
Thursday, May 04, 2017
6:45 PM – 8:30 PM

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

- 6:45 p.m. Pledge of Allegiance**
- Welcome & Introductions**
Chair Jim Bernard & Mayor Brian Hodson, Co-Chairs
- Housekeeping**
- Approval of April 04, 2017 C4 Minutes **Page 02**
- 6:50 p.m. R1ACT Appointments Notice** **Page 03**
- 6:55 p.m. Metro 2018 RTP Call for Projects Discussion**
- Staff Memo **Page 04**
- 7:40 p.m. Vehicle Registration Fee Discussion**
- VRF Revenue Options **Page 06**
- 8:20 p.m. Updates/Other Business**
- **JPACT/MPAC Updates**
 - **Letter from Wilsonville to Rep. Vial** **Page 11**
(Information only)
 - **C4 Retreat Update**
- 8:30 p.m. Adjourn**

Supplemental Agenda Item (if time allows):

Affordable Housing Discussion **Page 13**



Clackamas
County
Coordinating
Committee

Promoting partnership among the County, its Cities and Special Districts

CLACKAMAS COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE (C4)

Thursday, April 6, 2017

Action Minutes

Attendance:

Members: **Canby:** Brian Hodson (Co-Chair); **CPOs:** Laurie Swanson (Molalla); Marjorie Stewart (Firwood) (Alt.); **Fire Districts:** Mathew Silva (Estacada); **Hamlets:** John Meyer (Mulino); **Happy Valley:** Markley Drake; **Lake Oswego:** Jeff Gudman; **Metro:** Carlotta Collette; **Molalla:** Jimmy Thompson; **Oregon City:** Renate Mengelberg; **Sandy:** Don Hollis; **Sanitary Districts:** Nancy Gibson (Oak Lodge Water Services); **Transit:** Julie Wehling (Canby); Andi Howell (Sandy) (Alt); **Water Districts:** Hugh Kalani; **West Linn:** Teri Cummings; **Wilsonville:** Kristin Akervall

Staff: Trent Wilson (PGA); Caren Anderson (PGA)

Guests: Terry Gibson (Map-IT); Jaimie Lorenzini (Happy Valley); Zoe Monahan (Tualatin); Tracy Moreland (BCC); Mary Jo Cartasegna (BCC); Steve Williams (DTD); Nancy Kraushaar (Wilsonville); Don Krupp (County Administrator)

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

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Action</u>
Approval of March 2, 2017 C4 Minutes	Minutes moved, seconded and approved.
C4 Co-Chair selection Results	C4 notified that Brian Hodson was selected by C4 Executive Committee to continue his role as Co-Chair and Executive Committee member.
Results of March survey regarding topics of interest for C4 Retreat	C4 Retreat will be held on August 11 th and 12 th . Registration information will be sent out prior to the next meeting. The Executive Committee will review the topic list and combine items that are similar into larger topics such as Housing and Transportation, and share recommend a draft Retreat Agenda appear in May.
Memo and C4LUAS Affordable Housing Report	County staff will research what a countywide housing needs assessment would entail, including: costs, outcomes and stakeholders. Report back at future C4 meeting.
Memo regarding Countywide Transportation Coordination	Presentation given by Stephen Williams, Principal Transportation Planner in DTD. No action.
JPACT/MPAC Updates	No updates provided. JPACT members attending conference in Washington D.C.
Other: State Transportation Funding Package	Staff provided an update on transportation work in the legislature.

