

CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Study Session Worksheet

Presentation Date: March 31, 2015 **Approx Start Time:** 3pm **Approx Length:** 60 min.

Presentation Title: Road Maintenance: Funding Options; Results of Online Survey

Departments: Public & Government Affairs, Transportation & Development

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

Other Invitees: Randy Harmon, Warren Gadberry, Transportation Maintenance; Mike Bezner, Transportation Engineering; Diedre Landon, DTD Administration; Ellen Rogalin, PGA/DTD; Amy Kyle, PGA; Chris Storey, County Counsel

WHAT ACTION ARE YOU REQUESTING FROM THE BOARD?

None at this time; this is background information to help with future policy decisions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This study session will focus on two topics:

- Road maintenance funding options (as requested by the BCC at the March 10, 2015 study session updating the BCC on roads maintenance outreach) and
- The results of an online survey on road maintenance conducted Feb 24 - March 13.

FUNDING OPTIONS: The four possible funding options currently under consideration are:

1. Gas Tax – The County could levy a tax on sales of gas within the boundaries of the entire county, or just in unincorporated areas, or in a combination incorporated and unincorporated of areas. The tax could be permanent or could be tied to specific projects.
2. Vehicle Registration Fee – The County could impose a vehicle registration fee of up to \$43 per vehicle per year surcharge on vehicles in the county. Some vehicles would not be charged, including school buses, travel trailers, farm trailers, etc.
3. Road Utility Fee – The County could establish a monthly fee collected on all residences and businesses within the unincorporated areas of the county based on average daily trips, vehicle weight or other criteria.
4. County Road District – The County can form a special road district on any territory in any unincorporated area of the county. It does not have to be contiguous, but must not overlap with a similar district (e.g., the Government Camp Road District). All property owners in the district would be assessed a property tax levy.

More detailed information is attached, including:

- A table with the requirements, restrictions, timelines and amount required to raise the \$17 million annually for each option (Attachment A) and
- An memo dated October 2, 2013 from Chris Storey with more detail about each funding option (Attachment B).

SURVEY RESULTS: The online, non-scientific survey ran between February 24 and March 23, 2015 and tallied 653 responses. It was conducted by DHM Research of Portland and promoted by DHM and Clackamas County. As an online survey available from both the County website and TheRoadAhead.us website, it's important to note that the results do not necessarily reflect the demographics of the general population or voters of Clackamas County. The Road Ahead website experienced an unprecedented spike in visitors during the survey, further raising awareness. Residents who participated are likely to be more civically active and informed than the general population.

However, there are a few instances where responses to this survey can be directly compared to responses to the same questions in an online survey from February 2014. Those results show that:

ISSUES	2014	2015
My roads are in good condition	55%	58%
My roads are in excellent condition	2%	12%
Support a gas tax	44%	56%
Support a vehicle registration fee	46%	52%
Oppose a road district	60%	64%

- The percentage of respondents who think their roads are in good or excellent condition has gone up in the past year, from 57% in 2014 to 70% in 2015.
- A plurality feel that the County does not have enough funding to maintain roads (43%) and know that gas tax is the primary source of funding (48%).
- 69% said they would be willing to pay something additional every month for road maintenance services. Of those 69% – excluding a few “outliers” who offered to pay more than \$1,000/month – the average additional amount people are willing to pay is \$20/month.
- Both a countywide gas tax and a county vehicle registration fee received majority support overall (56% and 52%, respectively), though there was more strong opposition than strong support for each.
- Support for a gas tax rose from 44% in 2014 to 56% in 2015.
- Support for a vehicle registration fee rose from 46% in 2014 to 52% in 2015.
- Opposition to a road district has remained fairly constant – 60% in 2014 and 64% in 2015. (There was no comparative data for a utility fee.)

Attached are three documents with detailed survey results:

- An overview of the survey results prepared by DHM (Attachment C)
- The survey results by question (Attachment D)
- Comments from the survey, compiled and verbatim (Attachment E)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS (current year and ongoing):

The current annual gap between the amount of available federal and state revenue and maintenance needs is more than \$17 million. That gap has grown approximately \$660,000 per year since 2007. It is anticipated that the gap will continue growing at a steady pace.

The more the road system deteriorates, the more it will cost to repair it. It costs 10 times more to reconstruct a roadway than to maintain it. Current estimates to maintain or return a roadway to good condition are as follows:

- \$22,000/mile — to maintain a road in very good/excellent condition
- \$44,000/mile — to maintain a road in good condition
- \$176,000/mile — to upgrade a road in fair condition
- \$440,000/mile — to reconstruct a road in very poor/fair condition

LEGAL/POLICY REQUIREMENTS:

None at this time.

PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPATION:

PGA and DTD staff continue to work closely together to plan, create and implement outreach and education activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

None at this time.

SUBMITTED BY:

Division Director/Head Approval _____

Department Director/Head Approval M. B. Crawford 3-25-15

County Administrator Approval _____

Attachments:

- A: Brief Comparison of Road Maintenance Funding Options
- B: Legal Review
- C: Clackamas County Road Maintenance, February-March 2015; Online Survey
- D: DRAFT - Clackamas County Online Road Maintenance Survey
- E: Road Maintenance Survey Comments, Compiled and Verbatim

For information on this issue or copies of attachments, please contact
Gary Schmidt @ 503-742-5908

BRIEF COMPARISON OF ROAD MAINTENANCE FUNDING OPTIONS

Draft ☐ March 24, 2015

OPTION	ADMINISTRATION	PAID BY:	GEOGRAPHIC AREA	LEGAL FINANCIAL LIMITS	DURATION	ACTION REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT	USE OF FUNDS	CONSIDERATIONS	SAMPLE CHARGE = AMOUNT RAISED	ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST PER HOUSEHOLD
Gas Tax	State (with fee to County)	Users of gas-powered vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countywide <i>or</i> Unincorporated only <i>or</i> A combination of incorporated and unincorporated 	No limit	Can be permanent or tied to specific project(s) with a sunset provision	BCC action and voter approval	Capital or maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue fluctuates based on consumer patterns People can choose to purchase gas outside the gas tax area State charge for administration 	10-12 / gallon \$17,600,000 <i>(EcoNW is confirming the gas tax estimates. Assumes collection in unincorporated area.)</i>	\$108 / year <i>(Assumes 2 vehicles per household.)</i>
Vehicle Registration Fee	State (with fee to County)	Owners of motorized vehicles, except school buses, farm and travel trailers, government vehicles, etc.	Countywide	No more than \$43 / year / vehicle (the state amount)	Can be permanent or have duration set by BCC	BCC action; subject to referendum	Capital or maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent revenue stream that grows with number of vehicles on roads 40% of revenue must be shared with cities State charge for administration 	\$43 / year / vehicle \$8,600,000 <i>(VRF is calculated countywide and assumes the maximum rate of \$43/vehicle/year.)</i>	\$86 / year <i>(Assumes 2 vehicles per household.)</i>
Road Utility Fee	New administrative structure	Residents & businesses, based on average daily trips or vehicle weight	Unincorporated only	No limit	Can be permanent or have duration set by BCC	BCC action; subject to referendum	Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would require setting up an administrative structure 	\$10 / month \$16,000,000 <i>(Assumes collection in unincorporated area from residential and commercial users.)</i>	\$120 / year
Road District	By County, through property tax	Property owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unincorporated area -- need not be contiguous, but can't overlap a similar district (e.g., Govt Camp Road District) Incorporated areas -- if cities included, they must consent to be included 	No limit; has built-in inflation factor	Can be permanent or have duration set by BCC	BCC initiates district formation through a board order, holds 2 public hearings, then refers the formation question to voters	Capital or maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent, predictable revenue source Low administrative costs for collection Only possible areas of exclusion: cities that opt out and Govt Camp Road District 	95 / \$1,000 Assessed Value \$17,100,000 <i>(Assumes collection in unincorporated area from residential and commercial users.)</i>	\$285 / year <i>(Assumes \$300,000 assessed value.)</i>



OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL

PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING

2051 KAEN ROAD | OREGON CITY, OR 97045

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 2, 2013

TO: Board of County Commissioners
Donald Krupp, County Administrator
Laurel Butman, Deputy County Administrator

FROM: Chris Storey, Assistant County Counsel

RE: Road Maintenance Funding Options

Stephen L. Madkour
County Counsel

David W. Anderson
Kimberley Ybarra
Kathleen Rastetter
Chris Storey
Scott C. Ciecko
Alexander Gordon
Amanda Keller
Nathan K. Boderman
Assistants

Our office has been asked to review and analyze possible additional funding mechanisms to support road maintenance and capital improvements efforts. DTD staff is preparing a briefing on the current state of road maintenance efforts and current funding sources which should be reviewed prior to this memorandum. Below is an overview of the four possible funding options we have been exploring, a description of the process required to establish said funding option, a list of advantages and challenges relating to each, and a related timeline to establish and receive funding. The four possible funding options are a (i) gas tax, (ii) vehicle registration fee, (iii) utility fee, and (iv) county road district.

I. Gas Tax, Countywide

General Description: A local gas tax levied on sales of gas within the boundaries of the taxing area. This can be either a countywide tax, sales in unincorporated areas, or some mixture in-between. The gas tax as levied by the state is a cents-per-gallon tax but could also be levied as a percent-of-sales tax. The tax could be a permanent increase, or tied to a specific transportation project with a sunset clause once sufficient revenue has been raised.

If the gas tax is imposed countywide, the county would need to decide if revenue should be shared with the cities in whose jurisdictions those distributors exist. If the tax is not charged countywide, residents could choose to purchase gas in cities to avoid the added cost per gallon. Given the nature of the tax, consumers may choose to purchase their gas outside the county if the tax creates a material price differential.

