



## **Final Report**

### **2019 Retreat Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)**

**Friday, June 14 – Saturday, June 15**

---

<b>C4 Retreat Attendance</b>	<b>Page 02</b>
<b>C4 Retreat Summary of Agenda Discussions</b>	<b>Page 04</b>
<b>C4 Retreat Flip Chart Transcriptions</b>	<b>Page 05</b>



**Retreat Attendees (C4 Members and Alternates)**

- Jim Bernard, Co-Chair            Clackamas County, Chair
- Paul Savas                            Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Brian Hodson, Co-Chair            City of Canby, Mayor
- Traci Hensley                        City of Canby, Councilor
- Laurie Freeman Swanson          Molalla Community Planning Organization (CPO)
- Katy Dunsmuir                      City of Estacada, Councilor
- Tammy Stempel                      City of Gladstone, Mayor
- Kenny Sernach                        Beaver Creek Hamlet
- John Keith                            Stafford Hamlet
- Markley Drake                        City of Happy Valley, Councilor
- Theresa Kohlhoff                    City of Lake Oswego, Councilor
- Wilda Parks                            City of Milwaukie, Councilor
- Keith Swigart                        City of Molalla, Mayor
- Dan Holladay                        City of Oregon City, Mayor
- Rachel Lyles Smith                 City of Oregon City, Commissioner
- Stan Pulliam                         City of Sandy, Mayor
- Jan Lee                                City of Sandy, Councilor
- Paul Gornick                         Oak Lodge Water Services District, Director
- Paul Morrison                        City of Tualatin, Councilor
- Hugh Kalani                         Clackamas River Water
- Russ Axelrod                         City of West Linn, Mayor
- Teri Cummings                      City of West Linn, Councilor
- Tim Knapp                            City of Wilsonville, Mayor
- Christine Lewis                      Metro, Councilor
- Shirley Craddick                    Metro, Councilor
- Dwight Brashear                    SMART, Director

**Retreat Support**

- Erin Ruff                              Facilitator
- Trent Wilson                         C4 Staff Liaison

### **Retreat Attendees (Non-C4 Members)**

- Martha Schrader Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Ken Humberston Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Sonya Fischer Clackamas County, Commissioner
- Gary Schmidt Clackamas County Administrator
- Dan Chandler Clackamas County, Assistant County Administrator
- Chris Lyons Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs
- Trent Wilson Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs
- Dan Johnson Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Mike Bezner Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Karen Buehrig Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Stephen Williams Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Jennifer Hughes Clackamas County, Transportation & Development (DTD)
- Jill Smith Clackamas County, Housing Authority (HACC)
- Stephen McMurtrey Clackamas County, Housing Authority (HACC)
- Drenda Howatt Clackamas County, Commission Staff
- Mary Jo Cartasegna Clackamas County, Commission Staff
- Emily Klepper Clackamas County, Commission Staff
- Tracy Moreland Clackamas County, Commission Staff
- Caroline Hill Clackamas County, Commission Staff
- Erin Ruff Clackamas County, Resolution Services
- Matt Tracy City of Gladstone, Councilor
- Brett Sherman City of Happy Valley, Councilor
- Jaimie Huff City of Happy Valley, Policy Analyst
- Kathy Hyzy City of Milwaukie, Councilor
- John Lewis City of Oregon City, Public Works
- Dayna Webb City of Oregon City, Public Works
- Mark Ottenad City of Wilsonville
- Beth Goodman ECONorthwest

## **C4 Retreat: Summary**

### **Friday, June 14 – Transportation Day**

Following the successful passage of the Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) in February 2019 and creation of the \$1.2 million Strategic Investment Fund (SIF), C4 members initiated the early discussions of establishing the desired outcomes of the SIF and began discussing the opportunities and hurdles of collaborating on the usage of the \$1.2 million SIF.

#### ***Key outcomes from the half-day discussion include:***

**Usage:** Whether or not to use the funding on road transfers or more strategic project needs throughout the county.

**Strategies and Criteria:** While no criteria were established from the discussion, it became clear that a variety of criteria were possible and that C4 members desired staff to return with draft criteria and strategies for using SIF dollars, based on discussion from the retreat.

