Executive committee desires to revisit the draft agenda. 40 individuals have signed up, with a majority staying overnight.
 - MD: We need to talk more about economic development issues.
 - Trent Wilson (TW): Originally the agenda had planned for economic development discussion, but the agenda item has been expanded to include other jurisdictional goals. There will be additional time on day two for members to direct dialogue.
 - PS: County staff will reach out to staff of jurisdictions to recommend preparations for the jurisdictional goal sharing component of the Retreat.

4. 7:45 pm

JPACT/MPAC Update

Mayor Tim Knapp, Wilsonville & Councilor Mark Gamba, Milwaukie

- PS: Tim Knapp is not in attendance. Mark Gamba will give MPAC update and then there will be discussion on ad hoc committees.
- Mark Gamba (MG): At the last MPAC meeting there was a presentation on Metro's natural areas work. Certain individuals believe that the current legislative session is the most intense in recent memory. Regarding the Urban Growth Management Decision, MPAC discussed Portland's ability to absorb population growth projections, and market indicators suggest

the housing market is becoming more expensive. What happens in Damascus will change everything.

- DH: Damascus recently had disincorporation hearing in the court of appeals. There will be a joint meeting between Metro and Damascus next week to inform Metro of Damascus' current trajectory.
- MG: All the proverbial eggs are in Damascus' basket.
- DH: Damascus is trying to transition land to Happy Valley as quickly as possible.
- PS: Affected land needs infrastructure.
- DH: Damascus has no infrastructure.
- PS: Properties are moving quickly in the housing market and with high prices.
- MG: Concurrence with Paul Savas.
- PS: Metro has had bleak housing projections since the late 1990s. Currently, housing prices are less expensive outside of the urban growth boundary, such as Molalla. We need to balance population growth and job growth. Unemployment is a certainty.
- PS: Regarding JPACT, DEQ will give presentation on Clean Fuels bill. The new Area Commission on Transportation recently met in Portland, and there were nine members at the table for the purpose of approving other nominations. ODOT will randomly assign term lengths to produce staggered term structure. First full ACT meeting will be on June 17. Attendance is key since an affirmative vote only requires 18 votes.
- PS: Stephan Lashbrook will address projects with federal funding as extended cost and time factors influence feasibility. This was an issue raised in Washington, D.C., as well as project streamlining and certification.
- Stephan Lashbrook (SL): A small group has met with the Board of County Commissioners to discuss why projects cost more when federal money is involved, and why ODOT requirements drive up the cost of highway projects. An ad hoc committee will continue to meet to develop priorities and recommendations to take back to Washington, D.C. next year to educate federal partners.
- PS: The purpose of this discussion is to solicit interest and involve cities. The goal is to coordinate, collaborate and certify working agreements/intergovernmental agreements to eliminate project redundancy and reduce money needed.
- SL: Introduction of federal funding can increase a project cost by 20 – 50 percent and so some jurisdictions are leaving money on the table. Rather, jurisdictions are tradition

transportation funding to avoid federalizing projects. Swapping local funds and making deals already happens.

- PS: I brought up the idea while JPACT was in Washington, D.C. There was some support but additional conversations will happen offline. We need to show we are certified and streamlined because that is what the federal government wants to know. Clackamas County is certified to do certain things. There will be an ad hoc meeting for primarily staff to continue discussion. City Managers will be contacted. In the meeting, Mark Gamba and I will present the topic and leave them to work on it.

5. 8:00 pm

Jurisdiction Update

- MD: Mayor DeRemer has returned; Happy Valley is celebrating its 50th Anniversary. We have 235 new residences and over 150 townhouses, and Fred Meyers is moving in as of this week.
- Carl Exner (CE): Developers have come by with buyers to build up lots; seeking to increase urban renewal boundaries to develop a pool and a community center; and we're watching legislature on marijuana rules.
- DH: Damascus is shrinking. We had the court of appeals hearing, and our council chose to not have an attorney represent us. There will be a meeting with Metro next week, and we just had a charter review committee but the committee did not have a quorum.
- Dominic Jacobellis (DJ): We've narrowed down property search for the library, and will be meeting with people soon to discuss pricing.
- SL: SMART has acquired two additional CNG busses, so alternative fuel accounts for 20 percent of our fleet.
- Julie Stephens (JS): We are working on a program site review, which is like a triannual review for larger programs.
- Laurie Freeman Swanson (LFS): CPOs are working on a citizen comment for a housing development occurring just outside of the city. Also testifying and monitoring HB 2666, a gravel company bill that affects farmland feasibility.
- Jimmy Thompson (JT): Molalla is focusing on infrastructure and looking at transportation; streets are looking like streets. There are transportation projects in the pipeline and we are identifying other transportation funding options.
- Wilda Parks (WP): Milwaukie's farmer's market is coming up and we are participating in the USDOT Mayor's challenge for safer streets.