Position	Representative	Affiliation	Reappointment year
Active Transpo Stakeholder	Steph Routh		2019
City of Portland	Dan Saltzman*	Commissioner, Portland	2017
Clack Co	Paul Savas	Commissioner, Clackamas County	2019
Clack Co Stakeholder	Bill Avison**	Avison Lumber	2019
Clack Co Stakeholder	Jeff Gudman*	Councilor, Lake Oswego	2017
Clack Co Stakeholder	Brian Hodson*	Mayor, Canby	2019
Clack Co Stakeholder	Lori DeRemer*	Mayor, Happy Valley	2019
Clack Co Stakeholder	Bill Merchant	Vice Chairman, Hamlet of Beavercreek	2017
Freight Stakeholder	Pia Welch	Fed-Ex	2019
Hood River Co	Ron Rivers	Chair, Hood River County	2019
Hood River Co Stakeholder	Steve Bickford**	Mt. Hood Winery	2017
Hood River Co Stakeholder	Jess Groves	Commissioner, Port of Cascade Locks	2017
Hood River Co Stakeholder	Peter Cornelison**	Councilor, Hood River	2019
Metro	Craig Dirksen	Councilor, Metro	2017
Mult Co	Jessica Vega Pederson	Commissioner, Multnomah County	2017
Mult Co Stakeholder	Jerry Hinton*	Councilor, Gresham	2017
Mult Co Stakeholder	Joseph Santos-Lyons****	APANO	2019
Mult Co Stakeholder	Sam Breyer	Centennial School District	2017
Mult Co Stakeholder	Brian Newman***	OHSU	2019
Mult Co Stakeholder			2019
Mult Co Stakeholder	Chris Oxley**	Portland Trail Blazers	2017
ODOT Region 1	Rian Windsheimer	Region 1 Manager, ODOT	2019
Port of Portland	Bill Wyatt	Port of Portland	2017
Rural Transit Stakeholder	Julie Wehling	Canby Area Transit	2019
TriMet	Neil McFarlane	TriMet	2017
Wash Co	Roy Rogers	Commissioner, Washington County	2019
Wash Co Stakeholder	Denny Doyle*	Mayor, Beaverton	2017
Wash Co Stakeholder	Jeffrey Dalin*	Mayor, Cornelius	2019
Wash Co Stakeholder	Krisanna Clark*	Mayor, Sherwood	2019
Wash Co Stakeholder	John Cook*	Mayor, Tigard	2017
Wash Co Stakeholder	Pam Treece**	Westside Economic Alliance	2017

*City stakeholder

**Business/labor stakeholder

***Health stakeholder

****Environmental justice stakeholder

MEMORANDUM

TO: C4
FROM: Stephen Williams, Principal Transportation Planner
DATE: April 26, 2017
SUBJECT: 2018 Metro Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects

Between now and late August the local governments of the Portland urbanized area will participate in the 2018 Metro Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Call for Projects. The following describes the RTP Call for Projects, the schedule, and the roles in the process of the local governments, C4 and C4 Metro Subcommittee, and CTAC.

- The Metro Call for Projects is literally a process to create the list of projects that appear in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- In the Call for Projects the transportation providers (local governments, ODOT, and TriMet/SMART) provide Metro with a list of their transportation project priorities for the coming 22 year period of time from 2018 to 2040. These are generally put forward by the transportation providers from their adopted transportation plans, such as local TSPs.
- All the projects together make up what is referred to as the “RTP Investment Strategy.” It is called this because the projects represent improvements to the transportation system to strategically accomplish regional priorities. Metro is required to update the Regional Transportation Plan and Investment Strategy every four years.
- One of the core requirements for the RTP Investment Strategy is that it be “fiscally constrained.” This means that the MPO must limit the projects in the investment strategy based on the amount of funding that it can reasonably expect to be available in the future.
- All types of projects are included in the list – roads/highways, transit and active transportation, operations/maintenance projects, as well as planning and special studies. The Investment Strategy for the 2014 RTP included about 1,200 projects region-wide, with 253 for improvements located in Clackamas County.
- Some of the projects in the list have been identified for funding through state and regional grants such as ODOT STIP Enhance grants, Metro Regional Flexible Funds, or ConnectOregon.
- Inclusion of local government transportation projects in the Investment Strategy does not guarantee that the projects will receive funding in the future.
- The 2018 RTP will also include a list of projects that is not fiscally constrained. This list of projects includes priorities for the transportation providers for which funding is not anticipated to be available. It is easy to move projects from this list into the fiscally constrained list if funding becomes available. As a result, the unconstrained list is often referred to as the “vision” project list.
- The Investment Strategy project list will actually be composed of three sub-lists as follows:
 1. Fiscally Constrained Project List for 2018 to 2027 – The highest priority projects. Includes all the projects that have committed funding, or are in the project development process.
 2. Fiscally Constrained Project List for 2028 to 2040 – Priority projects that occur in later years.
 3. Unconstrained Project List for 2028 to 2040 – Needed projects that would be developed if funding became available.

