



Clackamas
County
Coordinating
Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4) Agenda

**Thursday, October 1, 2015
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM**

Development Service Building
MAIN FLOOR AUDITORIUM, Room 115
150 Beavercreek Road, Oregon City, OR 97045

1. 6:45 p.m. **Pledge of Allegiance**

Welcome & Introductions
Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs

Housekeeping
 - Approval of September 3, 2015 C4 Minutes Page 2
2. 6:50 p.m. **C4 Transportation Prioritization Project**
Presented by Karen Buehrig and Mike Bezner
3. 7:20 p.m. **800 MHz Radio System**
Presented by John Hartsock, C800
 - Emergency Communication System Replacement Overview Page 7
4. 7:50 p.m. **R1ACT Update**
5. 8:05 p.m. **Mayor's Meeting Update**
6. 8:10 p.m. **JPACT/MPAC Update**
Mayor Tim Knapp, Wilsonville & Mayor Mark Gamba, Milwaukie
7. 8:30 p.m. **Adjourn**

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday – September 3, 2015

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BUILDING

150 Beaver Creek Road – Auditorium

Attendance –

Members: Clackamas County: Paul Savas (Co-chair); **Canby:** Brian Hodson (Co-Chair); **CPOs:** Laurie Swanson; **Fire Districts:** John Blanton; Bob Reeves (Alt.); **Hamlets:** Rick Cook (Alt.); **Happy Valley:** Markley Drake; **Lake Oswego:** Jeff Gudman; **Metro:** Carlotta Collette; **Milwaukie:** Mark Gamba; **Molalla:** Jimmy Thompson; **MPAC Citizen Rep:** Ed Gronke; **Sandy:** Jeremy Pietzhold; Carl Exner (Alt.); **Sanitary:** Terry Gibson; **Transit Agencies:** Stephan Lashbrook (Urban); Vanessa Vissar (Urban Alt.); Andi Howell (Rural Alt.); **Water Districts:** Dick Jones (Alt.); **West Linn:** Thomas Frank (Alt.) **Wilsonville:** Tim Knapp

Staff: Gary Schmidt (PGA); Trent Wilson (PGA); Catherine Comer (BCS, presentation)

Guests: Mark Ottenad (Wilsonville); Annette Mattson (PGE); Zoe Monahan (Tualatin); Ed Hall (Sen. Merkley Staff); Jaimie Lorenzini (Happy Valley); Alan Lehto (TriMet); Rob Campbell (SBDC); Seth Atkinson (Sandy); Dayna Webb (Oregon City); Nancy Gibson (Water Districts)

<<<<<<<< DRAFT MINUTES >>>>>>>>

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Welcome & Introductions

Commissioner Paul Savas & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs

Housekeeping

Approval of August 6, 2015 C4 Minutes – Moved by Jeff Gudman, Terry Gibson 2nd. Approved.

2. Economic Development Panel

Catherine Comer (CComer) from Clackamas County Economic Development presented with Rob Campbell (RC) from the Small Business Development Center/Chair of the County Economic Development Commission for Clackamas County.

Presentation included information about different business clusters in Clackamas County, and the EDC's current efforts to reach out to Clackamas County businesses to learn about barriers to employment and growth in the area. EDC report to be finalized by the end of the 2015 calendar year. PowerPoint presentation was included in the agenda packet.

Questions from the presentation:

Terry Gibson (TG): What are the economic development strategies you are pursuing now that Hanjin has left the Port of Portland?

CComer: We have met with the Port of Portland on this, and the Port has met with many of our local business leaders, including a presentation to the Clackamas County Business Alliance. The biggest change because of Hanjin leaving has been an increase in trucking between Portland and Tacoma/Seattle, with businesses trying to get their product to a port for export. Otherwise, we have

seen little impact so far. We have heard that once the Port identifies a new operator to fill Hanjin's void, it is a two year process before that Port is back to full operation.

Markley Drake (MD): What is your relationship with the Cities?

RC: from the EDC's perspective, we have met with the city of Milwaukie and are interested in helping out with their North Milwaukie Industrial Area redevelopment goals.

CComer: And from the County's Economic Development team, we work with cities daily to help them reach their goals, and host quarterly round tables to help bring new ideas to our area. We operate as a gathering place. We have a direct responsibility to economic development in the unincorporated portions of Clackamas County, but we also have an indirect nexus/supporting role with each of the Clackamas cities, many of whom don't have staff capacity to fully operate an economic development office.

