

---

Thursday, August 03, 2023  
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

Zoom Link:

<https://clackamascounty.zoom.us/j/82143065518?pwd=S1NCVUIaSjQvM3k0VXFcb01kUIQwdz09>

---

## AGENDA

- 6:45 p.m. Pledge of Allegiance**
- Welcome & Introductions**  
*Chair Paul Savas & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs*
- Housekeeping**
- Approval of May 4, 2023 C4 Minutes **Page 04**
- 6:50 p.m. R1ACT Recommendations**  
*Introducing: Trent Wilson, C4 | County Government Affairs*
- Memo about Nominees and Recommendations **Page 06**
- 7:00 p.m. RTP Comment Letter**  
*Introducing: Trent Wilson, C4 | County Government Affairs*
- DRAFT Letter (**ACTION ITEM**) **Page 07**
- 7:15 p.m. Updates from C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee + Joint Values on Tolling**  
*Facilitating: Trent Wilson, C4 | County Government Affairs*
- C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee Framework **Page 10**
  - Discussion Draft Joint Values (**ACTION ITEM**) **Page 11**
- 8:00 p.m. C4 Retreat Follow Up**  
*Introducing: Trent Wilson, C4 | County Government Affairs*
- Priorities and 12 month Calendar **Page 12**
  - Retreat Transcript **Page 17**
- 8:20 p.m. Updates/Other Business**
- JPACT/MPAC Updates
  - Other Business
- 8:30 p.m. Adjourn**

# General Information



## Current Voting Membership

		C4 Exec	C4 Metro	C4 Rural	JPACT	MPAC	R1ACT
<b>Clackamas County</b>	Commissioner Paul Savas	●	●	●	●		●
<b>Clackamas County</b>	Commissioner Ben West		●	●			
<b>Canby</b>	Mayor Brian Hodson	●		●			●
<b>CPOs</b>	Martin Meyers (Redland CPO)	●	●	●			
<b>Estacada</b>	Mayor Sean Drinkwine			●			
<b>Fire Districts</b>	Matthew Silva (Estacada Fire District)	●					
<b>Gladstone</b>	Mayor Michael Milch	●					
<b>Hamlets</b>	Kenny Sernach (Beavercreek Hamlet)			●			
<b>Happy Valley</b>	Council Brett Sherman	●	●		●	●	●
<b>Johnson City</b>	Vacant						
<b>Lake Oswego</b>	Mayor Joe Buck		●		●	●	
<b>Milwaukie</b>	Councilor Rebecca Stavenjord		●			●	
<b>Molalla</b>	Mayor Scott Keyser			●			
<b>Oregon City</b>	Commissioner Adam Marl		●			●	
<b>Portland</b>	Vacant						
<b>Rivergrove</b>	Councilor Doug McLean		●				
<b>Sandy</b>	Mayor Stan Pulliam			●			
<b>Sanitary Districts</b>	Paul Gornick (Oak Lodge Water Services)	●					
<b>Tualatin</b>	Councilor Valerie Pratt		●				
<b>Water Districts</b>	Sherry French (Clackamas Water District)		●			●	●
<b>West Linn</b>	Mayor Rory Bialostosky		●				
<b>Wilsonville</b>	Mayor Julie Fitzgerald		●				

## Current Ex-Officio Membership

<b>MPAC Citizen Rep</b>	Ed Gronke
<b>Metro Council</b>	Councilor Christine Lewis
<b>Port of Portland</b>	Emerald Bogue
<b>Rural Transit</b>	Todd Wood (Canby Area Transit)
<b>Urban Transit</b>	Dwight Brashear (SMART)