Over the course of May, June and July, CTAC will be working to develop fiscally constrained lists that express local government priorities and also fit within the available funding. Through the course of this process, updates will be provided by staff to C4 and C4 Metro Subcommittee at their regularly scheduled meetings to enable those groups to provide input to CTAC. During July and August these lists will be brought forward to C4 and C4 Metro Subcommittee for discussion and endorsement. These lists are to be endorsed and provided to Metro no later than August 21.

Issues:

1. The challenge of the 2018 RTP Call for Projects process for C4, C4 Metro Subcommittee and CTAC is that the funding available for projects is anticipated to be significantly less than previously. It may be difficult to identify a project list addressing the local government's highest priorities within the funding limits.
2. A second issue for C4 discussion is the approach that should be taken to meeting the required schedule. C4 has scheduled its retreat for August 11/12. Staff believes it could be challenging to prepare the required lists, that will include several hundred proposed transportation projects, if sufficient time for review and discussion by C4 and C4 Metro Subcommittee is not available.

2017 C4 Transportation Funding Program Discussion

Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share		Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$	3,646,910.00
County Share (%)	60%	\$	5,470,365.00
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection **	100%	\$	9,117,275.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$43 per year.)</i>	\$25.00	--> Annually (per registered vehicle. --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection \$	9,117,275
--------------------------------	------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population**	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$ 5,470,365	176,259	N/A
Barlow	\$ 2,406	135	0.07%
Canby	\$ 285,315	16,010	7.82%
Estacada	\$ 52,305	2,935	1.43%
Gladstone	\$ 204,853	11,495	5.62%
Happy Valley	\$ 293,691	16,480	8.05%
Johnson City	\$ 10,069	565	0.28%
Lake Oswego *	\$ 615,509	34,538	16.88%
Milwaukie	\$ 365,064	20,485	10.01%
Molalla	\$ 157,181	8,820	4.31%
Oregon City	\$ 601,638	33,760	16.50%
Portland *	\$ 13,537	760	0.37%
Rivergrove *	\$ 8,034	451	0.22%
Sandy	\$ 181,240	10,170	4.97%
Tualatin *	\$ 51,740	2,903	1.42%
West Linn	\$ 455,149	25,540	12.48%
Wilsonville *	\$ 349,180	19,594	9.57%
Totals: \$	9,117,275	380,900	100%

Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2014.

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

** Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2016 registration numbers.

2017 C4 Transportation Funding Program Discussion

Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share		Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$	4,376,292.00
County Share (%)	60%	\$	6,564,438.00
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection **	100%	\$	10,940,730.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$43 per year.)</i>	\$30.00	--> Annually (per registered vehicle. --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection \$	10,940,730
--------------------------------	-------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population**	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$ 6,564,438	176,259	N/A
Barlow	\$ 2,887	135	0.07%
Canby	\$ 342,378	16,010	7.82%
Estacada	\$ 62,766	2,935	1.43%
Gladstone	\$ 245,823	11,495	5.62%
Happy Valley	\$ 352,429	16,480	8.05%
Johnson City	\$ 12,083	565	0.28%
Lake Oswego *	\$ 738,611	34,538	16.88%
Milwaukie	\$ 438,076	20,485	10.01%
Molalla	\$ 188,618	8,820	4.31%
Oregon City	\$ 721,965	33,760	16.50%
Portland *	\$ 16,244	760	0.37%
Rivergrove *	\$ 9,641	451	0.22%
Sandy	\$ 217,488	10,170	4.97%
Tualatin *	\$ 62,088	2,903	1.42%
West Linn	\$ 546,179	25,540	12.48%
Wilsonville *	\$ 419,016	19,594	9.57%
Totals: \$	10,940,730	380,900	100%

Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2014.

