

## CLACKAMAS COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

### Study Session Worksheet

**Presentation Date:** October 7, 2014      **Approximate Start Time:** 2:00 PM  
**Approximate Length:** 60 Minutes

**Presentation Title:** Update on the Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) Task Force discussion

**Department:** Department of Transportation and Development – Engineering Division; Public and Government Affairs

**Presenters:** Gary Schmidt, Director of the Department of Public and Government Affairs and Karen Buehrig, Transportation Planning Supervisor

#### **WHAT ACTION ARE YOU REQUESTING FROM THE BOARD?**

1. Input into the following questions that are being considered by the ACT Task Force:

- Does the BCC support the formation of an Area Commission of Transportation in ODOT Region 1?
- Does the BCC support an ACT membership based on both percentage of population and ODOT facility miles by county in ODOT Region 1?
- Which stakeholder groups should be represented on the ACT?

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (why and why now):**

The primary purpose of an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) is to provide input into the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on prioritization of projects on the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). It also serves as a venue for coordination and information sharing about statewide transportation issues. More specific information about ACTs can be found at:

[http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/pages/act\\_main.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/pages/act_main.aspx)

In 2010, residents of rural Clackamas County identified that ODOT Region 1 was the only area of the state that did not have an ACT. These representatives from several of the Villages and Hamlets discussed the concept and developed draft by-laws for a Clackamas County ACT. Building on this initial discussion, the Department of Transportation and Development (DTD) hired a consultant to facilitate a conversation with a larger group of stakeholders, including representatives from Hood River and Multnomah counties, to develop a proposal for an ACT that was presented to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The OTC reviewed the request for a rural

Clackamas County ACT in April 2011 and responded that an ACT that only covered the rural portion of Clackamas County did not serve the primary purpose of an ACT. During the 2013 legislative session, State Representative Bill Kennemer introduced legislation to create an ACT for rural Clackamas County. This caught the attention of ODOT and other stakeholders in ODOT Region 1. It was determined that it would be more productive for stakeholders throughout ODOT Region 1 to discuss the establishment of an ACT (or more than one ACT) in ODOT Region 1, rather than legislate a solution.

Since May of 2014, the Transportation Coordination Task Force has been meeting to discuss the formation of one or more ACTs in ODOT Region 1. Members of the Task Force are charged with making a recommendation to the OTC by December of 2014 regarding this issue. At their meeting in September, the Task Force heard from representatives from other ACTs across the state. In addition, several options for either one or two ACTs in ODOT Region 1 were discussed. These options are outlined in Attachment 1.

At their October meeting, it is anticipated that the Task Force will discuss possible membership composition of both a one ACT solution and a two ACT solution. The sample of membership options that will potentially be discussed is included in Attachment 2. A list of possible Clackamas County stakeholders that was developed during the 2011 rural ACT discussion is included as Attachment 3.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

If an Area Commission on Transportation is created for ODOT Region 1, it will not have direct financial impacts, but would likely have an impact on staff resources.

**LEGAL/POLICY REQUIREMENTS:**

N/A

**PUBLIC/GOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPATION:**

Six members of the current Transportation Coordination Task Force represent various stakeholders in Clackamas County.

**OPTIONS:**

- Support the creation of either one or two ACTs
- Provide input in the factors influencing the membership of the ACT
- Identify specific stakeholders that should be represented on the ACT

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends the Board of County Commissioners discuss the formation of an ACT in ODOT Region 1 and provide input in the potential ACT membership.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. One or Two ACT Options
2. Sample ACT Membership details

3. List of Potential Clackamas County Stakeholders

**SUBMITTED BY:**

Division Director/Head Approval

Department Director/Head Approval

County Administrator Approval

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
W.B. Carlisle 10/1/14  
\_\_\_\_\_

For information on this issue or copies of attachments, please contact Karen Buehrig @ 503-742-4683

