
Thursday, August 02, 2018
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

Development Services Building
Main Floor Auditorium, Room 115
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

AGENDA

6:45 p.m. Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome & Introductions

Chair Jim Bernard & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs

Housekeeping

- Approval of June 07, 2018 C4 Minutes **Page 03**

6:50 p.m. Draft Letters Advanced from C4 Metro Subcommittee (Action Item)

- Memo **Page 05**
- Wilsonville UGB Expansion Request **Page 06**
- RTP Post-Visioning Process Letter **Page 07**

7:05 p.m. 2018 C4 Retreat – Final Report

Presenting: Trent Wilson

- Final Report - 2018 C4 Retreat **Page 08**
- 2018-2019 C4 Agenda DRAFT Schedule **Page 20**

7:20 p.m. Vehicle Registration Fee Discussion

Presenting: Dan Johnson

- Staff memo and materials **Page 21**

8:15 p.m. Updates/Other Business

- JPACT/MPAC Updates
- Housing Bond Update
- Housing Needs Assessment Update
- Other Business

8:30 p.m. Adjourn

General Information



Current Voting Membership

		C4 Exec	C4 Metro	C4 Rural	JPACT	MPAC	R1ACT
Clackamas County	Chair Jim Bernard	●	●	●			
Clackamas County	Commissioner Paul Savas		●	●	●		●
Canby	Mayor Brian Hodson	●		●			●
CPOs	Laurie Freeman Swanson (Molalla CPO)	●	●	●			
Estacada	Mayor Sean Drinkwine			●			
Fire Districts	Matthew Silva (Estacada Fire District)	●					
Gladstone	Mayor Tammy Stempel		●				
Hamlets	Kenny Sernach (Beavercreek Hamlet)			●			
Happy Valley	Councilor Markley Drake		●				
Johnson City	Vacant						
Lake Oswego	Councilor Jeff Gudman	●	●		●	●	●
Milwaukie	Mayor Mark Gamba		●			●	
Molalla	Mayor Jimmy Thompson			●			
Oregon City	Mayor Dan Holladay		●				
Portland	Vacant						
Rivergrove	Mayor Heather Kibbey		●				
Sandy	Councilor Carl Exner			●			
Sanitary Districts	Nancy Gibson (Oak Lodge Water Services)	●					
Tualatin	Councilor Nancy Grimes		●				
Water Districts	Hugh Kalani (Clackamas River Water)						
West Linn	Council President Brenda Perry		●				
Wilsonville	Mayor Tim Knapp		●		●		

Current Ex-Officio Membership

MPAC Citizen Rep	Vacant
Metro Council	Councilor Betty Dominguez
Port of Portland	Emerald Bogue
Rural Transit	Julie Wehling
Urban Transit	Eve Nilenders

Frequently Referenced Committees:

CTAC:	Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee (C4 Transportation TAC)
JPACT:	Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (Metro)
MPAC:	Metro Policy Advisory Committee (Metro)
MTAC:	Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MPAC TAC)
R1ACT:	Region 1 Advisory Committee on Transportation (ODOT)
TPAC:	Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (JPACT TAC)

Thursday, June 7, 2018
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

Development Service Building
First Floor, Room 119/120
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

Attendance:

Members: **Canby:** Brian Hodson (Co-Chair); Traci Hensley (Alt.); **Clackamas County:** Jim Bernard (Co-Chair); Paul Savas; **CPOs:** Laurie Swanson (Molalla); Martin Meyers (Alt.); **Hamlets:** Kenny Sernach (Beavercreek); Rick Cook (Stafford); **Happy Valley:** Markley Drake; **Lake Oswego:** Jeff Gudman; **Milwaukie:** Mark Gamba; **MPAC Citizen Rep:** Ed Gronke; **Sanitary Districts:** Nancy Gibson (Oak Lodge); **Transit:** Dwight Brashear (Alt.); **Water Districts:** Hugh Kalani; **West Linn:** Brenda Perry; **Wilsonville:** Tim Knapp

Staff: Gary Schmidt (PGA); Chris Lyons (PGA); Madeline Unger (PGA); Mary Jo Cartasegna (County Admin); Tracy Moreland (County Admin); Steve Williams (DTD); Mike Bezner (DTD); Don Krupp (County Admin)