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

** Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2016 registration numbers.

2017 C4 Transportation Funding Program Discussion

Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share		Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$	5,105,674.00
County Share (%)	60%	\$	7,658,511.00
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection **	100%	\$	12,764,185.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$43 per year.)</i>	\$35.00	--> Annually (per registered vehicle. --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection \$	12,764,185
--------------------------------	-------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population**	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$ 7,658,511	176,259	N/A
Barlow	\$ 3,368	135	0.07%
Canby	\$ 399,440	16,010	7.82%
Estacada	\$ 73,227	2,935	1.43%
Gladstone	\$ 286,794	11,495	5.62%
Happy Valley	\$ 411,167	16,480	8.05%
Johnson City	\$ 14,096	565	0.28%
Lake Oswego *	\$ 861,713	34,538	16.88%
Milwaukie	\$ 511,089	20,485	10.01%
Molalla	\$ 220,054	8,820	4.31%
Oregon City	\$ 842,293	33,760	16.50%
Portland *	\$ 18,952	760	0.37%
Rivergrove *	\$ 11,248	451	0.22%
Sandy	\$ 253,736	10,170	4.97%
Tualatin *	\$ 72,436	2,903	1.42%
West Linn	\$ 637,209	25,540	12.48%
Wilsonville *	\$ 488,852	19,594	9.57%
Totals: \$	12,764,185	380,900	100%

Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2014.

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

** Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2016 registration numbers.

2017 C4 Transportation Funding Program Discussion

Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share		Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$	5,835,056.00
County Share (%)	60%	\$	8,752,584.00
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection **	100%	\$	14,587,640.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$43 per year.)</i>	\$40.00	--> Annually (per registered vehicle. --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection \$	14,587,640
--------------------------------	-------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population**	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$ 8,752,584	176,259	N/A
Barlow	\$ 3,849	135	0.07%
Canby	\$ 456,503	16,010	7.82%
Estacada	\$ 83,688	2,935	1.43%
Gladstone	\$ 327,764	11,495	5.62%
Happy Valley	\$ 469,905	16,480	8.05%
Johnson City	\$ 16,110	565	0.28%
Lake Oswego *	\$ 984,815	34,538	16.88%
Milwaukie	\$ 584,102	20,485	10.01%
Molalla	\$ 251,490	8,820	4.31%
Oregon City	\$ 962,621	33,760	16.50%
Portland *	\$ 21,659	760	0.37%
Rivergrove *	\$ 12,855	451	0.22%
Sandy	\$ 289,984	10,170	4.97%
Tualatin *	\$ 82,784	2,903	1.42%
West Linn	\$ 728,238	25,540	12.48%
Wilsonville *	\$ 558,688	19,594	9.57%
Totals: \$	14,587,640	380,900	100%

Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2014.

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

** Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2016 registration numbers.

2017 C4 Transportation Funding Program Discussion

Revenue Opportunity Projections

Jurisdiction	Revenue Share		Revenue Collection
City Share (%)	40%	\$	6,272,685.20
County Share (%)	60%	\$	9,409,027.80
Estimated Annual Revenue Collection **	100%	\$	15,681,713.00

Revenue Source	Rate	Assumptions
Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) <i>(Maximum is \$43 per year.)</i>	\$43.00	--> Annually (per registered vehicle. --> 50% reduction for motorcycles.

Annual \$ Collection \$	15,681,713
--------------------------------	-------------------

Jurisdiction	Annual \$ Distribution	Population**	City Distribution Percentage
Clackamas County	\$ 9,409,028	176,259	N/A
Barlow	\$ 4,138	135	0.07%
Canby	\$ 490,741	16,010	7.82%
Estacada	\$ 89,964	2,935	1.43%
Gladstone	\$ 352,347	11,495	5.62%
Happy Valley	\$ 505,148	16,480	8.05%
Johnson City	\$ 17,318	565	0.28%
Lake Oswego *	\$ 1,058,676	34,538	16.88%
Milwaukie	\$ 627,910	20,485	10.01%
Molalla	\$ 270,352	8,820	4.31%
Oregon City	\$ 1,034,817	33,760	16.50%
Portland *	\$ 23,284	760	0.37%
Rivergrove *	\$ 13,819	451	0.22%
Sandy	\$ 311,733	10,170	4.97%
Tualatin *	\$ 88,993	2,903	1.42%
West Linn	\$ 782,856	25,540	12.48%
Wilsonville *	\$ 600,589	19,594	9.57%
Totals: \$	15,681,713	380,900	100%

Population estimates are based on Portland State University (PSU) Population for Oregon and its Counties and Incorporated Cities and Towns: July 1, 2014.