- Brenda Perry (BP): The Willamette site recently received a heritage designation. The farmer's market is moving to a Sunday, we're preparing to put in a new reservoir, continuing Stafford conversation, and will advocate for putting up a sound wall on I-205, especially if the expansion project gains legs.
- Brent Dodrill (BD): Estacada industrial land is starting to generate interest. We are experiencing a housing boom, with 14 building permits just this month. The City Manager is retiring, and we are working on street-scaping. June 5 will be the celebration for completion.
- Rick Cook (RC): Stafford hamlet is working through the land process, and it might be time for a rural renewal.
- Bob Reeves (BR): Bite at the Mountain was a success, so thank you to all the fire districts involved.
- Terry Gibson (TG): This is sanitary district election season; we'll see how that goes.
- MG: The grand opening for the riverfront park had a good turnout. We are crystallizing council goals, and we are the only city that doesn't have an urban renewal program, but we are working on it. A large zoning change is anticipated in our downtown, which will spur development. Light rail is about to open.
- JF: We are in process of reviewing planning and development fees, which have not been raised since 2007. There will be an 8 percent increase this year and a 10 percent increase next year as a temporary fix because revenues are not keeping up with expenses. There is a Frog Pond task force. We are in the processes of finishing the public comment period, and we've started discussing prospects for a residential area and a pool prior to pursuing a ballot measure. The water line is going to be installed.
- PS: Clackamas County is conducting a scientific survey on road funding focused on maintenance only. The survey will be completed at the end of this month, and the results will be viewed at the C4 retreat. The BCC will use the information to determine whether to pursue a November ballot and what to ask for, if anything. There are also issues with the County Fairgrounds and a lack of funding for museums. The Transient Room Tax does not provide museum funding. The Tourism development council implementing the TRT felt TRT should be used for marketing visits to the county. Several tourism ordinances through the state address both maintenance/operation and marketing.

- WP: I'd like to see finances be used for more than just marketing.
- PS: This may be one of the issues we discuss or put on the ballot. The Board of County Commissioners will have a retreat in June or July to talk about a transportation ballot measure is the county was unable to meeting funding needs. Also on the May ballot is the fire district levy, the Happy Valley police levy, the Oak Lodge sewer election, and the West Linn Mayoral race is becoming heated.
- LFS: The county fairgrounds are a jewel, and it sits on good property. Is the Fred Meyers fund match still in place on the fairground development?
- WP: The fund match is not party to the county's budget.
- LFS: I'll find out more about the fund matching. We could hire a professional fund raiser. My background is in horses, and there are opportunities to find funds and develop a building to generate more horse income and work on other property corners. We could bring in more money than we currently do if we take the time to sort through the details.
- PS: Advisory Boards and Committees are defensive about these issues. The business model shows that cost is outpacing revenues. We end up in the red due to building maintenance. And similar building conditions are observed throughout the county. We need to find other funding mechanisms.
- WP: The fairgrounds and museum areas may be eligible for a Union Pacific grant. Union Pacific only provides grants to communities with rail lines. They do smaller grants, but perhaps some larger. One grant funded a community center, or maybe fixing a museum rook. Union Pacific is interested in heritage projects like museums and fairgrounds.
- PS: Brock is our person.
- WP: He is retiring.
- PS: I know. Rail is always under scrutiny due to the cargo they carry. They are trying to be good neighbors.

6. 8:15 pm

Pressing Updates

- *No pressing updates given.*

7. 8:30 pm

Adjourn – Approximately 8:10 pm

2015 C4 Action Items:

The following list represents the action items from the 2015 C4 Retreat. They have been divided into three categories: process items, informational items, and direction and decision.