## ***Frequently Referenced Acronyms and Short-forms:***

### **Related to the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)**

#### **C4 Metro Subcommittee**

#### **C4 I-205 Diversion Subcommittee**

**CTAC:** Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (C4 Transportation TAC)

### **Related to Metro and Metro Committees**

**JPACT:** Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (Metro)

**MPAC:** Metro Policy Advisory Committee (Metro)

**TPAC:** Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT TAC)

**MTAC:** Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MPAC TAC)

### **Related to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Tolling**

**OTC** Oregon Transportation Commission (ODOT policy decision body)

**Region 1:** ODOT's geographic designation for the metro area + Hood River

**R1ACT:** ODOT Region 1 Advisory Committee on Transportation

**UMO:** ODOT's Urban Mobility Office

**RTAC:** ODOT's Regional Tolling Advisory Committee

**STRAC:** ODOT's State Tolling Rules Advisory Committee

**EMAC:** ODOT's Equity Mobility Advisory Committee (for tolling)

### **General Transportation Acronyms**

**STIP:** State Transportation Improvement Plan (ODOT)

**RTP:** Regional Transportation Plan (Metro)

**TSP:** Transportation System Plan (Local – county and cities)

**HCT:** High Capacity Transit

**UPWP:** Urban Planning Work Program

### **General Housing and Land Use Acronyms**

**H3S:** Clackamas County's Health, Housing, and Human Services Department

**HACC:** Housing Authority of Clackamas County

**SHS:** Supportive Housing Services (Regionally approved funds for housing services)

**OHCS:** Oregon Housing and Community Services

**LCDC:** Land Conservation and Development Commission

**DLCD:** Department of Land Conservation and Development

**UGB:** Urban Growth Boundary

**UGMA:** Urban Growth Management Agreement

**Thursday, May 04, 2023**  
**Virtual Meeting via Zoom**

**Attendance:**

**Members:**     **Canby:** Brian Hodson, Traci Hensley; **Clackamas County:** Paul Savas, Ben West; **CPOs:** Martin Meyers, Marjorie Steward (Alt); **Fire Districts:** Matthew Silva; **Gladstone:** Michael Milch; **Hamlets:** Kenny Sernach; **Happy Valley:** Brett Sherman; **Metro:** Christine Lewis; **Molalla:** Scott Keyser; **MPAC Citizen:** Ed Gronke; **Sewer District:** Paul Gornick; **Transit:** Dwight Brashear (SMART, Urban), John Serra (TriMet – Alt); Todd Wood (CAT); **Tualatin:** Valerie Pratt; **Water District:** Sherry French (CRW); **Wilsonville:** Caroline Berry (Alt.)

**Staff:**             Trent Wilson (PGA)

**Guests:**            Janelle Bynum (State Representative); Laura Edmonds (Ec. Dev); Jamie Stasny (DTD); Jaimie Lorenzini (Happy Valley); Mark Ottenad (Wilsonville/SMART); Rick Cook (Hamlet); Sandra Hikari (ODOT); Adela Mu (ODOT)

The C4 Meeting was recorded and the audio is available on the County’s website at <http://www.clackamas.us/c4/meetings>. Minutes document action items approved at the meeting.

<b><u>Agenda Item</u></b>	<b><u>Action</u></b>
<b>Approval of April 06, 2023 C4 Minutes</b>	Minutes approved
<b>Meet Laura Edmonds, Clackamas County Economic Development Manager</b>	Laura Edmonds introduced as the County’s new economic development manager. New to the role, but will be reaching out to make connections with cities and city businesses.
<b>Economic Development Priorities</b>	State Representative Janelle Bynum attended, sharing takeaways from the legislative session. Recommended “committing to a vision” and “educating legislators” on your story.  Cities on C4 shared various economic goals and objectives for each individual jurisdiction.  Group needs included, additional land and staff to reach success metrics, and a list of challenges that included workforce, infrastructure costs, materials costs, and transportation gaps.
<b>C4 Retreat</b>	C4 Members confirmed the “working agenda” for the June

	<p>2-3 retreat. Confirmed “housing day” on June 2 and “tolling day” on June 3.</p> <p>Staff reiterated attendance and registration needs.</p>
<p><b>Updates on I-205 (Tolling, State Legislature, EA)</b></p>	<p>The Governor announced a Pause of Toll Collections until January 2026. Staff noted a variety of unknowns, and highlighted the C4 retreat would be a good and nearby opportunity to discuss priorities during the Pause.</p> <p>This announcement came on the heels of HB 3614 gaining significant momentum and support, but the bill will likely not move because of the Pause. The Pause also includes the formation of a Legislative Transportation Subcommittee on Transportation Planning, aimed at resolving toll policies and researching other funding mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>Updates/Other Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>JPACT/MPAC Updates</b></li> <li>• <b>Climate Action Plan Task Force Update</b></li> <li>• <b>Other Business</b></li> </ul>	<p>JPACT/MPAC – RTP and 2040 Planning Development Grants</p> <p>Climate Action Plan Task Force Update – Held its 12<sup>th</sup> and final meeting, final report going to BCC in June.</p>

Adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

## Memorandum

**To:** Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)  
**From:** Trent Wilson, C4 | County Government Affairs  
**Date:** July 27, 2023  
**Re:** R1ACT Nominations

---

### Overview

The Region 1 Area Commission on Transportation has reached the end of a term window for several seats in Clackamas County, which includes two cities seats and one stakeholder seat. For context, the current seats at term include one seat that C4 has prioritized for a rural city, and one seat for a city within the Metro urban growth boundary. The third seat is prioritized for a business representative.