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

** Registered passenger vehicles and motorcycles updated to reflect ODOT December 31, 2016 registration numbers.



April 18, 2017

Representative Rich Vial, Vice-Chair, House Committee on Transportation Policy
Oregon Legislative Assembly
900 Court St. NE, H-484
Salem, OR 97301

RE: South Metro I-5 Corridor Study for 2017 Transportation Legislation

Dear Representative Vial:

The City of Wilsonville City Council appreciates your leadership on transportation issues. We seek your support to encourage our state’s legislative team to advance a South Metro I-5 Corridor Study to be led by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) as a specific component of the pending “Transportation Package” before the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

The City, together with our partners at the Wilsonville Chamber of Commerce and local area businesses and governments, seeks to advance a South Metro I-5 Corridor Study. Recent testimony and discussions before the Congestion Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Transportation Preservation and Modernization highlighted increasing congestion on I-5.

The proposed transportation study is codified in the Metro 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as “Mobility Corridor #3,” a next-tier “corridor refinement plan” after bottleneck studies for the Rose Quarter I-5/I-84, I-205/Abernathy Bridge, Highway 217 and the Southwest Transit Corridor. The South Metro I-5 Corridor Study would look at a range of transportation issues by engaging multiple stakeholders to develop potential solutions regarding the movement of freight, commuters, local and interstate traffic along the South Metro I-5 Corridor, stretching from north of Salem/Keizer past Wilsonville to Portland and Hillsboro.

Traffic congestion in the specific South Metro I-5 Corridor stretch between I-5/Boone Bridge at Wilsonville past I-205 to Highway 217 has reached epic proportions with the end of the Great Recession and the population boom being experienced by the greater Portland and North Willamette Valley regions. A recently completed, legislatively funded Transportation Futures Study by Washington County identified several promising investments, including advancing study of the South Metro I-5 Corridor, which is reaching peak traffic-handling capacity.

We believe that such a study would need to look at multiple solutions to address the varying needs of different highway users, as well as potential land-use issues and funding resources.

Specific transportation issues to be studied in a South Metro I-5 Corridor Study include:

- **Freight:** What kinds of highway improvements or modifications to I-5 and major interchanges/connecting arterials could benefit the timely movement of trucks moving freight to/from and through Portland along the West Coast’s I-5 commerce route?
- **Commuters:** What kinds of public-transit services—including extension of WES south from Wilsonville to Woodburn and Salem/Keizer and introduction of new grade-separated east-west transit service from Oregon City/Clackamas County to Tualatin-Wilsonville/Washington County—could provide transportation alternatives for employees commuting to/from or across the Portland metro region? How can regional transit systems like Wilsonville’s SMART and Salem/Keizer Cherriots be better utilized to feed riders into the larger Tri-Met system?

- **I-5 Auxiliary Merge Lanes and Parallel Arterial Routes:** Just as the new I-5 NB and SB “aux” lanes between North Wilsonville and I-205 have substantially improved traffic flow along that portion of I-5, what strategic locations for additional auxiliary lanes such as SB Boone Bridge for merging on/off I-5 offer congestion improvements? Which roads parallel to I-5 that offer non-highway routing options for local trips should be studied for enhancement?
- **Origination/Destination (O/D) Analysis:** As part of a corridor study, ODOT can obtain data regarding the origination and destination of various kinds of trips. Also, ODOT is able to model the impacts on traffic flow if new or improved transportation facilities are built, as well as impacts of additional transit services on ridership.

Since 2008, ODOT has supported the “I-5 South Corridor Refinement Plan - Wilsonville to North Tigard,” stretching from Wilsonville I-5/Boone Bridge to North Tigard I-5/Highway 217 for the Metro RTP at an estimated cost of \$3.7 million during the 2008-2017 timeframe. Given inflation since that time, the City suggests that \$5 - \$10 million be dedicated to the study.