Guests: Mark Ottenad (SMART); Nicole Hendrix (SMART); Thelma Haggemiller; Jan Lindstrom; John Lewis (Oregon City); Jan Lee (Sandy); Julie Stephens (SCTD); Marge Stewart (Firwood CPO); Ben Bryant (Happy Valley); Megan McKibben (Congressman Schrader); Tyler Frisbee (Metro); Andi Howell (Sandy Transit); Julie Wehling (Canby Area Transit); Julie Stephens (South Clackamas Transit District); Kelly Betteridge (TriMet); Andy Mortenson (TriMet)

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

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Action</u>
Approval of May 3, 2018 Minutes	Approved.
2020 Regional Transportation Bond	Tyler Frisbee (Metro) presented on the regional need for transportation funding, examples of successful funding measures in other jurisdictions, and the process currently underway to develop a potential regional measure for 2020.
Transit HB 2017 Update	The following transit providers in Clackamas County presented on individual priorities and work currently underway to implement new STIF funds from HB 2017: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwight Brashear, SMART • Andi Howell, Sandy Transit

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julie Wehling, Canby Area Transit • Julie Stephens, South Clackamas Transit District • Mike Bezner, Clackamas County • Kelly Betteridge and Andy Mortenson, TriMet
C4 Options memo Discussion	Members discussed possible alternatives to the existing C4 structure.
Updates/Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retreat Update • JPACT/MPAC Updates • Other Business 	<p>Chris Lyons gave an update on the upcoming C4 Retreat, including a reminder to register and complete the transportation priorities survey.</p> <p>Mayor Knapp gave an update that JPACT is focused on autonomous vehicles, the draft freight strategy, RTP policies and implementation measures, and the Burnside Bridge project.</p> <p>Mayor Gamba shared that MPAC is also discussing similar issues to JPACT, and noted that today the Metro Council unanimously supported putting the regional housing bond on the November ballot.</p>

Adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Memorandum

To: Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

From: Trent Wilson, Public & Government Affairs

Date: August 02, 2018

RE: Letters Advanced by C4 Metro Subcommittee

Overview:

At their July 18 meeting, C4 Metro Subcommittee recommended advancing two letters to the August 2 C4 meeting. A brief introduction into the context of each letter is outlined below.

As the lead for both of these efforts, staff from the City of Wilsonville will be available to field questions about these letters and concepts.

Wilsonville Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Request

At the July 18 C4 Metro Subcommittee meeting, members approved support for the City of Wilsonville's Proposal for Expansion of the Metro Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) to include the Advance Road Urban Reserve (Frog Pond Areas East & South), recommending consideration by C4 for a letter of support. Wilsonville is the only Metro-area city in Clackamas County submitting a UGB expansion request, which the City has concept-planned as the Frog Pond Areas East & South Neighborhoods.

RTP Post-Visioning Process Comment Letter

C4 Metro Subcommittee discussed the concept of a post-visioning process at their June and July meetings (2018), and reviewed a draft letter at their July 18 meeting. The following draft letter, of comment to Metro, which has been amended since the July 18 C4 Metro Subcommittee, summarizes the issues of concern with the Draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and suggests a process after completion of the RTP to undertake a larger, more integrated view of the regional multi-modal transportation system.

Currently, endorsements of the letter/concept are also being considered by Clackamas and Washington Counties, Metropolitan Mayors Consortium, Clackamas County Business Alliance and Westside Economic Alliance.

The comment period for the RTP process closes on August 13, 2018.

DRAFT August 2, 2018

President Tom Hughes
Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

RE: Support for the City of Wilsonville's Proposal for Expansion of the Metro Urban Growth Boundary to Include the Advance Road Urban Reserve (Frog Pond Areas East & South)

Dear Council President Hughes:

The Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4) supports the City of Wilsonville's application to include the Advance Road Urban Reserve, composed of the East and South Neighborhoods of the Frog Pond Area Plan, in Metro's upcoming Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion.

