

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4) Minutes

Thursday, Feb. 5, 2015

Development Service Building
150 Beaver Creek Road – Auditorium

Attendance

Members: Clackamas County: Paul Savas (Co-chair); John Ludlow; Jim Bernard; Tootie Smith; Martha Schrader **Canby:** Brian Hodson; Traci Hensley (Alt.); **CPOs:** Laurie Freeman Swanson; Marjorie Stewart (Alt.); **Damascus:** Diana Helm; **Hamlets:** Tammy Stevens; Rick Cook (Alt.); **Happy Valley:** Lori DeRemer (Co-chair); Markely Drake (Alt.); **Lake Oswego:** Jeff Gudman; **Milwaukie:** Mark Gamba; **Molalla:** Jimmy Thompson; **MPAC Citizen Rep:** Wilda Parks; **Oregon City:** Dan Holladay; **Sandy:** Jeremy Pietzold; **Transit Agencies:** Stephan Lashbrook (Urban); Julie Stephens (Rural); **Villages:** Bob Reeves; **West Linn:** Jennifer Tan; Thomas Frank; **Wilsonville:** Tim Knapp

Staff: Gary Schmidt (PGA); Trent Wilson (PGA); Chris Lyons (PGA);

Guests: Don Krupp (CC Administrator); Mark Ottenad (Wilsonville); Jason Tuck (Happy Valley); Jaimie Lorenzini (Happy Valley); Warren Jones (Mulino); John Lewis (Oregon City); Michael Wagner (Mulino); Julie Wehling (Canby Area Transit); Shirley Craddick (Metro Council); Emily Klepper (Clackamas County); Dan Chandler (Clackamas County); Drenda Howatt (Clackamas County); Ernie Hayes (Clackamas County); MJ Cartasegna (Clackamas County)

MINUTES

1. 5:30 p.m. Meet and Greet
 - o Meet new and returning members of C4
2. 6:45 p.m. Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome & Introductions

Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Lori DeRemer, Co-Chairs

Housekeeping

- o Approval of December 4, 2014 C4 Minutes

- Commissioner Paul Savas (PS): (off agenda) discusses the resolution passed by the BCC
 - Asks other cities to pass similar resolution to commit to C4
 - Receives feedback that it is too much to ask cities to pass a similar resolution, but that C4, as a body, could pass such a resolution.
 - Commissioner Jim Bernard (JB): Asks who else has seen the resolution?
 - Mayor Lori DeRemer (LD) and Mayor Tim Knapp (TK): We have seen this, and the C4 exec team has discussed this, but the C4 body has not seen this. C4 doesn't meet with enough regularity to address items as formally as other bodies. Often the exec team will act on behalf of C4 to ensure items are timely.
 - JB: Thank you for the explanation. What I heard from the BCC today was to please start putting your requests and decision in writing and make sure [the BCC] is seeing those items.
 - Mayor Dan Holladay (DHoll): This resolution by the BCC appears to be non-binding. Does that make the resolution by the BCC meaningless?
 - LD: I disagree; this is a good faith agreement by the BCC. Of course it is non-binding, just like any advisory board that serves a city, the city council can choose to accept or not accept the recommendation. The same is true for C4 and the BCC. They want to view C4 as an advisory board. They are asking for requests and recommendations in writing. We should start doing that and reassess if the relationship changes.
 - Chair John Ludlow (JL): Yes, please send us recommendations and requests in writing.
 - TK: Acknowledges Mayor Holladay's concerns, but also Mayor DeRemer's sentiment that C4 should give the BCC time to hold good to their resolution.
 - I expect to see increased value, based in the BCC's resolution
 - PS: Do you see the cities passing a similar resolution?
 - LD: I think C4 would be a better forum for that.
 - Bob Reeves (BR): As a member of the exec committee, I see the BCC Resolution as a good faith step.

- Mayor Brian Hodson (BH): Agreement with Bob Reeves, and I will take go ahead and ask my city if they feel a resolution is warranted.
- TK: So who will draft the written communication
 - LD: The Exec Committee can decide that.
- TK: Can we also have a member list be sent to the C4 members? It feels like this list is kept from us. Why can't we send communication to the group?
 - LD: The Exec Committee keeps that list, we can discuss distribution on Monday.
- Jimmy Thompson: Going back to asking cities for a resolution, it seems like a fair request, even if burdensome. This way you have accountability on reporting from C4.
 - DHoll: Our city has a moment at the end of their meetings called commissioner communication where this type of information is shared. I encourage my commission to share this type of info at this time.
 - Other cities acknowledge similar styles of meeting.
 - Susan Kiel (SK): We actually have to have a written report of the meeting we attended.