As you and other state and regional leaders astutely recognize, an improved transportation system to serve the greater Portland metro and North Willamette Valley regions really needs to look south of Wilsonville and north of Tigard to better understand commuter, freight, local and pass-through traffic flows and potential multi-modal solutions to address traffic congestion. Because this stretch of I-5 transverses two ODOT regions, four counties and multiple cities and transit-providers, ODOT is well positioned to undertake a South Metro I-5 Corridor Study.

We hope that you will join with Governor Brown and leaders in the Oregon legislature, Metro, and area counties, cities, metropolitan planning organizations and public transit providers to advance a South Metro I-5 Corridor Study that could be incorporated as a specific project in a Transportation Package or separate legislation to be advanced in the 2017 legislative session.

Sincerely,



Tim Knapp, Mayor

City of Wilsonville/SMART; Clackamas County Cities Representative to Metro JPACT; City of Wilsonville Representative to Clackamas and Washington Counties Coordinating Committees

Attachments (3)

cc: Governor Kate Brown
Wilsonville state legislators: Rep. Bill Kennemer; Sen. Kim Thatcher; Sen. Alan Olsen
Oregon legislative leadership: Sen. Peter Courtney; Sen. Laurie Monnes Anderson; Sen. Ginny Burdick; Sen. Ted Ferrioli; Sen. Lee Beyer; Sen. Betsy Johnson; Rep. Tina Kotek; Rep. Paul Holvey; Rep. Jennifer Williamson; Rep. Mike McLane; Rep. Caddy McKeown; Rep. David Gomberg
Metro Council: President Tom Hughes; Councilor Craig Dirksen, JPACT Chair
Clackamas County leadership: Commission Chair Jim Bernard, Clackamas County Coordinating Committee Co-Chair; Commissioner Paul Savas, ODOT Region 1 ACT Vice-Chair, Clackamas County JPACT Rep.; Mayor Brian Hodson, Clackamas County Coordinating Committee Chair Co-Chair
Washington County leadership: Commission Chair Andy Duyck; Commissioner Roy Rogers, Washington County Coordinating Committee Chair, ODOT Region 1 ACT Chair, Washington County JPACT Rep.; Mayor Denny Doyle, Washington County Cities JPACT Rep.
Marion-Polk Counties / Salem-Keizer Area Transportation Study (SKATS) leadership: Mayor Cathy Clark, Chair; Commissioner Sam Brentano; Commissioner Craig Pope; Councilor Jim Lewis
ODOT Region 2 MWACT leadership: Councilor Ken Woods, Chair
ODOT: Director Matt Garrett; Region 1 Manager Ryan Windsheimer; Region 2 Manager Sonny Chickering; Area/District 3 Manager Tim Potter

Clackamas County Coordinating Committee (C4)

May 4, 2017

Memo: Countywide Housing Needs Assessment Discussion

Summary:

At the April 6, 2017 meeting, C4 members requested information be presented in the future addressing the scope of work for a potential countywide Housing Needs Assessment. This request is in response to one of the several recommended potential action items from the C4 Land Use Advisory Subcommittee report presented in March 2017 at C4. The information below outlines a draft scope of work summarizing a potential countywide Housing Needs Assessment.

Attached for reference:

- I. Example from City of Milwaukie – Table of Contents
- II. Example from City of Richmond, VA – Table of Contents
- III. LCDC Goal 10

Scope of Work

- IV. Scope of Work should include:
 - a. Compliance with Goal 10 for all participating cities (County is not required to complete 5 year Housing Needs Assessment)
 - b. Targeted housing information county and cities hope to achieve, including
 - i. Available and not available land
 - ii. Identification of single and multifamily housing
 - iii. Identification of gaps in affordable housing
 - iv. Identification of rental vs. ownership inventory
 - v. Identification of conditions of housing
 - vi. Identification of demographics
 - vii. Displacement information, if applicable
 - c. Incorporate already completed Housing Needs Assessments current under Goal 10.
 - d. Consultant to coordinate with designated Technical Advisory Group and county/city planning departments as needed to complete work.
- V. Administration
 - a. Planning Group – responsible for preparing an RFP, soliciting bids, review and selection of a consultant
 - b. Technical Advisory Group – responsible for guiding the planning process and reviewing project deliverables. The TAG could include staff from all cities, county staff, as well as local developers, and housing non-profits.
 - c. Consultant – Responsible for working with TAG and implementing the scope of work
- VI. Costs
 - a. Estimated cost is between \$100,000 and \$200,000
 - b. Cost sharing alternatives:
 - i. Proration by population
 - ii. Proration by number of housing units
 - iii. Seek out grant funds to minimize costs