C4 is tasked with coordinating transportation and land-use issues within Clackamas County. No topic draws these two issues together better than the need to address housing availability and affordability in the greater Portland metro region. While no one development can solve this issue in our region, Wilsonville has a proven track record of providing affordable and diverse housing options, and the Frog Pond Area Plan continues this effort.

The proposed expansion area provides for an additional 275 acres of housing, including a broad spectrum of housing types, multi-modal transportation connections including transit, and essential services to create a complete community. Members of C4 believe that the increased housing volume combined with the thoughtful concept-planning of an interconnected community matches well with the criteria for expansion of the UGB.

C4 recognizes that Wilsonville provides a significant portion of the County's affordable housing, with over half of the City's housing supply in the form of multi-family housing units that provide market-rate and affordable-housing opportunities at a range of unit sizes and prices. The expansion area enables the City to provide even more housing opportunities for county residents.

We observe that the City of Wilsonville has demonstrated an ability to grow thoughtfully and efficiently, in alignment with County and Regional goals and desired outcomes. The City has worked in good faith and performed the necessary due diligence and Metro-required concept planning for the East and South Neighborhoods of the Frog Pond Area Plan to be included in the 2018 UGB expansion. Thank you for considering our letter of support and we look forward to your decision.

Sincerely,

DRAFT August 2, 2018

Honorable Tom Hughes, President
Councilors of the Metro Council
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

**RE: Request to Develop 2019 Regional Transportation Strategic Action Plan
to Advance “2040 Growth Concept”**

Dear President Hughes and Councilors:

As the elected representatives from local governments of Clackamas County, we are writing to express our appreciation to Metro for the high-quality work performed on pulling together the various components to produce the updated 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We appreciate the level of public engagement and depth of analysis that Metro has demonstrated in producing the new federally mandated RTP.

During the course of reviewing the RTP, we have become aware that the RTP—an amalgamation of local city and county Transportation Systems Plans (TSPs)—is unlikely to keep pace with the needed improvements in our regional transportation systems that were envisioned in the 2040 Growth Concept. From our perspective, it is not always clear if or how all of the various transportation systems elements may work together, and if there are gaps in planned investments that would significantly improve regional mobility and multimodal transportation alternatives.

Rapidly growing population and employment in the greater metro region continues to generate increased demands on our transportation systems. The 2018 RTP shows that we seem to be increasingly challenged in how to collectively meet our goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, decrease travel times and congestion, lower fatalities and enhance safety, increase system reliability, and significantly expand transit and active transportation utilization.

We believe that a collaborative process to examine our transportation systems in a holistic and strategic manner would be beneficial. That is, if we collectively as a region looked at our overall transportation assets, mobility corridors, designated land uses, and travel/commute patterns, we would reach conclusions that could have positive long-term influence and a greater likelihood of achieving the 2040 vision as articulated by the Regional Framework Plan.

We propose to partner with Metro in 2019 to create a strategic action plan free of the constraints of the RTP that can inform our regional transportation decisions over the coming decades in support of the 2040 Growth Concept vision. We welcome the opportunity over the next several months to ascertain more specific issues for consideration to bring to a coordinating stakeholder task force of regional public- and private-sector leaders, including local elected officials and representatives of community organizations, businesses, transportation interests and others.

The output of this process would guide a transformative and aggressive program designed to advance a world-class, multi-modal transportation system that meets the needs of the greater Portland metro region for the next 100 years. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

cc: Lynn Peterson, President-elect, Metro Council



Final Report
2018 Retreat
Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

Friday, June 29 – Saturday, June 30

C4 Retreat Attendance	Page 02
C4 Retreat Summary of Agenda Discussions	Page 04
C4 Retreat Flip Chart Transcriptions	Page 06



Retreat Attendees (C4 Members and Alternates)