Mark Gamba (MG): Rob mentioned farming succession in the presentation; what is the plan to help this in Clackamas County?

RC: Good question, and good timing; there is an upcoming Business Expo at Clackamas Community College on Thursday, 9/10, and one of the table discussions will be about succession planning for rural communities. Farm land is nearly untouchable near the metro area because it is so expensive, and new buyers are challenged to purchase it because A) land production can't be considered as your income to pay for the mortgage, and B) the younger generation is just unable to afford purchasing land otherwise. In Clackamas County, there is a huge amount of farms with land owners aged 60 or higher, so succession planning is a big deal. The Clackamas Food System ONESStop is one resource the County is trying, in partnership with CCC and local farmers and food producers to be a resource for the agriculture community.

TG: Is EcoTrust a partner on ONESStop

RC: Yes.

Ed Gronke (EG): How are you approaching brownfield remediation?

CComer: For 2 years the County has received brownfield remediation grant for roughly \$200,000. This funding is used to help partners interested in purchasing brownfield lands do some of the remediation costs. We are also strong partners with Metro on this, lobbying in Salem and supporting potential land owners.

Brian Hodson (BH): With Hanjin leaving, has there been an increase in rail traffic?

CC: We haven't studied that.

Paul Savas (PS): I have seen a report that says the impact of Hanjin leaving is 2,000 additional crates on travelling via roads or rail per week: 700 by rail and, 1,300 by road. Those numbers may have changed since then.

Tim Knapp: In the presentation you mentioned working with property owners to prepare their site for future development and buyers, and that those sites are divided into tiers. How are you helping tier 2 and 3 sites get to tier 1 sites?

CComer: That is entirely up to the interest of the property owner. Our main role at the County is to identify the site, and offer solutions to the owners for them to upgrade their property. Of course, we let them know the resources we have available to assist. In some cases, like with the Clackamas Industrial Area Opportunity Site (CIAO Site), we work with Regional Solutions, via Bobby Lee at the Governor's office, to develop and promote the site. Clackamas County owns the CIAO site, so we have more developmental capability there. Regional Solutions is also involved with the Legacy Project, and that has more of a property owner component to the dynamic. We also work on "available properties", which requires property owners to sign an agreement saying they are willing to transact.

3. Input on R1ACT priorities

PS: The R1ACT met yesterday. We are still moving through some of the preliminary housekeeping pieces of the R1ACT, but also seem to be getting started with looking at projects. We looked at a draft work plan. The agenda is included in the C4 Agenda Packet.

PS: Kelly Brooks also shared information about fix-it and enhance projects for STIP. Enhance (non-highway) funds will equal \$11 million, Fix-it Leverage \$18 million, and Connect Oregon \$45 million.

PS: Many of the application deadlines are coming in soon, so please connect with our staff if your city/jurisdiction is applying for a grant.

PS: Rian Windsheimer had an interview with KATU news worth having a look at:
<http://www.katu.com/politics/Your-Voice-Your-Vote-Portland-traffic-increase-322639352.html>

TK: Looking at the draft work plan, it seems like a lot of the projects are “small ball”, and don’t really address some of the bigger facilities and larger needs that we keep talking about every month. It seems like the R1ACT was advertised as being able to address larger needs than what is currently displayed on the work plan.

PS: Point well taken, I believe this project list is currently wrapped around the STIP programs, so that comes with natural constraints on project types.

Jeff Gudman (JG): Confirming what PS just mentioned, the conversation began with “within the constraints of very limited funding, what can be accomplished”.

PS: I would be willing to take a proposal to the R1ACT is there is a motion that can be reached today.

TK: It does not seem clear who is taking the lead on prioritizing the projects for the regional benefits. It is even more unclear where JPACT fits into this conversation.

PS: We are being told that the priorities are coming from Governor’s Transportation Forum.

MOTION: JG moves that C4 request the R1ACT, in addition to their already suggested projects, identify and rank more significant multimodal projects in the region. 2nd by TG. Approved.

Gary Schmidt (GS): ODOT will have a new website soon about the STIP projects, with satellite maps and the full applications. This site is in test mode now, so the R1ACT member saw it, but it is not yet live to share with others.