# ODOT Region 1 – ACT Options

	<u>OPTION 1</u> <u>1 ACT</u> <u>4-County</u>	<u>OPTION 2</u> <u>2 ACTs</u>	<u>Enhanced ODOT Region 1 STIP</u> <u>Selection Committee</u>
Geography	All of ODOT Region 1	<p>ACT 1: Metro/JPACT plus the remaining portion of Washington County not included in the Northwest Oregon ACT and the small northwestern portion of Multnomah County that is not within the Metro boundary.</p> <p>ACT 2: All of Hood River County, the eastern portion of Multnomah County not within Metro, and the non-Metro portions of Clackamas County</p>	ODOT Region 1 STIP Project Selection Committee continues to operate for Enhance project prioritization.
Primary Advantages	<p>A single ACT provides a single forum to set priorities.</p> <p>Dialogue between jurisdictions and stakeholders inside vs. outside Metro is facilitated.</p> <p>Provides for a unified voice for the entire Region to the OTC.</p> <p>Builds greater understanding of various economic development issues, projects and needs of the different areas throughout Region 1</p> <p>Replaces and builds on the efforts of the Region 1 STIP Project Selection Committee which was largely considered a success.</p> <p>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</p>	<p>May avoid membership challenges associated with merging urban and rural areas within Region 1.</p> <p>Two committees may provide for more membership opportunities and allow for unique interests, such as the Forest Service and BLM, to participate in ACT..</p> <p>Provides direct voice to Oregon Transportation Commission for each ACT on other issues.</p> <p>Ability to spend more time and focus on local needs.</p> <p>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</p>	<p>Provides a single forum to set STIP priorities.</p> <p>Dialogue between jurisdictions and stakeholders inside vs. outside Metro could be facilitated if the membership is revised and the Committee takes on a broader role than STIP project prioritization.</p> <p>Builds on, rather than duplicates, the County Coordinating Committee structure.</p> <p>Meets on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</p>
Primary Disadvantages	<p>It is possible that either the size of the ACT will be too large to effectively prioritize projects or too small to allow for extensive direct stakeholder representation. The region may be too complex for this model.</p> <p>If ACT membership is proportional to population the ACT will either be very large or leave rural areas feeling potentially under represented given that 89% of people in Region 1 live within the MPO boundary.</p> <p>Distance and capacity limitations may make it more difficult for some rural stakeholders to participate effectively.</p>	<p>Would require a "Super ACT" prioritization process, or other undetermined means to unify recommendations to the OTC.</p> <p>The two ACTs would be significantly disproportional with more than 90% of the Region 1 population located in the western ACT. This disproportionate split might dilute the effectiveness of the smaller ACT in the "Super ACT" process.</p> <p>2 ACTs involve more meetings.</p>	Does not provide a forum for additional ACT functions like Connect Oregon prioritization, modal plan review, etc.
Membership	<p>Jurisdictions and stakeholders throughout the 4-County area.</p> <p>Presumably, membership would include a strong overlap with JPACT.</p>	<p>ACT 1: Metro area representation could start with JPACT or STIP Project Selection Committee members within the MPO and supplemented with other area-wide stakeholder interests.</p> <p>ACT 2: elected officials and stakeholders throughout ODOT Region 1 south and east of the Metro area.</p>	Existing STIP Project Selection Committee membership (4 appointments per County plus ODOT Regional Manager, JPACT Chair. City of Portland, TriMet, Port of Portland) plus other regional stakeholder interests.
How is the STIP funding allocated?	A single 4-County priority list is established.	Two separate priority lists would be reconciled by a meeting of representatives of the two ACTs together (as a Super-ACT).	A single 4-County priority list is established.
Coordination and Communication	The County Coordinating Committees and JPACT would establish formal relationships with the ACT and would assume increased responsibilities for seeking consensus on their respective regional priorities for consideration by the ACT. Hood River County would establish a similar	<p>The relationship between the ACT and JPACT as the MPO would be formalized.</p> <p>The Clackamas Coordinating Committee would establish a formal relationship with</p>	County Coordinating Committees and/or JPACT may request to have input on non-STIP items before the OTC.

# ODOT Region 1 – ACT Options

	<p>coordinating structure.</p>	<p>ACT 2 and would assume increased responsibilities for seeking consensus on their respective rural priorities for consideration by ACT 2. Multnomah County and Hood River County would establish a similar coordinating structure.</p>	
--	--------------------------------	--	--




Attachment 2

	2013 Population	Percentage	reps by pop percentage	Population Reps rounded down (except hood river)	ODOT Lane miles percentage	reps by odot road miles	rounded	Average Road miles / population
Multnomah	756,530	44.1%	8.81	8	35.00%	7	7	7.5
Washington	550,990	32.1%	6.42	6	24.00%	4.8	5	5.5
Clackamas	386,080	22.5%	4.50	4	30.00%	6	6	5
Hood River	23,295	1.4%	0.27	2	11.00%	2.2	2	2

1,716,895

20

20

STIP Stakeholder Model					
County -				elected/port/transit	
Multnomah County -	4 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		City elected	1	urban	1
		2 stakeholders	2	urban	
Washington County -	4 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		City	1	urban	1
		2 stakeholders	2	Urban	
Clackamas County -	4 members	Commissioner	1	both	1
		City	1	urban	1
		Stakeholder	1	urban	
		Stakeholder	1	urban	
Hood River County -	4 members	Commissioner	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
		2 stakeholders	2	rural	
<b>OTHER</b>					
	Metro		1	urban	1
	ODOT		1	both	
	TriMet		1	urban	1
	City of Portland		1	urban	1
	Port of Portland		1	urban	1
Total Reps			21		12