### **Saturday, June 15 – Housing Day**

C4 members began the day with a snap-shot of the draft countywide housing needs assessment and rolled into discussions about the available Metro housing bond dollars. The second half of the morning included an exercise for exploring housing policy tools that can be implemented to develop or attract new housing dollars, as well as discussion about potential next steps to address the housing issues at C4.

#### ***Key outcomes from the half-day discussion include:***

- Cities agreed to share discussions from the retreat with their councils and discuss the housing tool kit to learn if there are potential housing tools that agencies are willing to entertain, either independently or as a group.
- Cities requested continued engagement on Metro housing bond funds and a desire to see affordable housing in every city in Clackamas County.
- Members requested the outcomes from the housing needs assessment and Affordable Housing and Homelessness Task Force return to C4 for continued support and engagement.

### **Session 10: Next Steps Discussion**

In addition to the outcomes assigned above, C4 members also requested to send a letter to Metro regarding the T2020 corridors, and to return to Mt Hood Oregon Resort for the 2020 C4 retreat.

## C4 Retreat: Flip Chart Transcription

### Session 1 – Goals for C4

- Comprehensive housing plan
- Transportation equity
- Connecting transportation to housing (+1)
- Include satellite/rural communities in the process
- Collective advocacy on priorities
- Climate change (keep it in view)
- Get to know each other better
- Better understanding of Clackamas-wide issues (Sunrise/C2C/Orange Line)
- Legislative Update
- More focus on transit
  - As an aging and disabilities resource
  - Employee/employer resource
- Land Use
- ?? How should C4 include ODOT??
- ?? Are there new approaches to funding??
- Be bold, be brave, be clear.
- “Real Talk” about affordable housing
- “Stand together” on issues (as modeled with STIF funding cycle)
- 2020 Retreat should/could be all about transit.

### Session 2 – SIF Part I

#### ***What does a strategic investment of these funds look like to you?***

- Leveraging Funds (+5)
  - Grant opportunities
  - Development funding
  - Other regional/state funds
- Gap projects (+1)
- Accountability
- Multimodal and bike-ped
- Synergy of multiple agencies
- Long range goals
- Sinking funds
- Urban/rural balance
- Geographical sharing
- Equitable distribution
- Safety issues (+2)
- Co-investments/Match Funding (+1)
- Establish a lead agency to help developers and development
- Transfer of county roads (+1)
- Bond for bigger projects

- Consider road classifications
- Money should be for shovel ready projects
- Congestion relief
- ?? How to share funds??
- Contingency funds
- Anticipate growth
- ?? Can road funds be used to build charging stations??
- ??How to discern between maintenance and capacity??

<b>Session 3 – SIF Part II</b>
--------------------------------

**Action items:**

- County to make a list of road transfer priorities and return to C4/cities
- 1<sup>st</sup> infusion of funds (1/2 year) to go into first full year of funding (increasing the first funding pot by 50%).

**Multi-year Plan:**

- Requires flexibility
- Supports cities that have biennial budgets
- Increase the amount for distribution/provides more funding for potentially larger projects

**Bonding:**

- Can buy bigger/multiple projects
- Can't turnaround new projects quickly

**Equity:**

- Cities within UGB have more money/resources to tap into
- Can funding be tied to low-income housing
- Greatest need
- Rural over Urban, because of other urban resources
- Transit resource?

**General:**

- Leveraging dollars creates questions of equity
- Should there be a 1<sup>st</sup> year, flagship project so voters see the dollars at work?
- Where is the low hanging fruit?
- Where is the “biggest bang for the buck”?

**Transfers:**

- City led process versus county led process
  - City led process:
    - Cities know their development needs
    - Cities know their priorities and budget timelines

- County led process:
  - Could result in a rush of cities being “at the table”
  - County could make a list of cities and return to C4.
- ??Can both lead??

**Table Group Reports on Criteria for funding:**

- Paving condition index for county roads within cities (transfers)
- Prioritize projects by development (transfers)
- Determine where is the greatest need
- Safety as a top priority
- Project readiness
- Money should have mutual and/or cross-jurisdictional benefit
- Where is the best value visible to the voters
- Could there be a long range plan (up to 10 years), thus supporting readiness
- Target congestion/bottlenecks
- Target rural/underserved areas
- Identify project by project consideration

<b>Session 4 – T2020 Update</b>
---------------------------------

\*\* No notes for this section.