The current members of the R1ACT that hold these seats have all expressed the desire to continue. C4 can approve these nominations, or discuss if they desire a change in representation at the R1ACT.

Those members include:

- Rural City: Mayor Brian Hodson (Canby)
- Urban City: Councilor Brett Sherman (Happy Valley)
- Business: Bill Avison

Whomever C4 approves will be presented as “nominees” that the R1ACT will need to approve at their next meeting, currently scheduled for August 7, 2023.



**DRAFT**

August 03, 2023

Metro Planning  
600 NE Grand Ave  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

**RE: Regional Transportation Plan Public Review DRAFT**

Dear Kim Ellis, 2023 RTP Project Manager:

On behalf of the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4), we are writing to share our feedback on the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Public Review draft. We wish to express our appreciation for Metro's efforts and acknowledge the challenges of developing the next RTP on the heels of the COVID-19 pandemic, including holding various workshops and many visits by Metro staff to C4 meetings.

At this stage of the 2023 RTP's development, we wish to offer feedback on three critical gaps. Namely, better integration of Pricing Policy direction into the active tolling and congestion pricing projects, the need for engagement around future transportation funding options, and the importance of the region working together to prepare for electrification of the transportation network.

**Pricing Policies should be recognized by the tolling and congestion pricing projects in the 2023 RTP**

This process must acknowledge that the projects local jurisdictions moved forward into the 2023 RTP did not necessarily emerge as priorities in their local Transportation System Plans (TSPs) to specifically address the impacts of tolling and congestion pricing the interstates. Local TSPs have not had the time, data or resources to integrate the solutions that will be needed to the impacts of tolling, which means the 2023 RTP does not include those projects either. From the information that we have seen to date, the diversion created by the ODOT tolling and congestion pricing projects will be impacting the local roadway systems. We are concerned that the 2023 RTP does not prioritize local projects that will be needed to address the impacts of the ODOT led pricing projects.

In addition, significant time and effort has been spent on developing the Pricing Policies that are in Chapter 3 of the 2023 RTP. It is essential that they are used to guide the projects that implement pricing as they are designed and constructed. We are concerned that ODOT's tolling

and congestion pricing projects are not being carefully designed in a way that will ensure that the process is equitable, that the revenues will be reinvested equitably, or that will adequately address significant diversion onto local streets. As we witnessed in Clackamas County through ODOT's 2023 draft Environmental Analysis for the I-205 Tolling Project, tolling will produce diversion in significant ways that dramatically alter transportation needs off the interstate. Without being held accountable to the 2023 RTP Pricing Policies, the actual pricing projects will not bring forward the benefits expected by the RTP. As these projects move forward through the MTIP approval process, they should be required to provide a report on how the projects that are evolving are meeting the 2023 RTP pricing policies.

**The region must have a conversation to determine predictable and sufficient revenue to advance transportation projects**

Our region needs to be engaged with the discussion about how to replace lost revenue from the declining gas tax. Presently, cities and counties share 50% of the state gas tax, by formula, which is a significant source of local road funding. While many jurisdictions have established other revenue streams (many are also gas taxes), not everyone has or has been able to. And yet, the region currently has no funding replacement for that loss. ODOT, however, has said the congestion pricing program is their way to replace revenue from the declining gas tax, not for new capital projects but rather for maintenance of the interstate system. While a revenue share of the new congestion pricing program is certainly one idea – and a fair one if ODOT is replacing the gas tax – it cannot be the only solution. We must find a way for our communities to fund our projects or we will not reach our RTP goals. The 2023 RTP should include a project specifically designed to host a conversation at JPACT about the future of transportation funding.