Process to Establish: ORS 319.510-950; Oregon Constitution Art IX, Section 3a; HB 2001

ORS 319.950 states: **Local tax on fuel for motor vehicles.** A city, county or other local government may enact or amend any charter provision, ordinance, resolution or other provision taxing fuel for motor vehicles after submitting the proposed tax to the electors of the local government for their approval. [2009 c.865 §27]

Note: 319.950 becomes operative January 2, 2014. See section 28, chapter 865, Oregon Laws 2009.

Therefore this statute, once it goes into effect on January 2, 2014, allows the Board to adopt a proposed county ordinance imposing the gas tax. If adopted by the board, the ordinance would need to be referred to the voters of Clackamas County for their approval.

Advantages:

- User Fee approach seeks to align use by citizens with cost through fee.
- Administered by the State of Oregon so no additional staffing needed.

Challenges:

- Revenues may decline as higher gas prices reduce demand.
- Revenue will at a minimum fluctuate based on consumer patterns.
- State will charge an administration fee for collection.

Timeline: The earliest an ordinance can be adopted would be a 1st reading on January 2nd and a second reading on January 16th. This would allow sufficient time for the proposed ordinance to be referred to the voters for the May 20th, 2014 election. Paperwork would have to be completed and filed by March 11, 2014, excluding a time period for challenges. If it passes in May 2014, the clerk has 30 days to certify the results of the election and provide that certification to the Board. The Board would then issue a confirming order and the ordinance would go into effect on the date designated therein, most likely July 1, 2014. For subsequent election cycles, the lead times are the same. Once passed, collections would begin once the State is in a position to implement, which likely would be between 6 and 9 months.

II. Vehicle Registration Fee

General Description: All passenger cars, commercial vehicles, trailers and motorcycles must be registered through the Oregon Department of Motor Vehicles ("DMV"). The DMV issues vehicle registrations as well as titles. The registration is required to be renewed. The State currently imposes a \$43 per low-weight vehicle per year fee by statute (ORS 803.430(24)), with other vehicle classes at differing rates. Vehicle registrations are renewed every two years.

Clackamas County could impose a vehicle registration fee ("VRF") surcharge on all vehicles in the County. The county must share collected revenue – 60% to the County and 40% to the cities in the County. The overall portion of the fee charged cannot exceed the State's \$43 (or equivalent for different classes) fee and must be charged in whole dollar amounts.

Process to Establish: ORS 801.040, 041; 803.445; HB 2001; by ordinance without voter approval but subject to referendum.

The relevant statutes state:

ORS 801.040 Authority to adopt special provisions. This section describes circumstances where special provisions are made concerning the authority of cities, counties or other political subdivisions in relation to some portion of the vehicle code. This section is not the only section of the vehicle code that applies to such authority and shall not be interpreted to affect the vehicle code except as specifically provided in this section. The following limits are partial or complete as described:

(6) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, in accordance with the provisions of ORS 801.041, the governing body of a county may establish by ordinance registration fees for vehicles registered at a residence or business address within the county.

ORS 801.041 Terms and conditions for imposition of registration fee by county. The following apply to the authority granted to counties by ORS 801.040 to establish registration fees for vehicles:

(1) An ordinance establishing registration fees under this section must be enacted by the county imposing the registration fee and filed with the Department of Transportation. ****The governing body of the county imposing the registration fee shall enter into an intergovernmental agreement under ORS 190.010 with the department by which the department shall collect the registration fees, pay them over to the county and, if necessary, allow the credit or credits described in ORS 803.445 (5). The intergovernmental agreement must state the date on which the department shall begin collecting registration fees for the county.

(2) The authority granted by this section allows the establishment of registration fees in addition to those described in ORS 803.420. There is no authority under this section to affect registration periods, qualifications, cards, plates, requirements or any other provision relating to vehicle registration under the vehicle code.

(3) Except as otherwise provided for in this subsection, when registration fees are imposed under this section, they must be imposed on all vehicle classes.

(4) Any registration fee imposed by a county must be a fixed amount not to exceed, with respect to any vehicle class, the registration fee established under ORS 803.420 (1). For vehicles on which a flat fee is imposed under ORS 803.420, the fee must be a whole dollar amount.

(5) Moneys from registration fees established under this section must be paid to the county establishing the registration fees as provided in ORS 802.110.

ORS 803.445 Authority of counties and districts to impose registration fees; rules; maximum amount. (1) The governing body of a county may impose registration fees for vehicles as provided in ORS 801.041.

(2) The governing body of a district may impose registration fees for vehicles as provided in ORS 801.042.

(3) The Department of Transportation shall provide by rule for the administration of laws authorizing county and district registration fees and for the collection of those fees.

(4) Any registration fee imposed under this section shall be imposed in a manner consistent with ORS 803.420.

(5) No county or district may impose a vehicle registration fee that would by itself, or in combination with any other vehicle registration fee imposed under this section, exceed the amount of the fee imposed under ORS 803.420 (1). The owner of any vehicle subject to multiple fees under this section shall be allowed a credit or credits with respect to one or more of such fees so that the total of such fees does not exceed the amount of the fee imposed under ORS 803.420 (1).

In summary, the VRF is available to be imposed by ordinance by the County but there are several administrative processes that must be followed to implement and is subject to referendum.

Advantages:

- Consistent revenue stream that grows with the number of cars using road.
- Allows a pay for use system of some fairness for shared infrastructure.
- State administers collection; fee must be a whole dollar amount.

Challenges:

- 40% of revenue must be shared with cities unless otherwise agreed.
- Certain vehicles exempt, including school buses, farm trailers, travel trailers, government vehicles, etc.
- Local fee cannot exceed state fee.
- Multnomah County is the only county in Oregon that has implemented a VRF to date.*
- State would charge an administrative fee, estimated at \$40,000 for implementation, and ongoing per transaction fee.

Timeline: ODOT requests 3 weeks to approve ordinance prior to passage, and a minimum of six months for implementation, including IGA for collection and cost recovery, computer programming and related steps. Two months from effective date of the ordinance (after ODOT implementation complete) to allow due notice and begin collection. Estimated minimum of 9 months, one year more likely from initiation to effectiveness, assuming that the ordinance is not referred out to an election.

* = Washington County is considering a VRF; it passed out of advisory committee on a 11-2 vote on September 9, 2013.

III. Road Utility Fee

General Description: A road utility fee is a monthly fee collected on all residences and businesses within the unincorporated areas of the county. In essence, the transportation system infrastructure becomes a public utility and fees are charged to recover the cost of maintaining this utility in addition to existing supports. The theory is to generate a proportionate and universal fee that is based on the volume of trips generated by specific users.

This fee could be based on average daily trips ("ADT") based on traffic studies of trips generated from single family homes, multifamily dwellings, commercial uses and industrial uses. It could also be based on the weight of the vehicle, similar to the weight mile tax paid to the state. If the Board desires to pursue this option further, it would be presented with different possible configurations with ADT, weight, or other options for the utility fee.

The County would be responsible for administration. It would require staff or contracting for direct billing of all residences and businesses in the county, collection efforts, reconciliation and management. It is an open policy question of how to deal with vacant property, uninhabited homes, and similar issues. Some utilities "turn off" when unoccupied, such as water. Others continue to bill once connected to the system due to the difficulties of "deactivating" service and establishing when use has resumed, such as sewer.

Process to Establish: County Ordinance, subject to referendum.

Advantages:

- Fee based on type of dwelling or business and estimated road usage – closer model to pay for service than general property tax.
- Not a tax on property, but a user fee based on occupancy. It uses average occupancy as a proxy for road usage.

Challenges:

- Subject to referendum.
- System would need to balance revenue requirements with excluding or limiting impact on underdeveloped or unused property.
- Would require administrative efforts to establish billing lists, processing, collection and communications.

Timeline: The Board could begin consideration of an ordinance quickly. Implementation is likely to control the timeline to receive revenue. There would need to be an extensive public communications effort to vet the issue with citizens and if established would likely take multiple months to implement the program and begin billing. The timeline for implementation of the utility fee is most under the County's control with the exception of being subject to referendum, and can be managed more than the others to attempt to meet desired outcomes.

IV. County Road District

General Description: The County may form a special road district on any territory in any unincorporated area of the county. The District does not have to be contiguous, but must not overlap with a similar district. Also, cities must affirmatively consent to be included in the proposed boundaries. In this instance, the only possible areas of exclusion would be cities that opt out and the Government Camp Road District area.

All property owners situated within the road district would be assessed a property tax levy. The district could also charge a utility fee similar to that described in Section III. All roads within the County could be declared to fall under the district, including local roads, in this case the annual levy would vary depending on the project list. As a marketing tool and/or to demonstrate prioritization and local benefit, multiple road districts can be proposed/created at the same time in subsections of the county so long as they do not cover the same geographic area.

There is no maximum duration for a special district, unless the Commissioners impose one. Each district established would require the adoption of a master order authorizing its business plan, and require individual budgets, audits, management agreements and careful attention to the manner in which funds are held to ensure they do not get commingled into general county funds, including the road fund. The issue of ownership and responsibility of the roads would need to be accurately described. The most likely model is similar to the extension district, where the road district(s) would be a dedicated funding source that is then transferred to the County to accomplish the purposes of the district by agreement.

Process to Establish: ORS 451,¹ 198

The applicable steps are:

1. Draw the proposed District boundaries. This decision will have a material impact on the steps required to achieve formation – see Step 2.
2. To the extent territory within the proposed District boundaries is also within a city, a resolution of the governing body of a city approving the proposed inclusion within the District must be included in the initial formation request (ORS 198.835).
3. The Board of County Commissioners can initiate formation of the District by adopting a Board Order setting forth:
 - a. Intention of the Board to form District;
 - b. Name and proposed boundary of the District;
 - c. The date, time, and place of a public hearing on the proposal; and
 - d. Certified copies of consents from all cities implicated by the proposed boundaries. (ORS 198.835)
4. The Board then holds a hearing on formation of the District, which must be held not less than 30 nor more than 50 days after adoption of the Board order stating intent to form the District (ORS 198.800).
5. At the hearing, the Board will determine, in accordance with the criteria set forth in ORS 199.462, whether the area could be benefited by the formation of the District. The Board can modify the proposed boundaries of the District or give it

¹ I have assumed for purposes of this memorandum that the BCC is not interested in establishing an ORS 371 independent road district with independently elected directors who would co-manage and co-fund county road efforts.