4. C4 Retreat Action Items Update

Trent Wilson (TW): Shared results from August 6 poll. Results included in packet. Explained that the earlier economic development presentation was a first step to meet the Action Items goals, and that a follow up to the conversation would be led by the cities at a date to be determined by the Executive Committee. As a next step, the Executive Committee has asked that “creating a general, county wide prioritization list to be a review mechanism for transportation projects” be on the October agenda. Our County transportation team is already meeting to help figure out what that conversation could look like.

TK: How will the cities be included in that conversation?

TW: The preliminary discussion by C4 staff and the County Transportation Department has been to first come here, to C4, and seek more clarity on how C4 would like the everyone to be involved, and to

also discuss what are the goals of creating this list, how to categorize, etc. Essentially, C4 will get to determine how the cities are included in the conversation.

5. Jurisdiction Update

Alan Lehto (AL) and Vanessa Vissar (VV) (TriMet) provide a short update on the TriMet SE Service Enhancement Plan.

AL: The SE Service Enhancement Plan is a very visual example of how TriMet is seeking community feedback and working to implement it. We are also expecting to have a conversation about increasing the payroll tax. The change would be over a 10 year period and only fund new services, not existing

VV: In the long run, TriMet will try to increase frequency and weekend services to newly proposed routes. Also, we want to start considering new East-to-West routes, like connecting Happy Valley to Oregon City, etc.

VV: Public Comment period on the service enhancement plans ends on October 1. Feedback will be included in the next draft.

Questions/Comments from the presentation:

TG: Thanks TriMet for receiving and incorporating feedback. Line X is a clear indicator that communities were heard.

Carlotta Collette (CCollette): So we have been talking about the SE Plan, is there a SW plan, and are West Linn and Lake Oswego part of that?

AL: Yes. [AL passes out SW Service Enhancement Plan packets].

JG: With the new routes, when will shelters begin appearing?

AL: Shelters are usually put in place depending on frequency of use.

JG: Maybe the shelters could induce frequency, perhaps better signifying the route better than just a post with a route sign/number. Also, has there been any progress to figure out the connection gap between TriMet and SMART?

AL: TriMet staff has been meeting to figure that out. Because of our size, there are restrictions about where we can operate, and we cannot operate outside of our district without special approval and compensation.

PS: Perhaps there is room for a legislative fix for that one connection.

Stephan Lashbrook (SL): How are you working to connect the SE and SW?

AL: We are "one" TriMet.

John Blanton: Will there be additional lines in Happy Valley?

AL: We are open to ideas about where to serve, but some of Happy Valley is outside of the district, so more work needs to happen before bringing that service into a TriMet district.

Jurisdiction update continues:

PS: Please keep updates to urgent updates only, because we are running long on the schedule

JG: Nike will have an expansion move into Lake Oswego; we are anticipating 100 jobs from the expansion.

TG: The TriMet Orange Line celebration is on Saturday, 9/12, from 11am to 5pm at both Park Street Station and Milwaukie Station. The entire TriMet system will be fare-less during that time.

BH: Canby is breaking ground on its 35,000 sqft civic center. It will hold the City Hall and Library.

6. **JPACT/MPAC Update**

Mayor Tim Knapp, Wilsonville & Mayor Mark Gamba, Milwaukie

MG: At the last MPAC meeting we divided and discussed the UGM decision in small groups, a lot of people felt like it was a good way to flesh out concerns and questions. It created very good dialogue. Future discussion will be centering on housing stock, cost of housing compared to lowering income rates.

TK: JPACT meets on 9/10/15. There will be an update on the Sellwood Bridge Project. Discussion on the RFFA has been extended from 15 minutes to 45 minutes, so I am excited about the opportunity to dialogue.

PS: I am hoping to add to that dialogue some of what was discussed in the R1ACT meeting about how to level the competitiveness of projects so that each sub-region has more opportunity for funding.

PS: There is a little bit of time left; do either of the Mayor's want to provide an update from the Mayors and Chairs meeting?

TK: Nothing was really decided at the meeting. There was a lot of discussion about the uncertainty created from the remand. That puts a hold on things. We need to be considering the broad effects of the remand if it is delayed again. The Mayors' Consortium is meeting on Wednesday (9/9) to discuss how the land use process doesn't really honor the priorities and planning process of cities and communities because of its regional lens.