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
I. CITY OF MILWAUKIE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	2
A. POPULATION GROWTH	3
B. HOUSEHOLD GROWTH & SIZE	3
C. FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS	4
D. HOUSING UNITS	5
E. AGE TRENDS	5
F. DIVERSITY TRENDS	6
G. INCOME TRENDS	7
H. POVERTY STATISTICS	8
I. EMPLOYMENT TRENDS	8
II. CURRENT HOUSING CONDITIONS	11
A. HOUSING TENURE	11
B. HOUSING STOCK	11
C. NUMBER OF BEDROOMS	12
D. UNITS TYPES BY TENURE	12
E. AGE OF HOUSING STOCK	13
F. HOUSING COSTS VS. LOCAL INCOMES	14
G. PUBLICLY-ASSISTED HOUSING	15
III. CURRENT HOUSING NEEDS (CITY OF MILWAUKIE)	16
IV. ANTICIPATED HOUSING TRENDS	22
V. FUTURE HOUSING NEEDS - 2036 (CITY OF MILWAUKIE)	30
VI. RECONCILIATION OF FORECASTED NEED AND BUILDABLE CAPACITY	34



Table of Contents

A. Introduction	1
B. Definition of Affordable Housing: Income Levels, Rents and Home Prices	2
1. Target Income Levels	2
2. Affordable Rents and Home Prices	3
a. Affordable Housing Cost Definitions	3
b. Occupancy Standards	3
c. Utility Allowances	4
d. Affordable Rents and Sales Prices	4
C. Summary of Existing Housing Needs	6
1. Household Income Distribution	6
2. Overpayment	7
3. Substandard Housing Conditions	10
4. Overcrowding	10
5. Homeless	11
D. Market Rents and Home Prices	12
1. Home Prices and Trends	12
2. Rental Market Trends and Conditions	13
3. Comparison of Market and Affordable Rents and Sales Prices	16
a. Comparison of Market and Affordable Rents	16
b. Comparison of Market and Affordable Sales Prices	18
E. Target Area Market Conditions	19
1. Household Income Distribution	20
2. Cost-Burdened Renter Household	21
3. Single-Family Home Sales Prices	22

Appendix A1: AREA, Inc. Housing Market Overview and Housing Needs Assessment

Appendix A2:

- Public Housing Inventory
- Inventory of Federally Subsidized Housing Units
- Home Sales Price Tables, Citywide and by Zip Code



List of Tables

1. Affordable Housing Income Limits by Percent of Area Median Income and Household Size 3
2. Affordable Net Rents by Percent of Area Median Income and Unit Bedroom Count 4
3. Affordable Home Prices by Percent of Area Median Income and Unit Bedroom Count 5
4. Household Income Distribution 6
5. Households Paying More than 30% and More than 50% of Gross Income on Housing by Income Level 8
6. Renter Households Paying 30% or More of Income on Housing by Planning District 9
7. Households Living in Substandard Housing Lacking Complete Plumbing or Kitchen Facilities 10
8. Overcrowded Households 11
9. Median Home Sales Price Trends 12
10. Average Apartment Rents 13
11. Average Apartment Rents by Neighborhood 14
12. Distribution of Rents by Planning District 15
13. Comparison of Average Market and Affordable Rents 16
14. Distribution of Rental Housing Units by Rent Paid 17
15. Affordability of Existing Home Sales 18
16. Household Income Distribution, City of Richmond and Target Area Planning Districts 20
17. Cost-Burdened Renter Households, City of Richmond and Target Area Planning Districts 21
18. Comparison of Average and Median Home Sales Prices for Existing Homes, City of Richmond and Target Area Zip Codes 22



List of Charts

- 1. Income Distribution, City of Richmond, 2012 7
- 2. Households Paying More than 35% of Income on Housing by Planning District, 2012 9
- 3. Percent of Units with Rents Above and Below \$1,000 Per Month, City of Richmond Planning Districts, 2012 15

List of Maps

- 1. Highland Grove Target Area 23
- 2. Southside Target Area 24



Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals & Guidelines

GOAL 10: HOUSING

OAR 660-015-0000(10)

To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state.