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 1. Jim Bernard, Co-Chair | Clackamas County, Chair |
| 2. Brian Hodson, Co-Chair | Canby, Mayor |
| 3. Traci Hensley | Canby, Councilor |
| 4. Julie Wehling | Canby, Transit Director |
| 5. Paul Savas | Clackamas County, Commissioner |
| 6. Hugh Kalani | Clackamas River Water |
| 7. Sean Drinkwine | Estacada, Mayor |
| 8. Kenny Sernach | Hamlet of Beavercreek |
| 9. Markley Drake | Happy Valley, Councilor |
| 10. Jeff Gudman | Lake Oswego, Councilor |
| 11. Theresa Kohlhoff | Lake Oswego, Councilor |
| 12. Betty Dominguez | Metro, Councilor |
| 13. Mark Gamba | Milwaukie, Mayor |
| 14. Wilda Parks | Milwaukie, Councilor |
| 15. Jimmy Thompson | Molalla, Mayor |
| 16. Laurie Freeman Swanson | Molalla Community Planning Organization |
| 17. Susan Keil | Oak Lodge Water Services District, Director |
| 18. Dan Holladay | Oregon City, Mayor |
| 19. Renate Mengelberg | Oregon City, Councilor |
| 20. Carl Exner | Sandy, Councilor |
| 21. Jan Lee | Sandy, Councilor |
| 22. Andi Howell | Sandy, Transit Director |
| 23. Dwight Brashear | SMART, Director |
| 24. Brenda Perry | West Linn, Council President |
| 25. Tim Knapp | Wilsonville, Mayor |
| 26. Russ Axelrod | West Linn, Mayor |



Retreat Attendees (Non-C4 Members)

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Sonya Fischer | Clackamas County, Commissioner |
| 2. Ken Humberston | Clackamas County, Commissioner |
| 3. Martha Schrader | Clackamas County, Commissioner |
| 4. Don Krupp | Clackamas County, Administrator |
| 5. Mary Jo Cartasegna | Clackamas County, Commission Staff |
| 6. Tracy Moreland | Clackamas County, Commission Staff |
| 7. Gary Schmidt | Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs |
| 8. Chris Lyons | Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs |
| 9. Trent Wilson | Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs |
| 10. Shelly Parini | Clackamas County, Public & Government Affairs |
| 11. Amy Herman | Clackamas County, Resolution Services |
| 12. Martine Coblentz | Clackamas County, Resolution Services |
| 13. Dan Johnson | Clackamas County, Transportation & Development, |
| 14. Karen Buehrig | Clackamas County, Transportation & Development |
| 15. Stephen Williams | Clackamas County, Transportation & Development |
| 16. Jennifer Hughes | Clackamas County, Transportation & Development |
| 17. Ray Atkinson | Clackamas Community College |
| 18. Jacque Betz | Gladstone, City Administrator |
| 19. Jaimie Huff | Happy Valley, Policy Analyst |
| 20. Craig Dirksen | Metro, Councilor |
| 21. Kelly Brooks | Milwaukie, Assistant City Manager |
| 22. John Lewis | Oregon City, Public Works Director |
| 23. Dayna Webb | Oregon City, Senior Project Engineer |
| 24. Tom Markgraf | TriMet, Public Affairs Director |
| 25. Tom Mills | TriMet, Planner |
| 26. Nancy Kraushaar | Wilsonville, Community Development Director |

C4 Retreat: Summary of Agenda Discussions

Friday, June 29

Session 1: Transportation Goals for Clackamas County

Karen Buehrig and Stephen Williams (CC Transportation & Development) introduced findings from a questionnaire sent to C4 members and city/county transportation staff that outlined various transportation priorities. A low response rate to the questionnaire prompted a discussion about transportation goals at-large within Clackamas County. C4 members reached no conclusions during this discussion, but identified various outcomes that were important to jurisdictions and relevant for ongoing and future discussions about transportation planning.

Session 2: I-205 Widening Project Status and Value Pricing Recommendations

Rian Windsheimer (ODOT) and Chris Lyons (CC Public & Government Affairs) presented updates and findings on the I-205 widening project and recommendations coming from the Value Pricing Policy Advisory Committee. Retreat attendees asked clarifying questions aimed at how to advance funding needs for the I-205 project and discussed the state legislature's intent to fund I-205 with revenue generated from value pricing (tolling). Attendees also expressed concern about diversion.

Session 3: Transit Goals within Clackamas County

Following a discussion at the June 7 C4 meeting, retreat attendees explored goals for transit within Clackamas County, including urban and rural needs. Attendees agreed that HB 2017 funding presents incredible opportunities to advance goals, but that C4 should spend more time identifying what the transportation system should look like and accomplish for Clackamas County. Attendees offered the suggestion of creating a "lens" for exploring broader transportation goals that better understands linkages, related to housing and jobs, and project criteria, connections, and outcomes.