- a determinate life span of no more than 10 years, or leave it of indefinite duration (ORS 198.805).
6. A second hearing must be held on the question before final approval, no less than 20 and no more than 50 days from the first hearing (ORS 198.810(2)).
 7. Once the Board approves the petition for formation, it must refer the question of formation for election if the District would be funded by a permanent rate limit for operating taxes (ORS 198.810(4)).
 8. Such a referral election must be held on either a primary or general election date for which the filing deadline can be met (ORS 198.815(2)), which would be either the third Tuesday in May or the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November (ORS 255.345(1)). The filing date for such election dates are 61 days prior to the date of the election (ORS 254.103(1)).
 9. After the election, the Board enters an order establishing and forming the District if supported by the election, or else enter an order dismissing the petition for formation (ORS 198.820(1)). From the date of formation order, the District is considered established.
 10. If formed in May, the District may submit materials to collect property tax revenue in the same year. If formed in November, the district will wait a year before collecting revenue.

Advantages:

- Funding can be for capital or maintenance at BCC's discretion.
- Consistent revenue source, predictable and able to support debt issuance separate from County borrowing authority.
- Measure 5 impact likely minimal outside cities; may have an impact within cities facing compression (if included in the proposed district boundaries).
- Low administrative costs for property tax collection.

Challenges:

- Requires voter approval if levying property taxes.
- Normal collection issues would apply.
- If cities are sought to be included, they must consent by city council resolution.
- If some cities do not consent, what consequences and incentives?

Timeline:

For unincorporated area only district²:

Working backward, the election is to be held on **Tuesday May 20, 2014;**

Election materials must be complete and filed by **Tuesday March 11th.**

Election materials must be submitted to the County Clerk by **Monday February 24th** to allow 15 days for election challenges prior to deadline.

Election Referral and 2nd Hearing's last possible date: **Thursday February 20th.**

1st Hearing's last possible date: **Thursday January 30th.**

² For purposes of this District proposal, I have assumed the target is the May 2014 election.

BCC resolution initiating consideration last possible date: **Thursday December 19th** (This date was arrived at by noting December 31st is the first possible date, which is a Tuesday. It is unlikely the BCC will hold a business meeting on December 26th). An economic feasibility report showing projected revenues and expenditures for the first three years of the district's life and proposed legal boundary description must be completed by this date and included in the petition of formation. The same time considerations apply for any other election date, and the vote must be held on either a May or November ballot.

For County-wide district including cities³:

Timeline for November 2014 election on question:

Working backward, the election is to be held on **Tuesday November 4, 2014;**

Election materials must be complete and filed by **Thursday September 4th.**

Election materials must be submitted to the County Clerk by **August 19th** to allow 15 days for election challenges prior to September deadline.

Election Referral and 2nd Hearing's last possible date: **Thursday August 14th.**

1st Hearing's last possible date: **Thursday July 24th.**

BCC resolution initiating consideration on formation petition last possible date: **Thursday June 19th.** An economic feasibility report showing projected revenues and expenditures for the first three years of the district's life and proposed legal boundary description must be completed by this date and included in the petition of formation.

If the BCC desires a citizen petition in lieu of direct Board action, time would be needed to submit the petition for approval and gather signatures.

Again, I note that city resolutions are required beforehand, and the timing between hearings assumes the BCC does not modify the petition for formation. So the formal process of consideration must start no later than June 19th, 2014 to reach a deadline for being on the November ballot given statutorily-mandated time periods between hearings and notice requirements. Earlier action would add more flexibility and reserve for the schedule.

³ For purposes of the city-inclusive district, I have assumed a November 2014 election date due to the necessity of receiving city consents before formation may be legally proposed.



Clackamas County Road Maintenance February-March 2015; N=653; Online Survey

Between February 24 and March 13, 2015, Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. (DHM Research) hosted an online survey for Clackamas County residents to test opinions around road maintenance priorities and funding. A total of 653 residents participated. The survey was hosted at www.clackamascountysurvey.com.

Research Methodology: The online survey was primarily promoted by Clackamas County. DHM also promoted the survey through their social media channels and an invitation to participate was sent to members of Metro's Opt In panel who reside within Clackamas County. Where applicable, results are compared to those collected in a similar online survey conducted in February 2014. Results may not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

Statement of Limitations: It's important to note that the results of this online survey do not necessarily reflect the demographics of the general population of Clackamas County. Additionally, residents who participated may be more civically active and informed as they were notified and agreed to participate through communication by the County or the Opt In panel. Age and gender statistics for the 2014 and 2015 online surveys are compared to Census data for the general population of Clackamas County in the table below. Open-ended responses were provided to the County in a separate document and were not coded for content.

	February 2014 Online	February 2015 Online	US Census Data
Age			
18-24	1%	1%	10%
25-34	9%	6%	15%
35-54	38%	37%	38%
55-64	28%	30%	19%
65+	24%	22%	18%
Refused	1%	3%	---
Gender			
Male	45%	49%	48%
Female	53%	47%	52%
Refused	2%	4%	---

DHM Research Background: DHM Research has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout the Pacific Northwest and other regions of the United States for over three decades. The firm is non-partisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support public policy making. www.dhmresearch.com

INITIAL TOPLINE FINDINGS

ROAD CONDITIONS

- Clackamas County residents generally viewed the condition of roads in their area of the county positively (Good: 58% and Excellent: 12%).
 - Positive ratings were more common when compared to 2014 findings, when 57% gave positive ratings for local roads (Good: 55% and Excellent: 2%).
- More than one-half (56%) indicated that they felt the county did a “good” or “excellent” job making sure their area received a fair share of transportation maintenance services.

CURRENT FUNDING

- A plurality of residents (43%) felt that the County does not have enough funding to properly maintain all roads. This stands in comparison to the 27% who indicated that funding was currently at an appropriate level, and the 7% who thought that current funding levels were too high.
 - A notable one in four (24%) were unsure of their views of funding levels.
- A strong plurality of County residents indicated that the gas tax was the primary source of funding for road maintenance in Clackamas (48%), more than three times that of the next closest funding source, while nearly one in five (17%) were uncertain.

NEW FUNDING SOURCES

- After being provided with the information that the County estimates a current \$17 million funding gap between the cost of road repairs that need to be made and what the County can afford each year, respondents were asked to indicate how much, if anything, they would be willing to pay in additional taxes or fees each month for the County to maintain current levels of road maintenance.
 - While one-third of residents (32%) said they would not be willing to pay anything additional, 69% said they would be willing to pay at least something extra each month for road maintenance services.
 - Removing those who said they would not be willing to pay additional money and outliers over \$1,000, residents who said they would give extra were willing to pay an additional \$20 per month on average. When including those over \$1,000, the mean rose to \$24.40.

Respondents were asked to indicate their support or opposition for a number of proposals which would provide an independent and stable revenue source to pay for road maintenance in Clackamas County.

- The proposals of “*a county-wide gas tax added on to each gallon of gas purchased in the County*” and “*a County vehicle registration fee with a set charge per vehicle per year*” both received majority support overall (56% and 52%, respectively), however, strong opposition outpaced strong support for both proposals. The county-wide gas tax seems to be the most palatable option, with 24% “strongly” supporting, 32% “somewhat” supporting, 15% “somewhat” opposing, and 27% “strongly” opposing the proposal.
 - Support for a gas tax rose from 44% in 2014 to 56% in 2015.
 - Similarly, support for a registration fee rose from 46% in 2014 to 52% in 2015.

- The remaining proposals of “a transportation utility fee charged to county residents and businesses with a monthly bill in the same manner as other utility fees such as electricity, gas and water” and “a dedicated county road taxing district with a payment for road maintenance based on the assessed value of property” were viewed less positively by respondents, with total opposition rates of 72% and 64%, respectively.
 - Opposition to the creation of a road taxing district remained fairly consistent across years (2014: 60% and 2015: 64%).
 - No data was available from 2014 for the utility fee proposal.
- When asked to choose between a funding model for road maintenance “that aligns costs with usage” (Statement A) and one “that spreads the cost evenly across all property owners” (Statement B), Clackamas County residents were divided with a slight preference for the first proposal: some 50% indicated that their beliefs aligned more closely with Statement A, while 39% felt Statement B more accurately reflected their beliefs.

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

- When residents were asked to identify which of a list of sources of information they use to learn about current transportation issues in Clackamas County, two distinct and important categories emerged¹:
 - **Print Media:** The response rates for “newspaper coverage” (59%) and “County newsletter” (47%) were highest among all respondents. This indicates that traditional methods for contacting constituents are still effective in Clackamas County.
 - **Online Media:** The prevalence of the use of information sources such as the “internet” (28%), the “County website” (23%), “social media” (19%), and “email notices from the County” (17%) points to the importance of utilizing online media.
- Clackamas County residents indicated a strong level of awareness of both local and national transportation issues, with roughly three in four (73% and 74%, respectively) indicating that they were “very” or “somewhat” aware of these issues.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Clackamas County residents view the condition of roads in their area positively and feel the County does a good job distributing funds. Moving forward, the County should consider connecting how these current road conditions are at risk without further public funding for road maintenance.
- One in four (24%) residents were unsure of their views of current funding levels (too high, too low, etc.), perhaps indicating that continued outreach and education efforts could be effective in shaping public opinion on this issue.
- Considering the majorities who support both the “gas tax” and “registration fee” proposals, these survey findings suggest that Clackamas County residents are more supportive of a funding solution which “aligns costs with usage.”