Buildable lands for residential use shall be inventoried and plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

Buildable Lands -- refers to lands in urban and urbanizable areas that are suitable, available and necessary for residential use.

Government-Assisted Housing -- means housing that is financed in whole or part by either a federal or state housing agency or a local housing authority as defined in ORS 456.005 to 456.720, or housing that is occupied by a tenant or tenants who benefit from rent supplements or housing vouchers provided by either a federal or state housing agency or a local housing authority.

Household -- refers to one or more persons occupying a single housing unit.

Manufactured Homes -- means structures with a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) label certifying that the structure is constructed in accordance with the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 USC 5401 et seq.), as amended on August 22, 1981.

Needed Housing Units -- means housing types determined to meet the need shown for housing within an urban growth boundary at particular price ranges and rent levels. On and after the beginning of the first periodic review of a local government's acknowledged comprehensive plan, "needed housing units" also includes government-assisted housing. For cities having populations larger than 2,500 people and counties having populations larger than 15,000 people, "needed housing units" also includes (but is not limited to) attached and detached single-family housing, multiple-family housing, and manufactured homes, whether occupied by owners or renters.

GUIDELINES

A. PLANNING

1. In addition to inventories of buildable lands, housing elements of a comprehensive plan should, at a minimum, include: (1) a comparison of the distribution of the existing population by income with the distribution of available housing units by cost; (2) a determination of vacancy rates, both overall and at varying rent ranges and cost levels; (3) a determination of expected housing demand at varying rent ranges and cost levels; (4) allowance for a variety of densities and types of residences in each community; and (5) an inventory of sound housing in urban areas including units capable of being rehabilitated.

2. Plans should be developed in a manner that insures the provision of appropriate types and amounts of land within urban growth boundaries. Such land should be necessary and suitable for housing that meets the housing needs of households of all income levels.

3. Plans should provide for the appropriate type, location and phasing of public facilities and services sufficient to support housing development in areas presently developed or undergoing development or redevelopment.

4. Plans providing for housing needs should consider as a major determinant the carrying capacity of the air, land and water resources of the planning area. The land conservation and development actions provided for by such plans should not exceed the carrying capacity of such resources.

B. IMPLEMENTATION

1. Plans should provide for a continuing review of housing need projections and should establish a process for accommodating needed revisions.

2. Plans should take into account the effects of utilizing financial incentives and resources to (a) stimulate the rehabilitation of substandard housing without regard to the financial capacity of the owner so long as benefits accrue to the occupants; and (b) bring into compliance with codes adopted to assure safe and sanitary housing the dwellings of individuals who cannot on their own afford to meet such codes.

3. Decisions on housing development proposals should be expedited when such proposals are in

accordance with zoning ordinances and with provisions of comprehensive plans.

4. Ordinances and incentives should be used to increase population densities in urban areas taking into consideration (1) key facilities, (2) the economic, environmental, social and energy consequences of the proposed densities and (3) the optimal use of existing urban land particularly in sections containing significant amounts of unsound substandard structures.

5. Additional methods and devices for achieving this goal should, after consideration of the impact on lower income households, include, but not be limited to: (1) tax incentives and disincentives; (2) building and construction code revision; (3) zoning and land use controls; (4) subsidies and loans; (5) fee and less-than-fee acquisition techniques; (6) enforcement of local health and safety codes; and (7) coordination of the development of urban facilities and services to disperse low income housing throughout the planning area.

6. Plans should provide for a detailed management program to assign respective implementation roles and responsibilities to those governmental bodies operating in the planning area and having interests in carrying out the goal.