Session 4: Tualatin Transportation Bond Measure

Sherilyn Lombos (Tualatin City Manager) shared "lessons learned" from their successful May 2018 ballot measure on transportation funding.

Saturday, June 30

Session 5: Breakfast Discussion – Transportation Goals Continued

Retreat attendees continued the discussion from the first session about at-large transportation goals within Clackamas County. Attendees also expanded this discussion to consideration of the larger metro region, noting a need for the region to have a longer range plan that addresses the larger system, thus allowing Clackamas County to better

know how to fit within the system. Members landed on a need to continue advancing I-205 at the state legislature to ensure the remaining needed project design funding is identified. Members also discussed a set of “lenses” for how to approach transportation needs in the county, but ultimately agreed that pursuing a “transportation futures” study – requesting funding from the state legislature – made sense as well.

Session 6: Proposed 2020 Regional Transportation Bond

Karen Buehrig (CC Transportation & Development) and Chris Lyons (CC Public & Government Affairs) provided materials from the June 7 C4 meeting, where Metro staff presented existing information – mainly timelines – related to the proposed 2020 regional transportation bond. Members agreed much of this discussion was dependent on findings from a futures study and related to the conversations previously held on transportation and transit goals. C4 members suggested that important elements for Clackamas County’s approach to the 2020 regional transportation bond should be: congestion relief, a complete modal package, and a “big picture” view.

Session 7: The Road Ahead, 2018: A Continued Conversation

Dan Johnson (CC Transportation & Development) and Shelly Parini (CC Public & Government Affairs) shared the results of business outreach discussions related to a potential vehicle registration fee in Clackamas County. Retreat attendees agreed with the business community to advance discussions towards a \$25-\$30 VRF, but also communicated that more discussion was needed to understand the details of how funds might be used and whether or not C4 members would be interested in creating a joint fund to better leverage VRF dollars for higher-cost projects.

Session 8: Next Steps Discussion

C4 members requested the VRF discussion take precedence in the coming months and encouraged the BCC to take action quickly. Members were also interested in advancing legislative initiatives on I-205 and a potential transportation futures study, advancing additional discussions on the potential 2020 transportation bond and transit goals, and to continue engaging in efforts to address housing.

C4 Retreat: Flip Chart Transcription

Session 1 – Transportation Goals for Clackamas County

Outcomes

- Reduce Congestion (Highways, local roads)-Project Competitive
- Maintenance
- Safety
- Infrastructure
- Resiliency
- Access
- Reliability-Benefit the entire county
- Integrated System-Multiple choices via different modes
- Expanded capacity accommodating future growth
- Economic development
- Carbon reduction
- Vision- How far out?

Regional Outcomes

- Reliability (Reduce congestion)
- Safety
- Freight Mobility
- Community Trips (Active Transportation)
- Resiliency/Sustainability

Evaluate Projects On

- Multi-model transit Projects
 - Does it help to produce a redundant system of ways to get to work, school, and shop when and where we all need to enhance our daily lives
- Additional Projects
 - More direct route from Canby to I-5 (Arndt Road)
 - Stafford Road-Bicycles
 - Bike Ped-West Linn, LO, Portland
 - McLaughlin redevelopment

Session 2 – I-205 Widening Project Status and Value Pricing Recommendation

I-205 Funding

- Need to understand level/cost of toll
 - Will they be able to raise enough money to pay for project?
- Questions remain about diversion
- Funding will come from various sources
- Concern about lack of choices for alternatives to I-205