3. 6:55 p.m. C4 Orientation

- Done in advance of the meeting:
 - Began at 6:30 and finished at 6:46.
 - Councilor Jeff Goodman (JG): asked for the orientation to be emailed to C4.

4. 7:20 p.m. C4 Elections

- Executive Committee Elections
 - Urban and rural cities caucused for 10 minutes:
 - Urban Cities Rep will be Jeff Gudman (LO)
 - Rural Cities Rep will continue to be Brian Hodson
- MPAC – City Outside of UGB seat
 - Rural Cities met to determine
 - Member: Mayor Brian Hodson
 - Alt: Councilor Sean Drinkwine

5. 7:40 p.m. C4 Retreat

- Weeknight versus weekend

- *March, April, May, or June*
 - Consensus that June works best for most. Preference for a Friday evening and a weekend.
 - C4 Staff to send a doodle poll, or equivalent, to check on dates.

6. 7:50 p.m. ACT Update

- PS: Provides history or ACT
 - OTC had decided that the ACT is formalized and all Clackamas County groups should work together.
 - CPS has spoke with Tammy Baney, the new chair to the OTC, who has committed to reviewing the ACT and its process to ensure it is working and that all parties are being heard.
 - Clackamas County group strove for consensus model for decision making, but only received 58% by the group
 - SK: it is my experience, working for Portland Dept. Trans, that if CC doesn't work together, they will get eaten alive at the table and get nothing done. Working together should be this table's #1 priority.
- PS: Would like to see C4 make the recommendations for many of the seats, and then send the nomination list to the BCC for final approval.
- PS: I also want to open the floor and ask if everyone here feels like the members who serve on the ACT should also, consequently, be members at C4 – which primarily discusses transportation issues.
- TK: Passed out copies of the ACT proposal
 - TK: Explains OTC responses of “agreement between two entities will need to be reached prior to initiating the nomination process”. This will be the first chance to see if the BCC can really hold to their resolution.
- DH, BH, and PS: Discuss frustrations of 58% decision model, why is Clackamas County part of the model if they can be voted out entirely, concluding on value and need to work together.
- PS: I need a clear decision from this group
 - Gary Schmidt (GS): Clarifying, the BCC agrees on a process for selecting the business stakeholder.
 - i. C4 requests nominations/applications from different business bodies and stakeholder (i.e. CCBA, CC BCS, EDC, etc.)
 - ii. C4 considers the nomination list and ranks the candidates
 - iii. C4 sends the nomination list to the BCC

- iv. BCC makes final decision based on C4 nominations
 - o PS: And ideally, the urban and rural seats are also filled by members who are serving on C4.
 - o DH: Expresses concerns that nominations will just lead to BCC rejections.
 - i. LD: True, but that is the case for any advisory board and their elected body. If the BCC rejects the nominations, we wholly expect they will provide a "why" with their notice of rejection.
 - o SK: Again, I want to stress that this group is made up of a strong team, and I would like to hear more of a collaborative spirit. This tenor will resonate in the ACT meetings, and the group you are putting together will get chewed up if this present spirit continues.
 - o JG: Wash Co's WCCC seems to work in this process.
 - . TK: Yes, Wash Co said, "of course we would take WCCC's recommendation."
 - o JG: Well then, let's continue to move forward with the idea that the BCC will participate in good faith, as their resolution indicates.
 - o DH: So are the urban and rural cities nominations decided through a caucus?
 - . PS: yes.
 - o TK: Can we also get clarity on the rural communities group? I don't want this process we just discussed to circumvent their process.
 - . Bob Reeves (BR): It won't.
 - o DH: I want to assert and make sure that every city knows they have a right to serve, and are not disqualified by their lack of attendance as a rep of the ACT and not C4.
 - . Consensus
 - o JL: Please be sure to use our Business and Community Services Dept. They are well aware of all of our businesses in the County.
 - o. JG: Of course, we would reach out to all stakeholders.
 - o PS: call for a vote:
 - . JG: seconded
 - o. All approve.
7. 8:10 p.m. JPACT/MPAC Update
 8. 8:15 p.m. Pressing Updates
 - o Supporting C4 meeting materials
 - o Next Meeting March 5, 2015

9. 8:20 p.m. Adjourn