¹ Residents were allowed to select multiple information sources.



PREPARED FOR:
CLACKAMAS COUNTY
Online Road Maintenance Survey

February-March 2015

1 | INTRODUCTION & METHODOLOGY

Between February 24 and March 13, 2015, Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, Inc. (DHM Research) hosted an online survey for Clackamas County residents to test opinions around road maintenance priorities and funding.

Research Methodology: The online survey was primarily promoted by Clackamas County. DHM promoted the survey through their social media channels and an invitation to participate was sent to members of Metro's Opt In panel that reside within Clackamas County.

Statement of Limitations: It's important to note that the results of this online survey do not necessarily reflect the demographics of the general population of Clackamas County. In addition, residents who participated may be more civically active and informed as they were notified and agreed to participate through communication by the County or the Opt In panel. Age and gender of the online survey compared to census data for the general population of Clackamas County are displayed in the table below.

Age	Online	Census
18-24	1%	10%
25-34	6%	15%
35-54	37%	38%
55-64	30%	19%
65+	22%	18%
Gender¹		
Male	49%	48%
Female	47%	52%

DHM Research Background: DHM Research has been providing opinion research and consultation throughout the Pacific Northwest and other regions of the United States for over three decades. The firm is non-partisan and independent and specializes in research projects to support public policy making. www.dhmresearch.com

¹ Online survey: Gender Refused=4%

**Clackamas County Road Maintenance
February-March 2015; Online Survey
DHM Research**

Introduction: Clackamas County owns and is solely responsible for maintaining 1,400 miles of roads -- about 1,310 miles in unincorporated Clackamas County and 90 miles inside cities. Maintenance responsibilities include filling potholes, paving, trimming vegetation, clearing ditches, street sweeping, striping, traffic signals and signs, plowing and sanding, and emergency repairs.

1. Do you feel the condition of roads in your area of Clackamas County is:

Response Category	N=653
Excellent	12%
Good	58%
Poor	32%
Very poor	7%
Don't know	1%

2. Why do you say that? (**OPEN—see separate verbatim document**)

3. How good of a job do you feel Clackamas County does making sure your area of the county gets a fair share of transportation maintenance services?

Response Category	N=653
Excellent	4%
Good	51%
Poor	22%
Very poor	5%
Don't know	17%

4. Which of the following statements most closely aligns with your views even if none of them reflect your views exactly?

Response Category	N=653
The County has more than enough funding to properly maintain all roads	7%
The County has about the right amount of funding to properly maintain all roads	27%
The County does not have enough funding to properly maintain all roads	43%
Don't know	24%

5. To the best of your knowledge, what is the primary funding source for road maintenance in Clackamas County?

Response Category	N=653
Gasoline tax	48%
General County fund	13%
Property tax	12%
Vehicle registration fees	6%
Other (please specify)	3%
Don't know	17%

6. Which of the following sources of information do you use to learn about current transportation issues in Clackamas County? Select all that apply

Response Category	N=653
Newspaper coverage	59%
County newsletter	47%
Internet	28%
County website	23%
Social media	19%
Email notices from the County	17%
Written materials (posters, postcards)	10%
Phone call to the County	2%
Other (please specify)	13%
Don't know	6%

7. How aware would you say you are of local transportation issues in Clackamas County, including maintenance needs and/or projects?

Response Category	N=653
Very aware	15%
Somewhat aware	58%
Not too aware	24%
Not at all aware	3%
Don't know	0%

8. How aware would you say you are of national transportation issues, including maintenance needs and/or projects?

Response Category	N=653
Very aware	19%
Somewhat aware	55%
Not too aware	20%
Not at all aware	6%
Don't know	0%

Funding for road repairs comes from a variety of sources, including Clackamas County’s share of state gasoline taxes; state vehicle registration and title fees; state weight-mile taxes paid by heavy trucks; and the Federal government. The County estimates that there is a \$17 million funding gap between the cost of road repairs that need to be made and what the County can afford each year based on available revenues.

9. How much would you be willing to pay in additional taxes or fees each month to allow the County to maintain current levels of road maintenance services? **(OPEN; collect numeric response)**

Response Category	N=653
\$0.00	32%
\$1.00-\$5.00	28%
\$6.00-\$10.00	19%
\$11.00-\$20.00	9%
\$25.00-\$50.00	9%
\$75.00 or more	4%
Mean*	\$20.00
Don't know	0%

*Those who mentioned \$0 and outliers over \$1,000 were removed from calculation

Rotate Q10 and Q11

10. **(Ask all)** Regardless of how you feel about the issue of increased funding for transportation maintenance in Clackamas County, in your opinion, what are the reasons for **supporting** increased funding? **(OPEN--see separate verbatim document)**
11. **(Ask all)** Regardless of how you feel about the issue of increased funding for transportation maintenance in Clackamas County, in your opinion, what are the reasons for **opposing** increased funding? **(OPEN--see separate verbatim document)**

Here are a few possible options to provide an independent and stable revenue source to pay for road maintenance in the County. Do you support or oppose each? **(Randomize Q12-15)**

Response Category	Strong Support	Smwt Support	Smwt Oppose	Strong Oppose	Don't know
12. A County vehicle registration fee with a set charge per vehicle per year	16%	36%	18%	28%	2%
13. A dedicated County road taxing district with a payment for road maintenance based on the assessed value of property	8%	25%	17%	47%	3%
14. A county-wide gas tax added on to each gallon of gas purchased in the County	24%	32%	15%	27%	2%
15. A transportation utility fee charged to County residents and businesses with a monthly bill in the same manner as other utility fees such as electricity, gas and water	4%	21%	16%	55%	4%

16. Which of the following statements is closest to your beliefs, even if neither reflects your views entirely? **(Rotate A-B)**

Response Category	N=653
A. Clackamas County should choose a funding model for road maintenance that aligns costs with usage so that people and businesses that use roads more pay more towards road maintenance	
Feel strongly	23%
Lean towards	27%
B. Clackamas County should choose a funding model for road maintenance that spreads the cost evenly across all property owners, because roads are a basic community need that benefit everyone and should therefore be paid for by everyone	
Feel strongly	21%
Lean towards	17%
Don't know	11%

17. Do you have any additional comments for Clackamas County related to transportation maintenance? **(OPEN—see separate verbatim document)**

18. Would you like to be added to an email list to receive future information on the subject of transportation maintenance in Clackamas County? **(OPEN; collect email address—see separate verbatim document)**

18A. How were you directed to this survey? **(OPEN—see separate verbatim document)**

As you answer the following questions, please keep in mind that all your responses are kept confidential.

19. For most days of the week, is your primary mode of transportation:

Response Category	N=653
Driving in a vehicle alone	61%
Driving in a vehicle with others	18%
Bus or public transportation	4%
Bicycle	3%
Walking	3%
Motorcycle	1%
Stay home	7%
Other (please specify)	2%
Refused	1%

20. What is your age?

Age	N=653
18-24	1%
25-34	6%
35-54	37%
55-64	30%
65+	22%
Refused	3%

21. What is your gender?

Response Category	N=653
Male	49%
Female	47%
Refused	4%

22. In what city or town do you live?

Response Category	N=653
Oregon City	13%
Lake Oswego	11%
Milwaukie	11%
West Linn	8%
Happy Valley	6%
Oak Grove	6%
Beavercreek	4%
Canby	4%
Clackamas	4%
Damascus/Carver	3%
Gladstone	3%
Wilsonville	3%
Boring	2%
Estacada	2%
Molalla	2%
Portland	2%
Sandy	2%
Eagle Creek	1%
Jennings Lodge	1%
Mount Hood Village	1%
Oatfield	1%
Barlow	0%
Sunnyside	0%
Tualatin	0%
Other (specify)	6%
Refused	2%

23. Do you live in a city within Clackamas County or in an unincorporated area of Clackamas County?

Response Category	N=653
Incorporated	54%
Unincorporated	44%
Refused	2%

24. Do you consider your area of Clackamas County to be urban, suburban, or rural?

Response Category	N=653
Urban	14%
Suburban	58%
Rural	26%
Refused	2%

25. How long have you lived in Clackamas County?

Response Category	N=653
0-5 years	12%
6-10 years	13%
More than 10 years	74%
Refused	2%

Road Maintenance Survey Comments: Compiled and Verbatim

March 25, 2015

The online road maintenance survey conducted from Feb. 24 – March 13, 2015, included the following open-ended question: *Do you have any additional comments for Clackamas County related to transportation maintenance?* The responses to that question are compiled below in categories, followed by verbatim list of all the comments.

Please note that since many responses included more than one comment or suggestion, the total comments summarized by topic is higher than the number of responses. (For example, in the *Suggestions/Requests for Specific Action* category, there were 33 responses, but the tally of comments by topic totals 41 because some people made more than one suggestion or request.)