<b>Session 5 – Housing Values (Breakfast Discussion)</b>
--

- Quick implementation
- Equity
- Mixed income housing
- New growth, new land, new money
- Increase variety of housing type
- Integrated solutions
- Environmental efficiencies for homes
- Public, private partnerships
- Transit oriented development (has market risk)
- Supportive housing solutions
- Code and zoning flexibility
- Policy options:
  - Better enforcement of tools
  - Creation of CETs
- Determine how to add affordable housing to high income areas
- Put housing where we don't have it, presently
- Put housing where the jobs are
- Have a project in every city (re Metro Bond Funds)
- Fight stigma of “affordable housing”

- Improve case management and transition support
- Increase education/have a better understanding of the cost of poverty
- No sprawl/urbanization in unincorporated areas
- Keep kids in homes (avoid couch surfing/homelessness)
- Focus on mixed housing types to avoid east coast mega housing project models
- Determine how to preserve existing affordable housing
- Recognize that we can't build enough housing, and there is a need to incentivize the public sector
- Reduce steps for developers

## Section 6 – What Do We Know?

\*\* No notes for this section.

## Section 7 – What Can We Do?

### *What needs to be in place?*

- Integration with established neighborhoods
- Green spaces
- Helping developers "pencil out" a profit
- Access to services
- Places for people of all incomes in the neighborhood to meet and mingle
- transportation
- thoughtful development
- Public transportation
- trees
- Good transportation (other than car)
- Transportation
- Zoning
- Services nearby
- Land
- Costs (SDCs)
- Services nearby
- Educational outreach
- Access to jobs/help with resumes
- Commitment of local government
- connect Affordable Housing users with neighborhood in meaningful way
- inter-jurisdictional task force to assist, aide and coordinate on affordable housing opportunities
- Less red tape to be approved for services or assistance
- Life stability (Personal development)
- More public information
- Multi-modal transit options
- Partnerships
- Partnerships with churches, non-profits and business community



- Public transportation
- regional transportation connectivity
- Reliable transportation
- Services nearby
- Services nearby
- Transportation
- Transportation option
- Understanding the process for accessing specific services
- Walkability

***What population is in the greatest need?***

- Children
- Families
- Homeless
- Homeless and very low income
- Kids and parents
- Low income, single, houseless
- Low inventory for low income
- Low wage earners, families, mid wage earners, domestic violence victims, children, high school graduates, working people
- Lower income, working people
- Our jurisdiction's rate of poverty appears most prevalent among communities of unrelated individuals over the age of 15 and single mother households with children.
- People in recovery
- People with Disabilities
- People with Mental Health Challenges
- Seniors and older adults
- Single parent
- unsure, suspects families and mental health support
- wrap around with housing first model for those struggling with homelessness

***What is your community's greatest need?***

- Housing first
- Funds outside of Metro boundary
- Wraparound services, flexible services
- Buildable land
- High value jobs and industrial land
- Incentives to enhance workforce for social service providers (ex, case managers, home care, etc.)
- Link to jobs plus transit problematic
- Workforce development
- Access to Food
- Transportation
- Affordable Housing

- Access to Health Services
- High paying jobs
- Low percentage of commercial areas for employment, topographic challenges

### ***Values?***

- equity lens
- Compassion
- Connect housing with workforce development, services and transportation
- Welcoming/diverse communities
- Prioritize children
- Mixed income housing
- Housing is a climate crisis issue - housing with low energy use, solar, good insulation
- Focus on the lowest end first (ie. Homeless and homeless prevention)
- Housing First
- More public info
- Investing in community is valuable
- Remember living wage is a factor, as well as access to education
- Support and acceptance of need by the public
- Understand affordability in each community
- Better education throughout the community to counter damaging stereotypes
- Hand up vs. hand out education
- housing built should reflect wages people are making in that location
- No segregation within Mixed-income settings
- Families receiving subsidy who are capable of transition should receive support in order to make that transition
- We meet people where they are (low/no barrier)
- Integration
- Integrate all income levels, abilities and family size with the entire community
- integrate affordable units throughout the community
- Inclusive