Process Items: *The section is informational. C4 staff will work to ensure these items receive attention consistently throughout the year:*

- Draft official statements to communicate C4 positions
- Record C4 accomplishments
- Include the Mayor’s meeting reports in the agenda materials

Informational Items: *Informational items can be added to agendas when time allows. Please rank the following items to help the C4 Executive Committee set future agendas.*

- ___: Informational session on the STIP process
- ___: Engage in additional sharing of ongoing and upcoming project needs for each jurisdiction
- ___: Informational session for “Safe Routes to School”
- ___: Facilitate panel presentation on Economic Development priorities around the County
- ___: Increased dialogue on public safety
- ___: Increased education about community needs (i.e. 800 MHz Radio System)

Direction & Decision Items: *Direction and decision items require larger discussions and coordination by C4 members. Please rank the following items to help the C4 Executive Committee set future agendas.*

- ___: Improve the C4 process, roles, and responsibilities
- ___: increase jurisdictional communication efforts, including land readiness and aggregate land needs
- ___: Work on partnership agreements (UGMAs) with the County on land use and development
- ___: Integrated analysis on land use in the County - C4 to facilitate the sub-regional discussion at Metro
- ___: Establish a county-wide process to advocate for local projects at the state and federal level
- ___: Lobby together (or set similar legislative agendas) at the state legislature to show unity
- ___: Discussion around equity on fee structures [for infrastructure]
- ___: Work towards the reduction of hurdles for federal funding on local projects
- ___: Unify positions between cities and the County to help facilitate getting urban areas into cities
- ___: Create a general, county wide prioritization list as a review mechanism for transportation projects being submitted for STIP, MTIP, TIGER, etc.

 Metro | Memo

DATE: July 16, 2015
TO: JPACT and Interested Parties
FROM: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: MTIP/RFFA Process

Following discussion at JPACT last week, it was felt a reminder was in order of where we're at in the process of developing the policy that will:

- a. Define coordination between the three funding allocation processes that comprise the 2018-21 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)
- b. Define the desired policy outcomes for the 2019-2021 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA)

This process has several parts, outlined below.

1. Gathering Input

Staff began this process early last year by reaching out to stakeholders, participants and Metro Council to gather their insights on the 2016-18 RFFA, asking questions related both to the policy that guided the projects selected, and the process of selecting those projects.

One point, in particular, raised through the retrospective process led staff to adopt a more open and public approach to how the RFFA policy is developed. Stakeholders felt that their input was sought too far into the process so as to be meaningful. Policy direction was fairly well established by the time they were engaged, so the degree to which they could provide useful input and help shape the outcome was limited.

Responding to this concern, Metro staff began the policy update process with a series of three workshops – open to all interested parties – to discuss ideas on:

- a. Ways that ODOT, TriMet, SMART and Metro can better coordinate their funding allocation processes that comprise the MTIP
- b. What RFFA investment categories best reflect current regional transportation policy

In addition, staff conducted outreach to the three county coordinating committees, PBOT, and other stakeholder groups, to get their thoughts on these two questions.

The input received to date can be summarized as follows:

For the 2018-2021 MTIP, proposed coordination policies address the following themes:

1. Continue with existing coordination practices established in previous MTIPs;
2. Make refinements to existing coordination activities and add new ways in which to coordinate the allocation process and prioritization considerations; and
3. Organize and coordinate on other transportation topics which affect the allocation of transportation investments, such as coordination of Connect Oregon and TIGER grant applications, using federal funding effectively and efficiently, and delivery of multi-jurisdictional projects.

For the 2019-2021 RFFA, four policy option themes have emerged from discussions to date regarding on **WHAT** the funding should be spent. They reflect four distinct policy approaches that will allow for the public to provide input to regional policy makers regarding priorities and tradeoffs:

1. Retain the existing Step 1 region-wide programs and Step 2 project funding categories, focusing 75% of the Step 2 on Active Transportation/Complete Streets projects and 25% on Freight Initiatives/Green Economy projects.
2. Refocus Step 1 and Step 2 investments to align with Climate Smart Strategies list of short-term actions
3. Refocus Step 1 and Step 2 investments to achieve Safe Routes to Schools outcomes
4. Retain the existing Step 1 programs and Step 2 project funding categories, Active Transportation/Complete Streets and Freight Initiatives/Green Economy projects, but eliminating the 75/25 funding split

Metro staff is currently developing a public outreach tool based on these MTIP and RFFA policy themes aimed at gathering input on how the public wishes to see these funds spent. Staff will work with TPAC to refine the public outreach materials and bring them to JPACT at their September meeting for comments prior to opening a public comment period.

2. Refining the policy

When the public comment period is completed, and all of the input received to date has been summarized, the next phase will be to begin on developing **HOW** the region will go about selecting projects to accomplish the outcomes identified as the region's priorities. The input we've heard through our initial workshops and the first public comment opportunity will be used in drafting a document that describes the policy guiding project selection in the 19-21 RFFA. (For your reference, the policy document for the previous RFFA cycle is attached.)