COMMENTS SUMMARIZED BY TOPIC

Suggestions/Requests for Specific Action (33)

- Traffic improvements – 10
- Maintenance needs -- 9
- Improve bicycle options -- 7
- Improve pedestrian options -- 7
- Improve transit options -- 6
- Miscellaneous -- 4

Funding Solutions (70)

- Usage-based funding -- 17
- Raise gas taxes -- 16
- More money from heavy trucks -- 11
- Add bicycle registration fee -- 11
- Don't tie solution to property value 12
- Breaks for low-income or seniors -- 8
- Everyone benefits, so everyone should pay 7
- Bonds -- 5
- Tolling -- 3
- Charge by miles driven -- 3
- Use multiple options -- 3
- Transportation utility district -- 2
- Statewide sales tax -- 1
- Privatize entire system -- 1

Save Money/Use What You Have (65)

- Too much waste -- 13
- Change spending priorities -- 25
- No more taxes -- 10
- Spend more on transit, less on roads 4
- Get money from cities or state 3
- Don't know how you spend the money you have 2
- Privatize the system 2
- Things are OK as they are 2

Ban or Increase Fees on Studded Tires 14

Thanks /Doing a Great Job 12

Questions/Want More Information 11

Miscellaneous 43

VERBATIM COMMENTS SORTED* BY TOPIC

**as much as possible*

Suggestions/Requests for Specific Action

- The school zone in front of OCHS needs to be controlled by timed lights, not an all-day zone.
- Roundabouts for Beaver creek road at Leland/Kamrath and at Beaver creek School would solve traffic flow delays immensely for decades.
- The backup on I-205 N between I-5 and West Linn is extremely frustrating. Any way to improve flow on that stretch of road, particularly during rush hour?
- This may be a state issue, but the three intersections that were just completed on the back road to Silverton all need some fine tuning. The turning radius' are all very tight and it is quite difficult to make the turns heading north with a large truck or horse trailer. Also the intersections need a white stripe to let you know where to turn especially at night or in the fog. It is evident by the tire tracks in the ditches that there is a problem.
- Please continue to fix pot holes.
- Improve bike routes and cleaning of bike lanes.
- Focus on safe routes to schools, make active transportation a priority by implementing sidewalks and pathways and greenways for bikers and walkers to improve community, reducing auto traffic is ideal, main arterials should be developed to encourage efficient and safe vehicle traffic.
- Please focus on upgrading some of our streets and sidewalks, i.e. adding sidewalks to neighborhoods with high vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- There needs to be more public transit options throughout Clackamas County, not just in the areas that are within two miles of Multnomah County.
- We need more bike lanes. We need more sidewalks.
- Go take your vehicles and drive up Sconce Road. It is horrendous and we take other roads to avoid wear and tear on our vehicles, costing us more money in gas! I have lived near for over 20 years and the east end has never been taken care of. Make it a priority!

- I would like to see better pothole awareness. Better tree maintenance along streets. Added stop signs in neighborhoods. Sidewalks on both side of the streets. Leaning power poles need to be replaced.
- Bikes are pollution-free, don't clog up traffic, and cause the least damage to roads, but they face frequent damage [flat tires] due to the lack of regular street-sweeping on Highway 212/224 and the intersection of Jennings & Oatfield Roads. Please do regular street sweeping! Please make sure bike lanes are contiguous. When they fade out half way down a busy road, it's unsafe to bike commuters.
- Get more mowers.
- Make available more motorcycle parking in Clackamas County cities.
- Only that they recognize areas of springs or water drainage so those areas can receive better maintenance.
- Please work on improving flow of traffic. Please make transportation projects more aesthetically pleasing - consider the pedestrian and how traffic sounds can be reduced and distance from the traffic can be increased. Add designs to noise abatement walls. Add more and better street lighting. Add more street signs so that navigation is easier. Stop any new projects that will add more paving. Please do not connect the Springwater corridor to the proposed path near Scouter's Mountain. Please do not allow the Eagle Landing/New Hope development to continue. Please conduct traffic survey for neighborhoods affected by the Eagle Landing/New Hope development. Please keep the mismatched green lights at Causey and Stevens.
- Not sure if it is up to the county, but something needs to be done about the bottleneck between the Abernethy Bridge and Stafford on I205. The backups there are crazy and waste fuel and drain productivity.
- The closed rest stop on I 205 at 10 St. Needs to be torn up fenced off. It is a place for crime to happen now.
- Please make the pedestrian crosswalks MORE visible. Do a better job educating the public that rules regarding crosswalks include our entire state.
- Better enforce storm water management as the roads are a direct conduit to streams.
- I would like to see better bike path construction on most roads. Many roads have no pavement outside the fog lines. Bike riders are almost always gas vehicle users as well. The roads would be safer for bike riders, encouraging more bike use, removing cars from the roads, reducing wear and tear on the pavement, reducing use of fossil fuels and creating an opportunity for a healthier population.
- Please support trains, light rail, bus systems, etc.
- Bike lane. On highway 43 between Willamette and Oregon city. Please. We need one. Thank you.
- West Linn residents have suffered a great deal with the construction on highway #43, due to the Lake Oswego/Tigard Water Pipeline project. It causes delays, (including during the night-time, when bright lighting has been used to be able to work at 'off-hours' and avoid the traffic; which is a good idea in my opinion). Again, it not only causes delays, but it has made highway #43 so damaged that just driving across it is like riding on a road for covered wagons. There are metal plates across the road so that you cannot drive straight down the road without driving over them. This is very hard on tires and the suspension of your car. Further, there are so many asphalt patches and grooves, that you can't avoid them. I BELIEVE THAT LAKE OSWEGO AND TIGARD SHOULD PAY FOR THE COMPLETE RE-PAVING OF THE ENTIRE DAMAGED SECTIONS OF HIGHWAY #43 at the end of this project. NOT JUST A PATCH JOB HERE AND THERE! They are going to get a nice supply of fresh water from this project, and we as the City of West Linn have only been sacrificing this whole time. (For Many Months!) Of course, it also affects Oregon City, Gladstone, and all those who use highway #43 through our city as they commute.
- Oregon City is ramping up to become a major tourist destination as the old paper mill property is re-developed to take advantage of its proximity to Willamette Falls. Extension of the MAX to Oregon

City is our manifest destiny, not something to drag our heels on. I am in full support of whatever it takes to make this happen. Trains handle crowds very well. And crowds produce REVENUE!

- Work with ODOT to provide HOV lanes on I-5 and I-205 during rush hour, following the model pursued by the State of Utah along the Wasatch Front.
- Please keep bikes in mind. It is frustrating when a road is repaved only up to or halfway through the bike lane. This makes the bike lane even bumpier and makes me more likely to ride in the main lane. Also, when sweeping isn't done often, there are bike lanes that get really dangerous because they are covered with gravel. Finally, finding ways to slow traffic down through neighborhoods could reduce wear and tear there.
- S. Center Street in Oregon City gets a lot of traffic, but is in poor shape. Part of the soil supporting the road is washing away and I worry that the road will collapse down the hillside. Also, there are many pedestrians who walk along that road, and there is no space for them to walk. It is a dangerous stretch of road where there are accidents every year.
- Please do something about all the garbage on our rural roads. It looks like no one but poor white trash folks live in Clackamas County
- I urge the County to exert quality control on pavement patching, which generally is poor, bumpy and cracks and breaks in one year.
- There needs to be a stoplight placed on Hwy 224 in Carver.
- The county needs continuous sidewalks and more bus shelters.

Funding Solutions

- State-wide sales tax.
- Raise gas taxes but spend wisely.
- Larger vehicles cause more damage than motor vehicles under 6000 pounds. Have those over 6000 pounds pay more for registration.
- Really, I've noticed more areas focusing on Bike Lanes and Bike paths, however, it's the car owners/drivers who are paying for all of this work. If Bikers expect better bike lanes and more bike lanes throughout the county, they should be obligated to pay a portion of those as well. It's not fair to divert money that car owners pay for streets to focus on bike streets and neglect some of the streets for cars in the meantime. You wouldn't want someone to take money from you for one thing, then spend that money somewhere else that does not benefit you in any way.
- I'm sure you'll misinterpret the answers just given (last two questions). None of the proposals are fair; none are sufficient; purposes for which funding is sought aren't the only problems. Repair and maintenance of a huge capital asset has been underfunded for 30 years or more. With the amount of mileage already in the fair and poor category, the deterioration will accelerate if repairs are not made now. The value of the roads is simply too great to ignore. Bonds are intended and best suited for addressing capital expenditures. On top of that, the money sought does not address bridge repair, culverts, and other associated assets. If I were in charge, I'd bond for both so that repairs can be done in order and together. Don't repair the roadbed and then have to rebuild it after culverts are replaced or bridges are rebuilt. Expensive to do the work twice. It is irresponsible for anyone to oppose best efforts to do the repairs. Should be some jobs created for the next ten years too.
- When state and federal transportation taxes migrate to weight/mile or something similar, the county should do so also.
- Ownership of property does not align with road use. I strongly support a road use tax.
- Property owners should not bear the full burden of road maintenance because many, many road users own no property.
- I get really tired of the attitude that people who drive less should pay less (exempting gas tax of course) since those people need the roads just as much as others--all goods and resources are transported at some point by county roads including products to stores, getting people to work,

keeping county and other services running. The cost is already born more by those who drive more in the form of gas tax and vehicle fees. Additional costs should reflect the fact that every citizen is dependent on the transportation infrastructure.