- Support for partial funding of I-205 thru tolling

Session 3 – Transit Goals within Clackamas County

Multi Modal-Increasing Transit

- Lens criteria
 - Need to talk about linkages
 - How they relate to housing
 - How they relate to jobs
 - How projects assist with making
 - Criteria
 - Connections
 - Outcomes
 - What we want our transportation system to do for our county
- Build from what currently exists
 - Redevelopment-Example: McLaughlin
- Need to know routes, frequency
 - Needs assessment to bring to Trimet or start own system or SMART or Canby
 - City-routes and sub-routes
- Use of existing rails or express bus→streetcar or trolley in LO
- Collaborating between cities, communities
 - Transit ties people together
 - Urban→ rural coverage for all
 - Ride from churches
- Local systems within communities while still connecting to Trimet
- Shuffles to Trimet
 - Figure out \$
- Smaller vehicles→ more flexibility
- Public safety at stops
- Look at NW connector as an example→addressing connectivity issues
- Look at other models that work
 - Does it serve our county well?
 - What works, what doesn't, what are the consequences?
- Think about Boring and Damascus
 - No Trimet service
 - Other communities that do not have service
- Think about ridership
 - Productive service vs. coverage

Session 5 and 6 – Transportation Goals Cont. + Proposed 2020 Regional Transportation Bond

Important Elements in 2020 Regional Measure

- Congestion Relief
- Complete Modal Package
- Need for “big picture” view

For Legislative Agenda

- See \$24M to keep I-205 project design moving forward

Ideas/Area of Common Interest

- Connecting Rural to Urban-Options
 - A→B Access to Arterials
 - Infrastructure/Maintenance
 - Connections to Highways/ I-5, I-205 Access
 - Amenities vs. Necessities
 - Local support for projects
 - Multi-modal (bikes, ped)
 - Emerging need
 - HB 2017 Funds
 - How will it be used?
 - Urgent need to present plans
 - Regionally powerful ways to use \$
- Keeping roads open for access (rural roads)
 - Connecting urban and rural with complimentary means
 - Take advantage of STIF money
 - Prioritize planning first, then ID projects
 - Plan for and fund Travel Shed
 - Prioritize Regional and local needs for transit
- New transit money applied by 2019
- Priorities for legislative matters
 - Disconnect with UGB/Limits to project potential
- Decrease various bottlenecks and recognized diverted traffic paths
- State highway system is very important for connecting our communities
 - Think holistically
- C.C. master plan for transportation combined with city TSP?
- Ask legislature for planning funds
 - Washington county did (\$1.5M)

Integrated/Redundant System

- To enhance daily lives
 - Multiple options
 - Access
 - Congestion reduction
 - Expanded capacity
 - Safety
 - Carbon footprint reduction

Lens for Discussion

- Benefits to the entire community
- Vision is future focus
- Competitive projects
- Linkage to housing, jobs, etc.
- Regional projects/need
- Engineer capacity vs. perceived capacity
- Potential/available funding
- Innovative thinking
- Projects with consensus
- Environmental impacts
- Access strengths of cities and taking advantage of potential for integration of services
 - Rural and urban linkages

Transit → Planning Process

- Needs assessment
- Service level assessment
- Funding
- Productive service vs. coverage
- Looking at other models
- Local focus and connection
- Looking at the gaps

Session 7 – The Road Ahead, 2018: A continued conversation

Table 1

- Q1. Road maintenance, safety, wider shoulders
 - 10% of the county's 60% to use on other needs
- Q2. Will there be enough people to do the road work?
 - When VRF starts, how soon after will money start to come in.
 - YES local control important
 - Collaborate by using C4 to look at ways to support rural and city roads
- Q3.
 - Yes, \$25

Table 2

- Q1. Maintenance Interconnectivity (Urban and Rural)
- Q2. Local control
 - Yes
 - Within cities
 - Links crossing jurisdiction boundaries
 - No dead-ending
 - Commute shed
 - Thinking beyond local projects
 - Pipeline of ready projects

- Q3.
 - VRF- Yes, as a way to fund
 - \$30 sweet spot, \$25 helpful, \$29.95
 - Licensing multiple vehicles for different uses in rural areas
 - Careful communications
 - Responsible use of revenues

Table 3

- Q1. Local transit better interface with Trimet-seamless for rider
 - Maintenance
 - Wider shoulders
 - Larger capital project
 - Arndt Road
- Q2.
 - Yes (from city lens)
 - Very local
 - B.
 - If could benefit neighboring then yes collaborate
 - State roads too
- Q3. Yes, \$25
 - \$43 for electric