**Electric vehicle infrastructure is under-represented**

The automotive industry is sprinting toward electrification of their fleets. Most manufacturers will only produce electric vehicles as early as 2035. Likewise, starting in 2035 automotive dealers in Oregon will only be able to sell “new” vehicles if they are electric. Simply, density requirements and other recent land use laws limit where parked vehicles are able to charge, and charging stations do not exist in the same capacity as fueling stations. Hydrogen fuel markets are also expanding, though slower, and will have similar challenges. We must find a collective way to ensure adequate charging infrastructure is in place during this gas to electric transition. All of this is especially acute in Clackamas County since there are not significant levels of viable travel options. Models exist in California that may serve as a starting place for our region to begin discussing funding and expansion of infrastructure for fossil fuel alternatives. Supporting the transition to EVs and other alternatives is critical to help us move toward our climate reduction goals.

We must have a Regional Transportation Plan that is truly regional, and not a system that favors some communities over others. Our residents and businesses depend on a predictable transportation system that is fair and efficient. It is our goal in C4 and throughout Clackamas County to advocate for those fair investments and policies so that our region thrives together.



Sincerely,

**DRAFT**

Paul Savas, Commissioner  
Clackamas County  
C4 Co-Chair  
R1ACT Vice Chair

**DRAFT**

Brian Hodson, Mayor  
City of Canby  
C4 Co-Chair  
R1ACT Member

**C4 Membership:** Clackamas County; the Clackamas Cities of Canby, Estacada, Gladstone, Happy Valley, Lake Oswego, Milwaukie, Molalla, Oregon City, Rivergrove, Sandy, Tualatin, West Linn, Wilsonville; Clackamas CPOs, Hamlets, and Special Districts; Ex Officio Members including Metro, MPAC Citizen, Port of Portland, Urban and Rural Transit

## **C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee Framework**

### **Purpose:**

- Coordinate on I-205 and RMPP tolling policies, with recommendations to C4
- Serve as Pre-Coordination meeting ahead of the Regional Toll Advisory Committee

### **Co-Chairs:**

- Commissioner Paul Savas
- Commissioner Adam Marl

### **Membership**

- C4 Membership
- Designate a Member and Alternate

### **Early Actions**

- Coordination on Nexus Projects
- Drafting the Joint Values Document

## **DISCUSSION DRAFT**

Clackamas County jurisdictions support a functional regional transportation system that prioritizes safety, equity, a vibrant economy, healthy and active communities, climate action, disaster resilience, and the reliable movement of people and goods.

We acknowledge that additional transportation funding is needed to address maintenance and capital projects on the interstate system. We recognize ODOT has been directed to pursue pricing in some form, but also that toll collections have been paused until 2026 in order to better address local concerns. If interstate pricing is implemented, the jurisdictions listed here will advocate for the following values to be reflected in any proposed policy or project.

### **To rebuild trust with local communities, ODOT should...**

- Deliver clear benefits to the drivers, communities, and businesses affected by toll corridors
- Be influenced by local voices and jurisdictions ahead of implementation
- Prioritize robust and inclusive community engagement
- Incorporate and track commitments made with local and regional partners through transparent and consistent communication

### **To ensure the transportation system works for Oregonians, the OTC and the State Legislature should direct ODOT to...**

- Extend the existing revenue sharing models with local jurisdictions to apply to toll revenues
- Prioritize the completion of the bottleneck projects identified in HB 2017 (2017) and HB 3055 (2021)
- Explore alternative funding mechanisms beyond pricing to address transportation funding needs

### **To ensure the efficient and equitable movement of people and goods, tolling or congestion pricing programs should...**

- Decrease diversion into local communities
- Increase safety on and off the interstate system
- Ensure that all tolling or congestion programs are designed with regional implementation in mind to avoid economic disadvantages or unfair burdens on people and communities
- Maintain a regionally balanced transportation system that provides reliable travel times for commuters and employers on and off the tolled corridor
- Establish viable travel alternatives to accommodate mode shifts, including bicycle and pedestrian networks and accessible transit programs in areas with inadequate or no service
- Provide considerations for local trips with few or no alternatives
- Improve transportation system resiliency to natural disasters, such as earthquakes and wildfires
- Improve regional air quality and reduce vehicle pollution, both on and off the interstate system
- Establish a long-term oversight and accountability program to showcase financial transparency
- Consider recommendations from the Low-income Toll Report and the Equity Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC)
- Address the land use implications inherent with how tolling will affect local communities