It is these two elements – the **WHAT** and the **HOW** – that combined, comprise the RFFA policy document. Current RFFA policy, used for the two previous funding cycles, lists 10 process and administrative policies which guide the overall project selection process, and policy statements defining Step 1 and Step 2. Metro staff will work with TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council through the fall and winter on refining policy, leading to a draft policy document to be released for public comment in January 2016. The policy document is scheduled for adoption by JPACT and Metro Council in March 2016.

MTIP and RFFA policy adoption timeline

2015	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion and acknowledgement of draft financial forecast 	March
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release MTIP and RFFA draft work program • Hold TPAC and interested stakeholder workshops 	April
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet with sub-regional coordinating committees • Hold TPAC and interested stakeholder workshops 	May
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold TPAC and interested stakeholder workshops 	June
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPAC, JPACT, and Metro Council discussions on 2019-2021 RFFA policy themes for public comment #1, and draft proposal for 2018-2021 MTIP policy 	July/August/September
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public comment #1: Gather input on RFFA policy themes and draft MTIP policy 	September/October
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council review of public comments on RFFA policy themes, discussion and development of final RFFA and MTIP policy proposals 	October/November/ December
2016	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public comment #2: final draft of RFFA and MTIP policy 	January
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council work session on final draft of RFFA and MTIP policy • JPACT discussion of final draft of RFFA and MTIP policy • TPAC discussion and action on final draft of RFFA and MTIP policy, recommendation to JPACT 	February
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2019-2021 RFFA and 2018-2021 MTIP policy adoption by JPACT and Council 	March

3. Selecting the RFFA projects

Once JPACT and Metro Council have adopted policy, staff will initiate the process of gathering, conducting a technical analysis and ranking, and selection at the regional table of project proposals that are aligned with regional policy. A more detailed timeline and process outline will be developed in the weeks ahead.

RFFA project selection timeline

2016	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop solicitation packet and application materials 	April/May
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Release application packet 	June
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project applications due 	August
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct project technical review and ranking, receive sub-regional prioritized project lists, public comment on projects 	September/October
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council review public comments, finalize project list 	October/November/ December

4. Adoption of the MTIP

Upon completion of all of the funding allocation process occurring in the region, the policy and the projects selected will be compiled into the 2018-22 MTIP. Upon adoption by JPACT and Metro Council, the MTIP will be submitted to the Governor for approval and incorporation into the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP is sent to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration for their approval.

MTIP development, adoption timeline

2017	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct Air Quality modeling, demonstrate conformity MTIP development 	January – April
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TPAC/JPACT/Metro Council approval 	May/June
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MTIP sent to Governor 	July



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

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

July 13, 2015

Dear City and Regional Leaders of Clackamas County:

The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners (BCC) agreed on June 30, 2014 there is presently a deficit of 1,100 acres of non-retail employment land in Clackamas County, including a need for additional large lot industrial lands. Identifying this acreage represents a first step towards reconciling disagreement with assumptions in the 2014 Urban Growth Report (UGR) and also reaching the County's goal of achieving a 20 year supply of non-retail employment land within the Urban Growth Boundary by 2019.

Clackamas County has consistently communicated its disagreement with the assumptions produced by the 2014 UGR, especially regarding assumptions around employment lands. Metro's May 14, 2014 memo "*Residential development potential in UGB expansion areas, including Damascus*" identifies a number of issues faced by the city in producing housing to meet population forecasts. All of these issues apply equally to employment land in Damascus.

While the UGR estimates there to be 1,375 acres of available employment land in Damascus, our review of information by the City of Damascus, and conversations with city staff, led us to conclude the UGR overestimates the amount of employment land likely to be available in Damascus by around 900 acres. This discrepancy in acreage is validated by the Buildable Land Inventory (BLI) prepared by the City of Damascus in early 2014 representing the most likely development scenarios in Damascus, considering transportation and utility plans, along with inventories of sensitive areas.

The information in Damascus' BLI was further validated by the "*Non-Retail Employment Land Demand Forecast*" study by Johnson Economics and Mackenzie, which identified between 300 and 1,200 acres of land supply needed to meet forecasted population and job growth.

The next step for Clackamas County will be to identify what types of land are needed to meet the demand identified. We anticipate this and future conversations will result in clear land-use goals for Clackamas County, and we will soon be reaching out to our cities for further input on how and where to meet these needs.