Table 4

- Q1. Intra- County Connections
 - Road maintenance
 - Congestion relief
 - Integrated transit connections
 - Safe routes to school
 - Transport for vulnerable populations
 - Highway 43
 - East → West transit in WL
 - Transportation corridors including sunrise
- Q2.
 - Yes
 - Control own fate
 - Buy-in for voter support
 - Integration
 - State/regional funding for big projects
- Q3.
 - Yes/maybe
 - \$25-\$30
 - Highest fee based on car that is being assessed

Table 5

- Q1. Maintenance funding
- Q2. Yes, local. Yes, collaborative.
 - County roads that run through cities up to city standards so cities can continue maintenance
- Q3. Yes
 - See some polling to get a sense from general populace
 - Leaning on higher side between \$43-56

Table 6-Urban/Rural, Elected/Non-elected

- Q1.
 - Congestion
 - Maintenance and Safety
 - Connectivity
- Q2. Weight mile tax-corridors
 - What constitutes local?
 - A.
 - Individual
 - 99E
 - 205
 - B.
 - Local Control-Yes
 - Processes may not be efficient regionally
 - Collaboration on county wide plans-Yes
 - Voters don't care who the roads are being maintained by
- Q3. VRF-Yes
 - Impact on commissioners/elected
 - \$25
 - Not adding staff
 - Weight mile

VRF

- At least \$25 = Full support
- \$30 = 12 green
- \$43 = 3 blocked, more discussion
- Support VRF = All green
- Different charges for Gas vs. electric = 16 yes
- Progressive VRF rate = 5 block

Next Steps

- Transportation land use
- Housing
- Transit
 - Hub connections for local jurisdictions

- Guidance to staff for project focus
- Regional bond
- #1 County wide TSP/Regional vision
- #2 VRF
 - I-205 and Tolling
 - Congestion vs. construction
 - 7/12 Public input meeting-letter
- Opioids
- Housing
- Homelessness

Other Topics

- Housing and funding for affordable housing
 - Housing non-profits
 - Housing bond-C4 supporting #1
 - Constitutional amendment
- Annexation issues
- Project priorities from C4 to all member staff
 - Create support documents for C4 to study

Retreat Feedback

- More time for open forum on 1st day
- More agenda flexibility based on energy
- Cell phone access
- Cold room
- More time

2018-2019 C4 Agenda DRAFT Schedule:

Issues needing attention, identified at C4 Retreat, C4, or C4 Metro Subcommittee

- Retreat Recap
- Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) Next Steps
- Moving forward with I-205 Legislative Strategy
- Continued discussion on 2020 Regional Transportation Bond, as needed
- UGMA Revisit/Annexation Issues
- Burnside Bridge/Seismic Bridge List Presentation
- Housing Bond Resolution by C4
- Visit from Roy Rogers (to discuss MSTIP revenue sharing concept)
- PGE/Marie Pope visit
- 3-party IGA discussion/update

Meeting Schedule Recommendation

August 2018

- Retreat Recap and Final Report
- C4 Metro Subcommittee Letters
- VRF Next Steps

September 2018

- VRF Next Steps (continued). May include:
 - Visit from Washington County Commissioner Roy Rogers
- Discussion re Transportation Visioning Plan – Potential Legislative Request

October 2018

- PGE Visit/Presentation with CEO Marie Pope

November 2018

- Legislative Strategy Discussion

December 2018

January 2019

February 2019

March 2019

- C4 Co-Chair Elections
- C4 New Members Meeting

Memorandum

To: Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

From: Dan Johnson, Director – Department of Transportation & Development

Date: August 02, 2018

RE: Discussion on Potential Vehicle Registration Fee

Overview:

Discussion at August 2 C4 meeting is intended to clarify what cities desire regarding shared revenue of a potential Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF).

At the June 29-30 C4 Retreat, attendees expressed general support for the county's adoption of a VRF to address local road funding needs. Retreat attendees were substantially in alignment with feedback Clackamas County received from the local business community, including a willingness to consider a VRF of \$25 to \$30 and a need to identify how jurisdictions would use new funds generated by a VRF.