**This document is not an endorsement or acceptance of any proposal to implement tolling or congestion pricing.**

# C4 Agenda Calendar (2023-2024)

**DRAFT**

## Discussion Priorities

Retreat Priorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I-205/Tolling<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Expand roll of Diversion Subcommittee</li><li>○ Joint Values Statement</li><li>○ Near-term strategy</li></ul></li><li>• <i>Housing</i><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Find Mutual Solutions + Low Hanging Fruit</li><li>○ Explore HB 3115 (Camping Regulations)</li></ul></li><li>• Transit<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ How to Improve in ClackCo</li><li>○ How to Improve Relations/Agency Partnerships</li><li>○</li></ul></li><li>• Strategic Investment Fund – <i>as needed</i></li><li>• Explore Impacts of Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities</li></ul>
Related Topics for Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Various Projects in RTP related to transit, especially the Access to Transit Study</li><li>• TriMet Forward together Implementation and Forward Together 2.0</li></ul>

## Calendar

### August 2023 (3<sup>rd</sup>)

- **Joint Toll Values Document**
- **RTP Comment Letter**
- **R1ACT Member Recommendations**
- **C4 Retreat Recap**
  - 12 month calendar
  - Priorities Ranking

### **C4 Metro Subcommittee (16<sup>th</sup>)**

- No JPACT/MPAC Meetings
- Potential Cancel

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (16<sup>th</sup>)**

- No RTAC Meeting in August
- NEXUS Projects/Discussion

**September 2023 (7<sup>th</sup>)**

- **Tentative:** RTAC/NEXUS List – Potential Decision?
- **Tentative:** Transit Integration Webpage
- **DRAFT Agenda**

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (20<sup>th</sup>)**

- **Draft Agenda**

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (20<sup>th</sup>)**

- **Draft Agenda**
- **Ideas:**
  - Strategy ahead of Legislative Days, Leg Subcommittee on Transportation Planning

**October 2023 (5<sup>th</sup>)**

- **DRAFT Agenda**
- **Ideas:**
  - Sunrise Visioning Project Update
  - C4 VRF Funding Update (aka: Strategic Investment Fund)

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (18<sup>th</sup>)**

- **Draft Agenda**

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (18<sup>th</sup>)**

- **Draft Agenda**

**November 2023 (2<sup>nd</sup>)**

- **Draft Agenda**

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (15<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda
- JPACT – 2023 RTP Action

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (15<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**December 2023 (7<sup>th</sup>)**

- draft

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (13<sup>th</sup>) (One Week Early)**

- Draft Agenda
- JPACT moved up 1 week

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (20<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**January 2024 (4<sup>th</sup>)**

- DRAFT Agenda

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (24<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (24<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda
- Ideas:
  - Position Strategy ahead of Short Session

**February 2024 (1<sup>st</sup>)**

- Legislature 2024 Begins
- Consider having TriMet attend C4 to describe their Forward Together 2.0, and Metro's Access to Transit study
- Draft Agenda

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (14<sup>th</sup>) (One Week Early)**

- Draft Agenda

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (21<sup>st</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**March 2024 (7<sup>th</sup>)**

- **First Meeting of C4 Year**
  - Selecting Executive Committee representatives
  - Approving Retreat Agenda
- Draft Agenda

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (20<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (20<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**April 2024 (4<sup>th</sup>)**

- DRAFT Agenda
- 

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (17<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (17<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft

**May 2024 (2<sup>nd</sup>)**

- DRAFT Agenda
- DRAFT Agenda

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (15<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (15<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**June 2024 – 6<sup>th</sup> or C4 Retreat**

- C4 Retreat???
- DRAFT Agenda

**C4 Metro Subcommittee (19<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda

**C4 Toll Strategy Subcommittee (19<sup>th</sup>)**

- Draft Agenda



## 2023 C4 Retreat – Transcription of Notes and Wall Boards

### Retreat Goals and Desired Outcomes in next Year

#### Retreat Goals

- Find commonalities
- Test underlying beliefs
- Learn from other jurisdictions
- Identify opportunities
- Leave with new strategies
- Build collaboration
- Understand next year’s agenda
- Have fun
- ID actionable tasks
- Strengthen and make relationships

#### Desired Outcomes in 2023/24

- Housing – Maybe create a subcommittee
  - Mutual solutions + low hanging fruit
- Values statement on I-205/Tolling
- Expand the role of the Diversion Subcommittee
  - Work on a 3-6 month plan
- Determine how to engage bigger coordination groups
- HB 3115, camping regulations
  - Is this a place to discuss housing items like where we want mutual goals?
- Should tackle: Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities?
- Public Transit... improve it, and improve relations to make it better

### Housing Day

#### C4 Housing Action Items

- Outreach opportunities/info sharing.
  - Present more to cities
- Identify dirt for development and/or willingness to development (re cities, property owners)
- Could this work live in its own subcommittee?
- Can we create an inventory or dashboard of this work?
- Where can ClackCo TV help in this work?
  - Re communication, positive outreach/information
- Re Behavioral Health, can we do a gap analysis?
  - What resources do we have?
  - What is lacking?
- Can we take stronger legislative positions on this work?