- For building new infrastructure - new roads, new bridges, etc. - I believe costs should be spread evenly among all citizens in that geographic region. For maintaining existing infrastructure - repairing normal damage from use - I believe current maintenance costs should be biased towards current users, e.g. usage-based.
- The gas tax MUST be increased, especially now that oil is at a low.
- Construction/logging/heavy weight users should be required to post a bond to pay for road damage.
- Keep to the facts. Place fee on studded tires (or get rid of them). Base any new cost on use not on an unassociated figure (i.e., property value).
- As a resident of Milwaukie, which has a street fee already, I would only support this if Milwaukie were to get a proportional share of the revenue (and then perhaps Milwaukie could do away with its separate street fee). I am a strong supporter of the idea that those who use most should pay more. Indeed, I would support the long-discussed tolling systems that charged people using the interstates during peak hours. If the people who use them daily actually paid for them, we wouldn't need more or wider roads!
- The square footage of roads allocated to bicycles should match the amount they pay for.
- The burden of road maintenance fees should not fall upon property owners, there are more renters out there than owners, and many households with multiple drivers who are putting wear and tear on the road system as well as all those using the bus systems. You have to find an equitable system of funding the roads for all.
- If there's a business like trucking that uses and degrades roads more than passenger cars, they shouldn't be singled out. After all, consider what they are transporting. Probably groceries or gasoline or other items that are used by everyone in the community. It is short sighted and limited thinking to believe that the entire community is not involved in one way or another. It may be indirect involvement but we're all in this together.
- My only thought is that road fees should be paid by everyone, no matter if you use them for your bike, car, walking, receiving your mail, or for your kids to play in.
- You did not include a bond issue in your options. Get with it and pay for this stuff!
- I don't feel strongly about either of the solutions presented, but I'm of a mind to think that taxing per-mile or per-gallon (taxing based on road-usage) isn't the way to go. Lower-income persons/families with multiple jobs who live here may be adversely affected: they would have to pay the most money when they actually have the least amount of money to pay. Seems like taxing people for being poor and hardworking. That's terrible.
- People's income must be considered. People who rarely use the roads shouldn't pay. Seniors should be exempt!
- The idea of funding it by use is the way to go, of course with the emergence of electric cars a gas tax increase seems like a solution that may only work well for a while. The fairest way to fund this seems to be to charge by miles driven but of course I have no idea how to do that.
- I don't think property owners alone should fund the maintenance of the roads. I believe large trucking companies contribute to the destruction of our roads and therefore there should be a way to get money from them also, even if from out of state. Gasoline taxing would be a good start.
- Make it fair, and progressive, those who have more should pay more, business that use the roads should pay the lions share.
- Tax vehicles according to their weight.
- Have funding that reflects the number of driveways from private property onto a public road, the number of parking spaces on private property (i.e. apartments, businesses and shopping centers), a fee for every vehicle registered to a county address, and a fee for the development of properties.

- Everyone who leaves their home uses the roads; usage is not limited to commuters. Those who commute individually pay more in fuel and parking and should not be required to pay more if they drive more. Suggestion to increase gas tax on puce users. Sound infrastructure needs to be maintained to continue commerce and support the interconnection of Oregon communities.
- Maybe increase tax on big corporations that haul products on county roads. The weight of these vehicles has plenty to do with cracked roads and potholes.
- If Clackamas County chooses a funding model that spreads the cost across the wider community, rather than a model that emphasizes users bearing the primary costs, then the County must be more supportive of enhancing choices for transportation for all modes and all ages, because property owners will be making contributions to the system whether they drive exclusively or choose a mix of transportation tools that meet their needs. Surveys show that more people want choices, for example, many would prefer their child to be able to walk or bike to school. Many elderly need options as they seek to age in place. The County needs to do more to support more choices and modes, on the ground, not just in plans. At the same time, asking users to pay more also makes sense. From a policy perspective the best is probably to have a local gas tax while also creating a local transportation utility, and allowing the local communities to have some say in how the local funding is spent so that the mix of spending can be shifted somewhat to meet perceived needs in the local communities.
- Road users need to pay the full cost. We need policies that promote more efficient use of the system and promotes other transportation and freight modes that put less stress on the roadway. Spreading the cost across all residents rather than vehicle users will continue to subsidize vehicle use and promote further reliance on single occupancy vehicle transportation. Add a bike registration fee as well, so bicyclists are paying a user fee to support the maintenance of bike lanes and paths.
- I think if they are going to tax vehicles that larger vehicles should pay more than smaller ones. I also think there should be a registration/bike tax since they use the roads as well.
- The monies may need to come from multiple tax options.
- I recognize the issue of not over-taxing those who can least afford it. On the other hand, the most easily (and economically) managed is the gas tax and/or vehicle fees. I think the goal would be simplest is best, but with some mechanism to exempt those least able to afford additional taxes.
- Float a bond and catch up. It's getting worse faster than you can fund by other methods.
- Any funding should be part of a comprehensive transportation funding plan. Dedicating money only to roads, is a narrow focus that favors one class of user.
- I believe bicyclists should have a registration fee and pay a road tax. A lot of bicyclists use our roads & should have to pay for that usage.
- I would point out to the conservatives who oppose taxes, and particularly those who resist using the County's bonding authority, that true conservatives take care of what they already own. So far, that's not happened and won't if the small change fees and taxes are adopted. We share a very large problem, county wide. In particular, the rural areas are taking a beating. Now is a favorable time to offer bonds, the rates are low. You've already wasted a couple of years. I suspect, if you don't act pretty soon, the cost of servicing bonds will go up. One thing's for sure, the cost of repairing the roads is rising exponentially.
- I really think, especially on Highway 26, that the pass through rigs, construction vehicles and other utility trucks should pay for this. Those of us locals don't even cause 5% of the problem. Why should we pay for the other 95%?
- Here are my suggestions. 1. Fund the \$17m backlog with a bond measure. 20-year bond at 4% interest spread across more than \$42 BILLION in assessed property value. The typical home is valued at \$255,000. It works out to about one or two dollars per month to the typical homeowner. 2. Increase the transportation maintenance budget by about 20%... currently \$27m, increase to \$34m per year. If the entire increase was spread only to households, the increase comes out to about \$4 per month per household. Of course, the increase should be spread to every road user in

the county by way of a variety of fees, taxes and charges that ensure full and fair participation. 3. Make sure that both financing programs (backlog and current maintenance) include funding to mitigate and manage the environmental damages caused by the transportation system. Also, tie the entire program to county job development and employment initiatives to ensure that most if not all of the investments employ local businesses and local labor. 4. Use the backlog funding to encourage and incentivize a long term transition to incorporated cities and towns so that the county can get out of the urban services business, This includes the annexation of pockets of unincorporated areas with the existing urban service boundaries of existing cities and towns. We're in the second decade of the 21st century for Christ sake. It's time for citizens to take responsibility for their communities.

- Clackamas County has miles of bike lanes, I would like to see bike riders help to pay for the costs of maintaining the bike routes/lanes.
- Costs should be spread evenly to all residents to a certain extent to cover usage of busses, delivery services, and other community vehicles then taxed on usage thereafter, e.g. the gas tax and some sort of tax for EVs. Tax based on property value is unfair, and not related to vehicle usage.
- A taxing district that supports the unincorporated roads and transportation issues should be considered because those residents and businesses are not taxed as I am in West Linn for such repairs.
- I think that a gas tax is a more equitable model to pay for roads. The only concern I would have is that many poor people have been forced out of city centers and may have to pay more to commute to work from the suburbs.
- Make sure that low income persons are not adversely affected by any new taxes or fees.
- Bicyclists should be taxed as well since money for roads is going to form and maintain bike paths.
- If you are going to obtain revenue from motorists, make sure to obtain funds from bicyclists too.
- Increasing the gas tax is the simplest and fairest way of raising the necessary revenue for road maintenance. We don't need new taxes and fees. Increase the per-gallon gas tax is the way to go.
- I don't think costs should be the burden of homeowners or included in property taxes. There are many non-property owners using the roads.
- All costs should not be borne by property or business owners. People who own vehicles and use roads should also be paying even if don't own property.
- The value of my house has nothing to do with how much I use the roads.
- Why should property owners shoulder the entire burden for road maintenance? This expense must be tied to those who use the roads. However, when some jurisdictions refuse to allow light rail or street cars into their communities, which would provide drivers with another option, that municipality should also shoulder a proportionate share of the cost. Those of us who commute daily would LOVE to have another practical option to driving. But no, can't let in "those" people. Right Clackamas County?
- A gas tax is appropriate, however, I believe commercial trucks should have a few cents more, as they damage roads due to weight. For example, logging trucks in my area cause serious damage and pot holes to the road. Also drive recklessly and fast, have never seen a sheriff's unit nor a weigh master monitoring the logging trucks in my area.
- I think we should use taxes on sales of marijuana and cigarettes to help pay for transportation maintenance. What about a tax levied on purchases of alcohol or soda?
- Think Metro-wide, not just Clackamas County. Think ahead 20-30 years on how things will be and what will be needed.
- Sooner is better so roads and bridges do not deteriorate even more. We also need more public transportation, especially for the aging population.
- Flat taxes are unfair to the poor and unfair to those of us who have made a choice to bike commute or to live where we work. A gas tax is more fair because it's based on use. But hybrids should pay a fee instead.

- Transportation taxes should be related to both usage levels and ability to pay - i.e. income. It makes more sense to tie the tax to vehicle licensing or miles traveled or perhaps to local income tax.
- A gas tax would take advantage of visitors to Mt Hood. People who live in Multnomah County, and everywhere else, and visit Mt. Hood for recreation should contribute to better roads.
- VMT would be an even better model for assessing road tax, but a gas tax is the second fairest way. Be smarter than the Feds though and tie it to inflation so that you don't have continually have the political angst of "raising taxes" every five years just to remain solvent.
- Transportation funding must be tied to usage, if we want to encourage use mass transit, carpooling, etc.
- Now that I saw the comment about usage, I feel that is a better method; however, I think that strongly needs to consider that bike riders and people from out-of-state use our roads as well. A gas tax seems the best way to pick up heavy users, but then something needs to be done about the amount of transportation funds spent on bike paths when people using them may be paying very little toward maintenance if that's their only form of transportation.
- Include bicyclists. They share the road too. But also add safer access & pathways for them.
- Toll roads.
- Funding for road maintenance and upgrades should be tied to usage. I am retired. On most days, I drive under 5 miles, if that. Why should I see yet another property tax increase? The term "gas tax" needs to include diesel. Of course there is the problem of how do you insure that a majority of vehicles on county roads are buying their fuel in Clackamas County?
- Privatize the entire system.
- Do not support charging businesses and not everyone is a property owner.
- I don't feel attaching a fee to property owners is fair since many people rent. I do not appreciate that you ask 2 questions of funding options and you have to choose which way you lean, when neither is a good source. When this goes to vote of citizens it should have an option for NO - or you'll be replicating the uproar in City of Portland.
- Consider fees on bike transit.
- A fee based on usage makes the most sense to me.
- If a vehicle tax is proposed, I believe that larger vehicles, including pickups and SUV's should be taxed more than smaller cars. This seems more fair in the ratio of road wear and tear. This is why a gas tax is somewhat more equitable, as larger vehicles use more gas.