Thank you for your patience as we continue working to ensure Clackamas County remains a great place to live, work, and play!

Sincerely,

John Ludlow
On Behalf of the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING

2051 KAEN ROAD | OREGON CITY, OR 97045

July 13, 2015

Dear Clackamas County Business Leaders:

Last fall, the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners adopted a set of economic development goals as part of Performance Clackamas. One of the goals seeks to achieve a 20-year supply of non-retail employment land within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) by 2019. A 20-year supply provides market choice and variety and helps ensure competitive land prices. We believe our business leaders share this vision.

As a first step to reach this goal, Clackamas County commissioned a *“Non-Retail Employment Land Demand Forecast”* by Johnson Economics and Mackenzie. The study concluded that Clackamas County is short somewhere between 300 and 1,200 acres of employment land, plus whatever supply is necessary to meet our retail land needs.

The wide range of need identified in the study was the result of uncertainty around the potential land supply in Damascus. Metro’s May 14, 2014 memo *“Residential development potential in UGB expansion areas, including Damascus”* identifies a number of issues faced by the city in producing housing to meet population forecasts. All of these issues apply equally to employment land in Damascus.

After the Johnson study was completed, we were able to review information from the City of Damascus and gain a higher level of certainty around the amount of employment land actually available in Damascus. We believe that the Metro Urban Growth Report overestimates the amount of employment land likely to be available in Damascus by over 900 acres. This provides more certainty that our employment land shortage is at the high end of the range described in the Johnson study. This discrepancy also calls into question whether the region as a whole has a sufficient supply of employment land.

Together, this analysis indicates that Clackamas County needs an additional 1,100 acres of employment land, including a supply of large-lot industrial sites. We will need to provide for a wide variety of businesses, from manufacturers to business and professional services to health care.

Figuring out the amount of land we need is a critical first step, but there is more work to be done. We hope you will join us in advocating for solutions to our shortage of employment land as we continue working towards achieving our economic development goals in Clackamas County.

Sincerely,

John Ludlow

On Behalf of the Clackamas County Board of Commissioners



FAQ's

Clackamas Forestry Product Cooperative Program

What is the project?

During the 2015 legislative session, Rep. Julie Parrish (R-Tualatin/West Linn) introduced and the Oregon Legislature passed HB 2984. The bill requires Clackamas County to establish over the next two years a pilot project to determine the feasibility of creating the Clackamas Forestry Product Cooperative Program, otherwise known as the Clackamas Urban Lumber Program. The purpose of the project is to develop a statewide model for counties to establish cooperatives that provide for the commercial production and marketing of specialty lumber products on nonforest lands in urban areas to promote economic development and generate new public revenues for communities across Oregon.

Why is this program needed?

Currently there is no efficient method of harnessing valuable lumber from trees grown in cities. Typically, a dying/diseased/hazardous tree is cut down and either chipped or used for firewood, wasting any potential value of the resource for use by specialty hardwood mills. Alternatively, specialty hardwood trees could provide great economic and environmental benefits if planted and managed with the intention of eventual harvest. This innovative concept has the potential to yield significant benefits for Clackamas County, its cities and the State of Oregon.

What will the County do during the 2-year pilot project period?

The pilot is intended to determine the feasibility of a Forestry Product Cooperative. No planting, enrolling, or harvesting of trees will occur during this study period. Rather, as directed by the Legislature, the County will carry out the following five tasks to determine the feasibility of a Forestry Product Cooperative Program:

- **Financial** – Conduct economic analyses to determine necessary volume capacity to grow and sustain the cooperative
- **Technical** – Design tree enrollment, geotagging, growth modeling and reporting processes
- **Governance** – Identify and create a cooperative governance structure
- **Outreach** – Solicit stakeholder recommendations regarding cooperative structure and operation
- **Training Manual** – Develop an “Owner’s Manual” to guide counties in successful cooperative implementation

When will the program begin?

Clackamas County will report its findings to the 2017 State Legislature, including an assessment of the likely success or failure of a forestry product cooperative. Based on these findings, the Legislature will determine next steps on potential program implementation.

Can this program help remove my dying/diseased/hazardous tree in my yard?

The pilot project will not include any enrolling, planting, or harvesting of trees. Those with individual and immediate tree concerns should contact a professional arborist or urban wood sawyer prior to tree removal.

Contact: [Samantha Wolf](mailto:swolf@clackamas.us); Project Coordinator
swolf@clackamas.us; (503) 742-4685

Updated: 7/29/15