#### Table A SWOT: Availability of Developable Lands - 3 DOTS

- Strengths

- Building OUT existing land
- We have the BEST staff
- We plan for growth
- Weakness
  - UGB + Usable lands – 3 DOTS
  - Cost of permits
    - Growth pays for development
  - Disproportionate growth in the county
- Opportunities
  - 99 corridor
  - Sunrise gateway
  - Focus on areas w/ public services
  - Middle housing retrofits + homelessness – 4 DOTS
- Threats
  - Infrastructure - 7 dots
  - Community receptiveness
  - Short term rentals
  - Mandates vs innovation – 1 dot
  - Interest rates

**Table B SWOT: Financial Incentives – 1 DOT**

- Strengths
  - Metro Bond – 2 DOTS
  - SHS Money – 2 DOTS
  - State Money
  - Public/private opportunities
- Weakness
  - Lack of funding
  - Constrained funds
- Opportunities
  - Land – 3 DOTS
  - SDC waivers
  - Tax exemptions
  - Planning Departments
  - Predictability
  - Communication – 1 DOT
- Threats
  - NIMBY – 1 DOT
  - Political landscape
  - Zoning
  - Clear scope/target (don't fit all of the issues into one deal)
  - Cost/Interest Rates – 1 DOT

**Table C SWOT: Street Outreach, Navigation, and Shelters – 1 DOT**

- Strengths
  - \$\$\$

- Coordination of CBOs responsive to increased need + pressure
- Coordinating with Cities + City Police
  - WL, Wils, OC, Milw. Behavioral Health Officer/Case Manager – 2 DOTS
- Single COC
- Good county coordination
- Milw. + OC have city level coordinating meetings
- Weakness
  - Lack of rural area outreach and knowledge (e.g. private property, can't see from road)
  - Not enough shelter, sheer # of beds in enough places – 1 DOT
  - WL no designated projects
  - More coverage in rural areas – 2 DOTS
  - Gap in personal connections
- Opportunities
  - Relatively small population = high touch + individualized treatment plans
  - Greater coordination between cities and county – 1 DOT
  - Coordination for foster youth
- Threats
  - SHS funds end in 8 years, then what? – 2 DOTS
  - Some shelter might close and population will further centralize in OC – 1 DOT
  - NIMBY
  - Public perception
  - Obsessed with data, not results
  - Location, zoning, willingness

**Table D SWOT: Rapid Rehousing + Supportive Housing**

- Strengths
  - Good staff w/helpful information and programs.
    - But... (arrow pointing to weakness)
- Weakness
  - Cities don't know what programs/resources the county offers – 2 DOTS
  - Phone tree = lost in the abyss
  - 24/7 doesn't exist
- Opportunities
  - County could present to city councils – 4 DOTS
- Threats
  - Doesn't address root cause of crisis
  - More of a band aid

**Table E SWOT: Behavioral Health + Addiction Recovery – 1 DOT**

- Strengths
  - Engaged together, focused on improvements
  - Recognized statewide crisis
- Weakness
  - Resources not distributed geographically
  - Lack of overall capacity
  - Transportation challenges

- Diversity from treatment
- Lack of awareness as a cause of homelessness
- Opportunities
  - Diversify locations – 7 DOTS
  - Services integrated with law enforcement and public safety
  - Fostering more community support and resources – 1 DOT
- Threats
  - Measure 110 – 1 DOT
  - Proliferation of illicit substances
  - High rates of youth substance use
  - Easy access

**Table F SWOT: Self Sufficiency, Childcare, Workforce (1 DOT)**

- Strengths
  - Supporting what is already being done
  - Community Colleges
- Weakness
  - Lack of Childcare networks – 3 DOTS
  - Providers
  - Funding (lack of) – 1 DOT
  - Integration with school system - 3 DOTS
- Opportunities
  - Roadmaps for Kids/Workforce – 3 DOTS
  - Public/Private Partnerships on Childcare
- Threats
  - People not wanting to work in the sector
  - High turnover
  - High stress/workload