PS: Correct. Metro asserts that sub-regional needs are irrelevant in their determinations.

CCollette: Not that the Metro asserts that sub-regional needs are irrelevant, but that Metro is limited by state law to look at the reserves map through a "regional balance" lens, only. Obviously the County and Wilsonville have needs and goals, but the current law requires regional balance to be considered, and that is what the Metro council is tasked with. Also, Metro set the projections for the current UGR with feedback from the cities, as well as using local comp plans and zoning to establish our numbers, so you can't just say that we haven't reached out or look at community projections. Further, Metro is considering how to reward communities, like Wilsonville, who have shown they are not only willing to accept additional lands in the reserves map, but also ready. I agree that it is a shame their process is being held up by the remand, but hopefully we can find a solution to move Wilsonville forward and we think this may help. Finally, there are no reserves in Clackamas and Multnomah Counties. Solving the remand fixes that. Metro believes the solution is simple, and Clackamas County has other ideas. So we are waiting.

7. **Adjourn**

Clackamas County

Emergency Communication System Replacement Overview

Why does the Emergency Communication System need replacing?

1. *The existing emergency radio system is out dated and prone to failure*
2. *Need to transition to current digital technology*
3. *Need to ensure ongoing system compatibility and interoperability*
4. *Need to respond to population growth*

Project Goals

- ↻ Timely replacement of Clackamas County’s emergency radio/data infrastructure
- ↻ Maintain a system that is based on current digital technology and ensures compatibility and interoperability into the future
- ↻ Maintain or enhance existing service levels
- ↻ Develop a capital financing strategy that minimizes the financial burden on user agencies and reinforces public trust and confidence
- ↻ This project is the responsible way to save lives and fix the problem, creating an efficient, dependable communications system that works in all parts of Clackamas County.

Project Definition

This project will construct a new P25 open source digital radio system, including a microwave transport system, providing equal coverage and performance to the current system while also expanding coverage and maintaining interoperability. Features include:

- 3 Additional 5 sites to make up for the performance difference between analog and digital;
- ✓ Additional 6 sites for expanded coverage at Mt Hood and the Clackamas drainage in South County;
- ✓ Additional 1 site for the portable at the hip coverage;
- ✓ Additional 2 sites for enhanced in-building coverage (total of 14 added sites);
- ✓ Application to allow SMART phone access to the system;
- ✓ Paging system replacement;
- ✓ Post-warranty support; and
- ✓ Systems refresh for equipment and software upgrades.

Includes approximately 50% of subscriber radios – the balance remains an agency responsibility.

Major Elements of the Proposal

Replace two-way radio infrastructure	\$27.9 million
Approximately 50% of subscriber radios	\$5.0 million
Add tower sites	\$16.9 million
Include system refresh/upgrades	\$2.7 million
Ensure project management/contingency	\$2.1 million
Upgrade console equipment	\$1.7 million
Cover miscellaneous expenses	\$2.0 million
Ensure backup dispatch	<u>\$0.4 million</u>
TOTAL COST	\$58.7 million

Proposal Cost Specifics

Project Costs	14 added sites (Option 4)
Simulcast Equipment	\$14,927,509
A portion of Subscriber Radios	\$5,000,000
Additional Radio Sites	\$11,082,344
Master Site Equipment	\$3,534,291
System Refresh/Upgrade	\$2,699,200
Generator/Commercial	\$5,798,542
Microwave Backhaul	\$3,367,980
Console Equipment	\$1,650,269
Site Alarms and Monitoring	\$1,364,444
Spares and Materials	\$1,230,603
48 VDC Power System	\$1,064,567
Equipment Contingency	\$627,608
Backup Dispatch	\$425,596
Equipment Testing	\$101,000
Project Management	\$264,676
Paging	\$373,248
Unified PTI (mobile dev)	\$188,384
Asset Management	\$119,054
Post Warranty Support	\$3,104,080
Sub-Total	\$56,923,395
Estimated cost of issuance	\$1,780,932
Total including cost of issuance	\$58,704,327

Financing Specifics

- Cost per \$1,000 of Assessed Value (15-year Bond) \$0.10
- Average Homeowner Cost per Year (\$250,000 Assessed Value) \$25.00
- Interest on the 15-year bonds \$18,906,948