5 both 24%  
12 urban 57%  
4 rural 19%  
21

ODOT Lane miles percentage					
County -				elected/port/transit	
Multnomah County -	7 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Portland	1	urban	1
		2nd Largest city	1	urban	1
		4 stakeholders	4	urban	
Washington County -	5 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Largest City	1	urban	1
		Small City	1	urban	1
		2 stakeholders	2	urban	
		2 stakeholders	2	urban	
Clackamas County -	6 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Largest City	1	urban	1
		Smaller urban City	1	urban	1
		Smaller rural City	1	rural	1
		Stakeholder	1	urban	
		Stakeholder	1	rural	
Hood River County -	2 members	County Commissioner	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
<b>OTHER</b>					
	Metro		1	urban	1
	ODOT		1	both	
	Transit	1 urban	1	urban	1
		1 rural	1	rural	1
	Port of Portland		1	urban	1
	Port of Portland		1	urban	1
Total Reps			25		16

4 both 16%  
16 urban 64%  
5 rural 20%  
25

County population percentage					
County -				elected/port/transit	
Multnomah County -	8 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Portland	1	urban	1
		2nd & 3rd Largest cities	2	urban	2
		5 stakeholders	4	urban	
		5 stakeholders	4	urban	
Washington County -	6 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Largest City	1	urban	1
		Small City	1	urban	1
		3 stakeholders	3	urban	
Clackamas County -	4 members	Commissioner	1	both	1
		Urban City	1	urban	1
		Urban Stakeholder	1	urban	
		Rural Stakeholder	1	rural	
		Rural Stakeholder	1	rural	
Hood River County -	2 members	Commissioner	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
<b>OTHER</b>					
	Metro		1	urban	1
	ODOT		1	both	
	Transit	1 urban	1	urban	1
		1 rural	1	rural	1
	Port of Portland		1	urban	1
Total Reps			25		15

4 both 16%  
17 urban 68%  
4 rural 16%  
25

Population/Road Miles average					
County -				elected/port/transit	
Multnomah County -	7 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Portland	1	urban	1
		2nd Largest city	1	urban	1
		4 stakeholders	4	urban	
Washington County -	5 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
		Largest City	1	urban	1
		Small City	1	urban	1
		2 stakeholders	2	urban	
		2 stakeholders	2	urban	
Clackamas County -	5 members	Commissioner	1	both	1
		Largest City	1	urban	1
		Smaller urban City	1	urban	1
		Smaller rural City	1	rural	1
		1 stakeholders	1	rural	
Hood River County -	2 members	Commissioner	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
		City Rep	1	rural	1
<b>OTHER</b>					
	Metro		1	urban	1
	ODOT		1	both	
	Transit	1 urban	1	urban	1
		1 rural	1	rural	1
	Port of Portland		1	urban	1
Total Reps			24		16

4 both 17%  
15 urban 63%  
5 rural 21%  
24

## 2nd ACT Membership Options

	2010 Population	Percentage	reps by pop percentage	Population Reps rounded
Multnomah	6,715	4.7%	0.94	1
Washington	0	0.0%	0.00	0
Clackamas	113,807	79.7%	15.93	16
Hood River	22,346	15.6%	3.13	3
	142,868		20	20

County population percentage				
				elected/port/ transit
<b>Multnomah County –</b>				
1 member	County staff	1	both	
<b>Clackamas County –</b>				
16 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
	Canby Councilor	1	city	1
	Sandy Councilor	1	city	1
	Mollala Councilor	1	city	1
	Estacada Councilor	1	city	1
	Transit District Directors	4	city	4
	US 26 corridor hamlets	2	rural	
	Hwy 213 Corridor hamlets	2	rural	
	Businesses and Stakeholders	4	both	
<b>Hood River County –</b>				
3 members	County Commissioner	1	both	1
	City Councilor	1	city	1
	Port District	1	city	
<b>OTHER</b>				
USFS/BLM		1	rural	
ODOT		1	both	
<b>Total Reps</b>		<b>23</b>		<b>11</b>

### Attachment 3:

List of potential stakeholders developed during the previous discussion on a rural ACT.

- City of Canby
- City of Cascade Locks
- City of Estacada
- City of Hood River
- City of Molalla
- City of Sandy
- Clackamas County
- Hood River County
- Multnomah County
- Port of Cascade Locks
- Port of Hood River
- Columbia Area Transit
- South Clackamas Transportation District
- Sandy Transit
- Canby Transit
- Transportation Reaching People / Mountain Express
- TriMet
- SMART – Wilsonville Transit
- The Villages at Mt. Hood
- Hamlet of Beavercreek
- Hamlet of Molalla Prairie
- Hamlet of Mulino
- Stafford Hamlet
- Citizen Planning Organizations (CPOs) in rural Clackamas County
- Mid Columbia Economic Development District
- West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce
- Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs
- US Forest Service
- US Bureau of Land Management
- Oregon Department of Transportation
- Freight
- Rail
- Bicycle / pedestrian interests
- Economic development / business
- Environmental interests
- Recreation interests
- Agriculture interests