**Day 1 “Family Meeting”**

- Oregon City: Can the county adopt our 3 concept plans?
  - Need county help with that?
  - Do property owners need to annex into the city for that?
- Happy Valley: We need improved transportation facilities
  - Low city property tax, unable to create incentives
- Lake Oswego
  - How to bring more of the unincorporated areas into the cities?
  - Is there a coordinated effort on that?
- County:
  - Do cities have “dirt” to build more affordable housing?
- Happy valley:
  - Trying to meet CFEC rules, create walkable communities
  - How can the county help with the fringes?
  - Is the county thinking about Housing Bond 2.0?
  - Transit is a hurdle for us
- Wilsonville
  - Are there dollars to buy down land?

- Metro: The bond dollars are allocated, no money to dip into at this point
- West Linn: Wants to connect more with cities, education on what is happening with housing
- County:
  - If there is city buy-in... call us. We want to partner
- Molalla:
  - Welcome more information/visits with staff at our work sessions
  - Don't forget about the cities that don't have Metro money
- Milwaukie:
  - How do we preserve affordability?
  - Are there legislative opportunities, such as addressing tax credits and caps, funding future housing needs assessments and tax data
- Happy Valley
  - How do we mutually lift up grant applications, how do we share expertise if a city doesn't have it – like with affordable housing projects?
  - What market innovations are we looking at?
  - How to equip property owners to reconsider or reconfigure their space?
- County:
  - How do we streamline, get creative and fund "NOW" ways to address housing
    - Example, home-share
- Milwaukie
  - Want to prioritize work/live developments
  - Interested in environmental reuse
  - Focused on workforce improvements
- Wilsonville
  - Can the county create a dashboard of the work going on?

### Day 1 Parking Lot

- Low hanging fruit #1: provide supplemental funding and supplies so that senior centers are community centers can operate as warming/cooling shelters. Note: cooling shelters don't require overnight accommodation, so school gyms could be used for this too.
- Low hanging fruit #2: Many churches want to serve as emergency shelters. Create funding for improvements such as sparklers and egress windows. And create staff positions to help churches navigate conversations with neighbors
  - And what about churches with excess land that could be developed as affordable housing? How can we help them facilitate conversion in those instances?

### Transportation Pages

#### ODOT Session Notes/Reactions

- Is this a learning moment for ODOT? For the state? For Locals?
- There is a perspective gap construction/project/need vs revenue generator
- How do we rebuild trust and the trust lost with constituents?
- Listening vs heeding. ODOT is not heeding.
- How do we get a hearing on good bills? Need our voice to be heard
- Don't "take the bait" of project to help us feel better about tolling
- Stronger together, time to "mount up."

- Involve businesses

## Brainstorm Session

*What does success look like in 2026 under the following topics?*

### Engagement/Local Involvement

- More positive benefit than negative impacts on EVERY community member
- Show your work. Where is the data?
- Accountability and local involvement via work group or legislative subcommittee
- Bring the rural areas into the conversation
  - Woodburn, aurora,
  - Marion, Clack, Yamhill, Hood River
  - CPOs, Hamlets
- OTC members visit the communities and drive the roads
- Strickler at C4 and on local tours
- Empower a local task force to inform the legislature (and provide staffing for it), not ODOT
- Where does IP4 come in?
- Reengage R1ACT – 6 DOTS
- AOC+LOC need to be involved
- How to engage the freight lobby

### Equity and Access

- Women should be considered within the equity analysis
- Low income families trying to get to work should be included
- Toll the “entire” region – 2 DOTS
  - Could mean – toll all at once
  - Could mean – Toll 84, 26, 217 in addition to I-5 and I-205
- Restore “fareless square” (trimet)
- Remove barriers to equal access to transportation infrastructure
- Reengage how low income exemptions further reduce the already infeasible funding stream from tolls to complete projects
- Most vulnerable communities do not have a choice about when to travel. They cannot go to work at different times. Need better solution for hourly workers.
- Don’t pick off communities with pet projects – 5 DOTS
- Worry that only rich will be able to afford tolls – 1 DOT
- Equity reports cannot sit on shelf
- Too many unknowns, show the data
- Determine how to engage those who have barriers to engage
- Need to figure out how to get away from current assumptions/presumptions. Need to understand the exact cost on drivers, families, businesses.
- Must have larger voice where tolls will be implemented.