Save Money/Use What You Have

- Get rid of TRIMET, split the funds between the counties.
- Trim the dead weight; people who don't perform and high paid administrators recruit people that know construction.
- Transportation maintenance should take precedence over social programs. Let Churches and private organizations take up the social programs.
- No more taxes....use what you have.
- Again, you are thinking of taxing the people who own or work. If you can't come up with something that taxes EVERY single person/household, I'm not interested in even thinking about it. In fact, I'll put effort into making sure it gets blocked. There's only so much that we have, and working people are a dwindling bunch. You treat us like a bottomless piggy bank and you need to know, there is a bottom.
- Don't waste money. Unnecessary project. Quit wasting money on green projects, they will cost more than they will save.
- The county must force cities to maintain the roads; too many cities get a "free ride" on the county's roads. The county must control city use of county roads within a city; the city can't dump more traffic on a road than the county can support.

- In our county we prioritize clean air, water, and living. If you lead with these objectives can you get more support for the issues that you want to prioritize?
- A gas tax is not stable because as cost goes up less will be used producing less revenue. No one wants another bill in the mail and then you have collection issues if people don't pay. People traditionally do not support property tax increases.
- So much waste in government. Use the money you have wisely as individuals must.
- Do not create more divisions and departments to cover this service, too top heavy as it is.
- Bring your maintenance standards up to a standard that will produce longer lasting repairs and increase the efficiency of the maintenance personnel or replace them with people who can do the job correctly.
- Additional funding is not required, just a little courage.
- My neighborhood was established in 1961, currently 108 or so homes. We pay taxes but our roads are falling apart since our tax money seems to go east of I-205 to build new roads. How about using our taxes in our neighborhood to improve our roads before someone falls and sues the County? Many walkers live in my neighborhood, no sidewalks, no street lights, only potholes and patches. You can do better, reinvest in older neighborhoods and quit chasing development no one can afford!
- Unless there is a case statement that is based on health and safety, I do not support establishing a dedicating funding source for transportation. And, I am not interested in funding comparisons with other counties, used as justification for more road funding in Clackamas County. People live in Clackamas County because they can't afford to live somewhere else. Transportation is the least of our problems. Income, unemployment, education... Seriously, potholes are not on my radar as a voter.
- Spend more on PUBLIC transit, including light rail. I'd like to see the Orange Line extended from Milwaukie to Oregon City. I'd like to see WES extend from Wilsonville to Salem.
- Spend less tax dollars on bikes. They do not pay taxes.
- Make sure dedicated funds for road maintenance are used for that purpose only. Fight to remove prevailing wage mandates from government work. The same people will do the same quality work for a private wage salary.
- Employees that work for the county and drive here every day and use our roads but live in Vancouver or Portland; how do you collect taxes from them for using our roads? Criminal clients that frequent our roads for the jail, courts, etc.; how do you tax them for taking our buses every day and/or driving their cars here? The State needs to kick in a lot more for County seat cities to ensure our infrastructure is adequately maintained and improved.
- Do the job that is needed to be done, with the funds allocated. Get a web site so the public can communicate with the county.
- Stop just asking for money. Clearly show us what you do with current funds.
- We don't need more roads or more lanes on existing roads. Stop building new capacity and maintain what we have.
- Reorganize your Department of Transportation. The people in charge are not doing the people of Clackamas County a service.
- More proactive maintenance. Fix more, smaller problems before they become a thing. Do not try to raise our taxes again. We're getting killed on property tax increases already.
- Support high capacity trains from Salem. Support mass transit. Climb out of the cave and join the rest of the metropolitan region. Locate businesses within the County so people aren't forced to commute such long distances. Let people pay the price for "acreage" in all the ways it costs the rest of the County. Stop having the County be a warehouse distribution point for the rest of the area - we can do better than that!
- Get rid of the road "fluff". The county doesn't need to plant trees and flowers, they need to take care of ROADS.

- Be thankful and be good stewards for what you've been given.
- The costs of road repair are unreasonably high and the quality of the repairs often leave the road in worse shape than at baseline. Suggestion to reduce/eliminate some of the various excessive governmental/regulatory requirements to help keep the cost down. We have created our own excessive and expensive bureaucracy which does not leave enough funds to accomplish county goals.
- Concentrate on the quality of road repairs - using poor asphalt mixes and patching potholes in the rain are poor choices for quality road maintenance. Using recycled tire material in the asphalt mixes and fixing problem areas by rebuilding from the base up are good choices, along with enforcing load weight limits.
- The County should welcome, rather than resist the addition of public transit options. More public transit options would ease traffic and parking issues, and result in less maintenance costs for roads.
- I think the public needs to be able to discuss the transportation budget and have more control over it so that what we want to pay for gets taken care of and money is not wasted on things we don't care about as much.
- Clackamas county commissioners should NOT EVER consider a "funding model" that includes any increase in fees, taxes, or any other gimmick.
- Repair the roads we have and invest in public transportation.
- Figure out how to make it work! We pay enough in taxes already. How come, with the increase in gas costs, and the increased car congestion, (ergo increase in income for you), you can't make it work?!
- The county should put a hold on approving any more housing or business developments until the existing infrastructure is repaired and/or improved to handle the increased load. Our small section of Salmonberry that is still a part of Clackamas County's road system is used much more heavily by Oregon City residents and developers than by those of us who live here. The city should recognize that, and perhaps pay for a share of needed repairs.
- I see fleets of county cars and trucks sitting in idle reserve. I see County retirees making more in retirement than when they worked. I see greater and greater sums of transportation money being spent everywhere but for the roads. I see more and more expensive building codes implemented that are more for political correctness than are ever needed to ensure a job is done correctly. Stop all of this and then let's talk about where you are at with my money.
- Please, spend the money like it was out of your own pocket. No foo-foo projects or subsidies.
- Transportation should involve buses, mass transit, a proposal for a light rail to Timberline Lodge and funding that is not increasing what we already pay the various levels of government. Write more grants for federal funds.
- If Clackamas County didn't waste so much money on trails and other unnecessary projects and pay attention to the declining infrastructure this road issue could have been deeply offset years ago. Very poor planning.
- Why are heavy trucks ruining my local road when there aren't the funds to fix it? Why is safety prioritized so low? Why is more road volume continue to be allowed when we can't afford the traffic we have in terms of maintenance, capacity and safety?
- Forget any more light-rail agreements with Metro that sucks the money out of the economy and doesn't pay for itself.
- You need to come out and publish publicly where all the funds are currently spent and eliminate all the stupid politically correct expenditures and get back to honest basics. Governments do nothing but ask for more dang money. REALLY? How about living within a budget and show us where you are spending it right now. How about eliminating "zero based budgeting" where if you don't spend (waste) it you don't get it next year. That kind of dishonesty.

- The State of Oregon is currently passing new taxes on fuel that will raise the cost of fuel somewhere between \$0.20 and \$1.00. How can the county also raise the cost of fuel or driving? We will be taxed to death, and run all business out of the county and state! Enough is enough!
- No increase in road funding.
- I think we need to work within a budget and always looking for more revenue isn't the answer.
- If we cannot afford to maintain the roads, we must reduce the standards to which we construct roads so we can afford to maintain them.
- People can only be taxed so much before they can't afford to live on their income.
- Hold off on paying for bicycle services until the roads and bridges are being properly maintained.
- The County has multiple needs so they need to combine them in one package rather than piece meal them to the voters so additional planning is needed.
- Get back to people when they call. Actually have some customer service, and you may find people more willing to fund you.
- Just because Portland is dysfunctional and can't live within their means, doesn't mean we have to follow suit.
- Get rid of the public employee union so you can fire the non-productive employees.
- I think the status quo is acceptable.
- A lot of what is handled by government could be performed by the private sector for less money.
- Until every dime that was stolen from us to fund a light rail project we never wanted is fully reclaimed and used for the roads that money was SUPPOSE to be used for you don't need or deserve a single extra dime!! I will never claim or track my miles for a miles tax and if registration fees get too high or complicated I will choose to exercise my right to travel on public roadways with or without county approved registration tags because you answer to US we don't answer to you and we the citizens are getting fed up with being trampled on and milked dry to the bone!!
- If you aren't getting your share of gasoline tax, which should be more than sufficient if you quit it being wasteful, then figure out how to get it. We all pay for it.
- Please start focusing on local roads and the lower income areas of the county and stop catering to the rich!!
- I strongly feel any roads maintenance, county or otherwise, should be able to be funded by much more general sources. Infrastructure is not just a local issue, but a national issue and roads should be useable not only for vehicle traffic, but foot and bicycle traffic as well.
- The County complains about a lack of revenue, but takes no real steps to control costs. When the County negotiates a cut, or even a slow-down, in the rate of public labor costs, then I will take the issue seriously. When the State repeals the Prevailing Wage law that makes public infrastructure projects 15-25% more expensive than they have to be for the benefit of unions, then I will take seriously the claims of need. Until then, quit asking me for more money!!
- The county needs to find ways to cut costs in other areas to help pay for road repair. If you look deep, I'm sure you can find money.
- County has more than enough funding, they just are not using it wisely.
- Reduce administration costs, i.e. reduce the County Commissioner's salaries and put savings into transportation maintenance especially in south Clackamas County.
- Unload superfluous county programs. Disengage from all mass transit schemes and concentrate on supplying basic needs.
- NO NEW TAXES! Citizens of Clackamas County are taxed enough, we don't need one more thing. If you dealt with TriMet and kicked them out then maybe we could reward you.
- My husband feels that the county office "campuses" are like a palace and doesn't understand how something like that can be built and maintained while our roads are so neglected.