While state law mandates that fees received by a VRF are split between the county (60%) and cities (40%), C4 members asked for further discussion on certain elements of the VRF including the possibility of using some of the VRF revenue for collaborate efforts and/or a shared strategic investment fund.

Clackamas County wants any effort resulting in increased assessed fees, such as VRF, to be clearly identified, well-reasoned, and widely supported. Support by individual cities and C4 as a whole is crucial if a VRF is to be successfully adopted by the Board of County Commissioners. Therefore, we want to clearly identify and clarify options and expectations between the county and cities.

Discussion Items:

- ***How do the cities envision sharing revenue generated by a potential VRF?***
 - Traditional 60%-40% split?
 - Non-traditional approach that still honors the 60%-40% split, while also creating a joint fund for strategic investments and/or collaborative approaches?
- ***If C4 agrees to pursue consideration of a non-traditional revenue sharing model, please provide clarity on the following issues:***
 - Define "strategic investments" and/or "collaborative approaches"
 - Describe core concepts that revenue sharing might be used to address, if implemented

2018 Local Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)

Strategic Investment Fund Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share	Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$3,725,680.00
County Share (%)	60%	\$5,588,520.00
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection *	100%	\$9,314,200.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$56 per year.)</i>	\$25	--> Annually (per registered vehicle.) --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection	\$9,314,200
-----------------------------	--------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population **	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$5,588,520	183,383	N/A
Barlow	\$2,270	135	0.06%
Canby	\$276,067	16,420	7.41%
Damascus ***	\$178,637	10,625	4.79%
Estacada	\$53,045	3,155	1.42%
Gladstone	\$196,038	11,660	5.26%
Happy Valley	\$314,064	18,680	8.43%
Johnson City	\$9,499	565	0.25%
Lake Oswego ****	\$586,018	34,855	15.73%
Milwaukie	\$344,832	20,510	9.26%
Molalla	\$152,745	9,085	4.10%
Oregon City	\$575,673	34,240	15.45%
Portland ****	\$12,879	766	0.35%
Rivergrove ****	\$7,711	459	0.21%
Sandy	\$179,141	10,655	4.81%
Tualatin ****	\$48,951	2,911	1.31%
West Linn	\$430,662	25,615	11.56%
Wilsonville ****	\$357,448	21,260	9.59%
Totals:	\$9,314,200	404,980	100%

* Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2017 registration numbers.

** Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2017.

*** Though Damascus is disincorporated, state law distributes State Motor Vehicle Fund receipts previously assigned to the City to Clackamas County for 10-years after disincorporation.

**** A portion of this city is outside Clackamas County; population represents the population PSU estimates within Clackamas County jurisdiction.

2018 Local Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)

Strategic Investment Fund Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share	Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$4,470,816.00
County Share (%)	60%	\$6,706,224.00
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection *	100%	\$11,177,040.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$56 per year.)</i>	\$30	--> Annually (per registered vehicle.) --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection	\$11,177,040
-----------------------------	---------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population **	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$6,706,224	183,383	N/A
Barlow	\$2,724	135	0.06%
Canby	\$331,281	16,420	7.41%
Damascus ***	\$214,364	10,625	4.79%
Estacada	\$63,654	3,155	1.42%
Gladstone	\$235,246	11,660	5.26%
Happy Valley	\$376,877	18,680	8.43%
Johnson City	\$11,399	565	0.25%
Lake Oswego ****	\$703,222	34,855	15.73%
Milwaukie	\$413,798	20,510	9.26%
Molalla	\$183,294	9,085	4.10%
Oregon City	\$690,807	34,240	15.45%
Portland ****	\$15,455	766	0.35%
Rivergrove ****	\$9,253	459	0.21%
Sandy	\$214,969	10,655	4.81%
Tualatin ****	\$58,741	2,911	1.31%
West Linn	\$516,794	25,615	11.56%
Wilsonville ****	\$428,938	21,260	9.59%
Totals:	\$11,177,040	404,980	100%

* Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2017 registration numbers.

** Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2017.

*** Though Damascus is disincorporated, state law distributes State Motor Vehicle Fund receipts previously assigned to the City to Clackamas County for 10-years after disincorporation.

**** A portion of this city is outside Clackamas County; population represents the population PSU estimates within Clackamas County jurisdiction.