### Economic Impacts

- Equity for income restricted folks is a good idea, but it will make tolling a “zero sum game” Use other methods besides tolling
- Statutory revenue sharing with local governments (like 50/30/20)

- Study micro-economic impacts
  - E.g. saying that tolling creates “construction jobs” is not an economic analysis
- Business communities need a solution for how tolling is going to impact how and where people shop, dine, and recreate
- Free up federal and state funding for local projects with less process
- Develop more “15 minute” cities where everything is close and people rarely need to travel on tolled roadways
- Push an Environmental Impact Statement that evaluates accurate and agreed upon economic impacts – **13 DOTS**
- Study effects on retail and how prices are affected by shipping, pre-manufacturing, and deliveries.

#### Alternative Modes of Travel – 1 DOT

- Effective Metro ride-share
- More transit coverage + services
- Transit that address the needs of the community – **3 DOTS**
- Funding for alternative mode infrastructure
- Transit system in place that includes shuttles, last mile service, improved connectivity between TriMet and local providers, and founding to the “small providers” for stable operations
- Financial incentives for utilization
- On-demand micro transit (example: uber-shuttle) – **2 DOTS**
- How to make people feel safe using transit?
  - How to design spaces success (example: women waiting at bus stop at night)
- “point to point” public transportation in the rural areas
- Problem: Stafford has no transit system and is too hilly for bikes as a primary method for its residents

#### Climate

- Improved Air Quality
- Electric car charging stations
- How do we make light vehicles obsolete?
- Mode shift requires “real” other options
- Diversion = reduced air quality and idling
- Need to think outside of the box
- Complete the local bike/PED/trail network
- How does backyard build policies (like ADUs) affect rural/urban air quality

#### Diversion

- ODOT fund replacement of trolley trail bridge, connect OC to Gladstone
- Funding for REAL solutions
- Diversion free solutions – **2 DOTS**
- If tolling, then gantry locations that minimize the diversion trends
- System upgrades to improve transit efficiency – **1 DOT**
- Toll Free Lanes – **6 DOTS**
- Involve the rural areas on diversion discussions – **1 DOT**

## Safety

- Less fear of sharing the road with “big rigs”
- Improve safety for crossing roads, not only driving along them.
- Improved safety on the local system as well as the main lines
- Invest in local shuttles and transit, demonstrate safety and dependability.
- Safety improvements DOT NOT equal diversion mitigation
- Safe system approach. We need to eliminate ALL the fatalities and serious injuries, maintain current roads, fix potholes
- Diversion solutions to discourage cut-through traffic
- Keeping diversion off local roads and out of neighborhoods. Frustrated drivers will cut through local communities
- Educate how to properly merge
- Give cities the authority to set speed limits
- How do we help people feel safe accessing + using transit
- More people “like me” on transit, less fear of scary people

## Different Funding Ideas

- ODOT thoughtfully considers other tolling strategies besides JUST toll all lanes at all times, such as express lanes or free lanes, cordon pricing, and/or vehicle miles traveled – 7 DOTS
- Funding by reworking DEQ emissions by bonding fees revenue to pay for 3<sup>rd</sup> lane – 1 DOT
- McClain no longer transportation co-chair
- Use Kicker to fund ODOT projects
  - \$8B kicker shows there is money to budget for transportation projects
- Better freight transportation infrastructure and single driver transit alternatives – 2 DOT
- No tolling
- Funding from EV charging stations fees
- Mileage fees
- More Vehicle Registration Fee – 1 DOT
- Better use of highways around the clock with commercial transportation incentives for driving off-peak hours.
- VMT (Vehicles Miles Traveled) – could have actual data on which roads are used, justifies where dollars can go, more specific than 50-30-20
- Parking fees in high impact areas are more equitable than tolls?
- Make the freight lobby tell local governments what they tell ODOT/legislature re their support for tolls
- Retune the Oregon land use laws and practices

## Action Items from the I-205 brainstorm discussion

\*Didn't have time to finish this discussion

- Discuss how to use IP 4
- Unified message
- Alternative Meeting space for local tolling coordination, don't eat up C4 time with only tolling
- What are the strategies/milestones to work toward
- Can we make a letter of agreement, or values document?