Thank You

- I appreciate you are doing the best you can under the circumstances. Thank you.
- Throughout the 17 years of living [in] Clackamas County [~~Dog Services~~] I have watched the funding for road maintenance continue to dwindle. However the men and women of the road department work very long hours to continue to keep the residents of Clackamas County safe throughout the year. I just want to say thank you to all of you guys and I appreciate everything you guys do.
- We need to fix our roads and bridges. It will get done one way or another. This survey is a good idea. By asking the people who will be paying you should get an idea of the fight you're in. Many taxpayers already feel overtaxed. We still need to fix our roads and bridges! Like it or not.
- You do a great job with the resources you have. I appreciate the quick repairs of potholes, the clearing of brush along roads, and regular restriping.
- The crew that did the ditching on S. Wildcat road did an excellent job. They worked steadily and I did not have to wait very long any time I was traveling to and fro.
- The road workers are dedicated and I appreciate them. We take them for granted.
- County does good job of maintaining roads on a limited budget.
- Keep up the good work!
- We periodically have one or two relatively small potholes crop up on the road into our subdivision, and it seems that when I stop by the County shops to report it, within 2-3 days the/se pothole/s have been patched; kudos to county road maintenance!!
- Keep up the good work.
- Keep up the good work, it must be hard to do your job with a cadre of psycho tea party rung grabbers running the county.
- Keep up the great work!

Studded Tires/Snow Tires

- Ban studded tires. I pave roads and I see what studs do to the roads. I have had snow tires for the last to sets of tires. Works just fine on ice. They don't damage the roads like studs!
- Tax studded tires or ban them outright. Seriously. They provide a false sense of security at best, and there's no need for them in Clackamas County! They are tearing up the roads needlessly.
- How about a tax on all car chains and studded tires sold in our county since they cause a lot of road damage?
- Place a fee on studs and studded tires.
- Just the original one: Get studded tires off the roads. The County Commissioners have to know (or should know) that these tires pulverize the road surface. I am sure there are calculations on the cost of this un-necessary damage, based on the large number of vehicles driving on these tires during the season they are allowed. We have lived in Oregon 15 years, and have never put them on our vehicles.
- Have people using snow tires pay an additional fee due to increased damage those tires cause.
- No more year round snow tires!!!
- Stop the use of studded tires.
- Consider weight limitations on roads to mitigate the damages from Heavy Rig use and outlaw studded tire or restrict use to December & January only.
- Put a \$100 - \$250 per year charge on the use of snow tires! Immediately.
- I feel those who choose to put studded tires on their cars as soon as studded tires are allowed and to drive the whole season until the last day for studded tires need to be charged for this choice.
- Fees for studded tires need to be much higher, especially for heavier vehicles. Studs do a lot of damage to our roads and the users need to pay for what they do.
- For people who choose to use studded tires, they should be assessed a fee.
- Ban studded tires.

Questions/Want More Information

- It would help if you provided a map of the roads the County is responsible for with this survey. I have no idea which roads the County is responsible for.
- What have they done with the money they've been receiving?
- Provide the total cost to bring every road up to "good" or better rating. Provide information on how long it will take to get this overall rating if the funding was available. Provide a plan to reach this goal if funds were available. The citizens deserve to know what it will take to reach this goal. The report should indicate how much work will be performed by in-house employees vs. consultants and how much work will be contracted.
- Most of the ideas for fund raising seem to fall on the residents when more than just the residents are using the roads, also if I am paying for maintenance who gets priority for the maintenance; that is what roads get fixed first. It seems the more wealthy communities get priority over the more rural areas, also where do the log, gravel, and larger delivery trucks fall into this maintenance funding?
- Whatever option is selected, the problem of it being only within Clackamas County will cause problems because if the prices are cheaper in a neighboring county, the people will go there for gas.
- I live in Milwaukie, where we already have a street fee. Would a new tax replace that?
- How does road maintenance stack up against other critical needs in the county? Is this being evaluated in a non-biased way? If so, how?
- Educate us. How is funding done today? Does the county need to be in the equipment and labor business or be a service provider that has mix use ownership and private contractors.
- Thinking about the option of added assessment, would this also be on property that is not on an improved road? Not looking for a response, just want to be sure it is addressed. I realize we use roads leading to the unimproved road, but should have a lower rate.
- Are revenues from Measure 91 available?
- How do responsibilities to maintain and cost burdens break down among municipal, county, state and federal roads/streets?

Miscellaneous

- CC needs to be pro-active. Set the standard for what can be accomplished when there is the POLITICAL will. We need strong leaders willing to make hard decisions that benefit all residents, businesses and property owners, not just their own agendas. Stop infighting, work together as they are meant to. The county commissioners are so busy congratulating themselves that they forget that they are temps, they can and will be replaced. Do your jobs.
- 3rd survey, first two phone surveys cost us \$23,000, and nothing to show for it. How much is this survey costing? Quit waiting for the "perfect answer" Get off your butts and make a decision. The roads aren't getting any better.
- You need to take a good look internally before you ask the citizens for more money.
- I have already written additional comments. I truly hope that it is worth my time to have written them.
- Pay it now, or pay it later.
- We need additional dollars for road maintenance, but any new leveraged dollars must only be used for road maintenance and have ROI methodology of prioritization.
- Just that striping seems to be missing, or very faded, on many streets.
- I don't like to see you put sand or salt on roads ever; people who need to get around in the winter need to have appropriate tires.
- Define what work needs to be done for some of the maintenance people.
- Really? No questions about bicycle and pedestrian transportation infrastructure? This is my main way of getting to work!

- The public does not trust the county board to actually use the money for roads. One can anticipate that the board would reduce the money from the general fund to offset the new money.
- Transportation means every form of moving people through the county. Focusing only on cars and trucks sends a bad message to the residents of the county and creates a cars vs. bike mentality that hurts the county. Changing the tone of the conversation is needed in order to find an answer to long term maintenance and funding needs.
- I recognize & support the necessity to raise funding to maintain our county roads! Please share this with our elected representatives.
- Good luck with this. It's a large and hairy topic!
- Keep educating residents about the funding issues for roads in Clackamas County.
- Any discussion re: road maintenance & transportation should take into account bicycle traffic as well.
- While not opposed to bike lanes and light rail, they seem to have the lion's share of focus, effort, and money but serve a relatively small percentage of the population. I am especially displeased when I see rail and bike projects that hamper or reduce vehicle throughput. Clearly a case of the tail wagging the dog here.
- Lake Oswego shouldn't get a PENNY in transportation dollars until they make West Linn whole.
@Y\$*(!*((\$&#*(@)%*#)@\$*!@(#\$
- It is very difficult to find out anything done in Clackamas Co. I live on county line and have a Multnomah Co. mailing address. Funny you can't send me information because my property tax statements manage to come to the correct mailing address. Gives me the impression that you want my money but can't go to the effort to keep me informed. I have called the county on a few occasions to discuss this but have not received a county newsletter to date.
- Clackamas County should have helped pay for the Sellwood Bridge.
- Why spend billions on light rail when it was voted down - they started working on before the vote was taken and went ahead with 5 questionable county retards opinion to proceed.
- Leadership means making hard decisions that may not be popular with the niche constituents who funded your election or voted for you. Taxes are not evil. Taxes are the mechanism that funds public projects for the public good. Transparency is when the public can see where there tax money is spent. Your job is to think about the future today -- and then plan and spend to make the future secure.
- Please use the money of us taxpayers wisely.
- Something needs to be done now!
- I understand that local roads are important but think the county also needs to be a team player in supporting regional transportation systems and community transit. For example, voting against assistance for the Sellwood Bridge was ridiculously short sighted by Clackamas county residents and the lack of support for light rail and other mass transit options by our county commission is disheartening.
- Quit screwing the people over and develop transit options. Your machinations to avoid it are pathetic.
- Good luck?
- This survey is obviously skewed so you can manipulate the results to show that tax increases are supported by the citizens --then the sock puppets in the media will regurgitate the path line
- I would like to see some action taken on obtaining funding for our roads and highways. It will benefit everyone in the county.
- Good luck.
- County officials need to shelve their anti-tax, anti-Portland rhetoric and focus on practical solutions that benefit current and future generations.

- Clackamas County needs to recognize that it is part of the large community and decisions made relative to transportation (and other matters) can and should not be made in isolation (Sellwood Bridge and positions of certain Commissioners relative to relations with Portland as examples).
- If you don't maintain roads why should we have to pay for them? If you are willing to maintain all roads it should be done immediately as replacement costs are always higher in the long run than maintenance.
- This problem isn't going to be solved until elected officials begin to care more about doing their job than getting reelected.
- The county does pretty well here.
- There should be an attempt to prevent subsidies for maintenance of rural roads by the residents of the urbanized area and to prevent subsidies for improvements to roads in the urbanized area by rural residents.
- Rumor has it that Lawnfield Ave. which has just been widened and re-paved is going to be closed down after new highway overpass is complete and running. If that is true... Then what a WASTE of taxpayers' money on the Lawnfield project that was just finished.
- The county needs to tell the Govt and Democrats in Salem that because they passed the LCFS tax that they just spent the money that could have gone to roads in CC. Thanks a lot you idiots.
- Stop planning bike/ped/horse pathways with the UGB!
- Clackamas County is a rural county. We need roads. Transit options such as buses, light rail, etc. doesn't work for us. We need our roads! Let's fund this important resource.
- I saw this URL on my Twitter feed and feel it was a bait and switch as I expected to answer questions related to what will South End Road look like in 10 years.
- Good luck trying to solve this problem with a county-wide vote. Washington County's transportation district has been successful, but the only equitable method would be to have a state-wide formula for an increase in the gas tax. Good luck.
- This is not downtown Portland and roads are very important to rural and urban areas of the County, for residents and commercial purposes. The placement of bike lanes should be very thoughtfully planned. They should be where they really will be of use and not everywhere. Particular attention should be paid to conflicts with trucks and faster moving vehicles.