### ***What can make the application process easier?***

- more knowledgeable assistance
- Make process easily accessible
- goals that are clearly stated
- Standardized zoning
- Help connect cities with planning money coming out of HB2001 (if/when it passes)
- Reduced SDCs and faster permitting of affordable housing projects
- Don't raise WES SDCs so dramatically!
- Assist cities in direction on zoning and/or code modification
- it's confusing and degrading at times except for a few rock stars in building Dept.
- Limit the number of departments that review the application
- Flexible zoning/codes

- Identify needs
- Clearly define program criteria
- Be intentional
- Zoning changes - allow more types of housing and quicker processes
- Easy permitting and review process

## Section 8 – What Could We Do? (i.e. Housing Toolkit Deck)

### ***What's Interesting?***

- Suburban Tables
  - Everything but: employer assistance, farmworker housing, and limited tax exemptions
  - Allow Housing in Commercial Zones
  - Transit Oriented Development
  - Expanding Permits
  - Add ADUs
  - Utilizing public lands for affordable housing
  - Providing density bonuses
  - Credit enhancements
  - Urban renewal areas
  - SDC waivers
- Rural Tables
  - Change SDC tool from waiver to subsidy
  - Employer assisted living
  - Expedite permitting
  - Mixed use housing

### ***What's missing?***

- Can Clackamas County form its own transit district to improve transit connectivity
- Upzones/rezones
- SDC dis-incentives
- CET (suburban and rural)
- Rent control
- Make design standards easier
- Vertical tax credits (rural)
- ??Desire to meet with Homebuilders Association and developers re tools.

### ***We have more questions about...***

- Suburban Tables
  - Community Land Trusts
  - Use of density bonuses
  - Reduction of parking requirements
  - New market tax credits

- HOME Funds
- Transfers of development rights
- Credit enhancements
- Affordability covenants
- Urban renewal
- Employer assisted housing
- Rural Tables
  - Charging SDCs depending on the # of people in the dwelling
  - Funding long term support for projects

### Session 9 – What Will We Do?

- Integrate “Task Force” work
- Integrate transportation/transit into housing decisions (related to T2020)
- C4 as a peer-to-peer learning place (have more education at C4 meetings)
- Translate work to communities (better communication and outreach)
- Build/study the development of housing that reflects the wages of nearby jobs
- “Instigate”
- Explore long range plans/programs with developers to tackle affordable housing development
- Create a pro-forma on the housing toolkits
- Develop an inventory of the livable space for multi-purpose housing/zoning
- Improve transit
- Instigate conversations about SDC rates (and rate of increase)
- Explore CET/New \$\$
- Work towards satellite housing resource offices
- Reach council consensus on moving forward with projects
- Have discussion with cities about affordable housing tools
- City members to instigate discussion with their own councils and return to C4
- Explore HNA results/findings with councils
- Explore transit connectors with schools

### Session 10 – C4 Goal Setting

Goals (ranked by dots)

- 14 – Discuss transit improvements
  - Analysis/limitations/shuttle services
  - TriMet Service (bring to C4)
- 12 – All 3 T2020 corridors to advance and/or support CC
- 9 – “top 5” housing deck as a housing to-do list for C4
  - Education
  - Pros and Cons
- 8 – Be Goal 10 compliant

- 5 – Move forward with Futures Study
- 5 – reach agreement on SIF \$\$
- 4 – VRF
  - Have a 3 county comparison of \$ and miles
  - Cost breakdown of maintenance per mile
- 4 – Define equity and then create accountability
- 4 – SIF projects that benefit multiple jurisdictions
- 2 – Education/Outreach
- 2 – have action steps from HNA
- 1 – BCC to explore dedicated developers for Metro Housing Funds
- 1 – Talk with councils about housing tools
- 0 – create a card exercise with transportation
- 0 – Integrate “Task Force” work

<b>C4 T2020 Letter</b>
------------------------

- To Metro
- Re: Validation of and education for 3 corridor projects
- 13 member votes in favor of advancing

<b>Retreat Feedback</b>
-------------------------

- More brainstorming for the future
- Location
  - Have a more robust menu
  - More vegetarian options
  - More fruit
  - Better breakfast
  - Mics were poor
  - Have food on arrival (lunch?)
  - Choose snacks that improve health
  - More time for alcohol/socializing
- Packets were great
- Retreat should be longer
- Retreat should end earlier
- Cost is fine for next year