



# Meeting Summary

## Transportation System Development Charge Working Group Meeting #3

April 5, 2016, 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Clackamas County Development Services Building, Room 209, 150 Beaver Creek Rd, Oregon City, OR

### Participants – Committee Members

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Jon Kloor – *Home Builders Association*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Martha Fritzie – *Clackamas County*

Matt Grady – *Gramor Development*

Paul Grove – *Home Builders Association*

Monte Hurley – *AKS Engineering*

Dan Johnson – *Clackamas County*

Lori Phillips – *Clackamas County*

Mark Meek – *North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce*

Rick Nys – *Clackamas County*

Mike Robinson – *Perkins Coie*

Michael Walter – *City of Happy Valley*

### Project Team and Staff

Jimmy Thompson – *Clackamas County*

Diedre Landon – *Clackamas County*

Carl Springer – *DKS Associates*

Deb Galardi – *Galardi Rothstein Group*

Sylvia Ciborowski – *JLA Public Involvement*

### Welcome and Introduction

---

Jimmy Thompson, Clackamas County, welcomed participants and thanked them for their participation. The purpose of the meeting was to review and discuss Transportation System Plan (TSP) project lists and criteria, and identify criteria for use in Transportation System Development Charge (TSDC) project list prioritization.

Jimmy reviewed the history that has led up to the TSDC Update. Clackamas County recently updated its Transportation System Plan (TSP) that includes new transportation goals—including goals around equity and active transportation. Happy Valley is also updating its TSP in 2016. The Clackamas County TSDC has not been updated since 2006. Updates to the TSDC methodology are needed to support new TSP goals.

Diedre Landon provided an update on the project team briefing to the Board of County Commissioners (March 15, 2016). The project team met with the BCC to seek their support of the TSDC update process that includes meetings with the TSDC Working Group as an advisory body. BCC members hoped that the

TSDC methodology and rate calculations could be simplified as much as possible, to make the process easier to explain to developers and citizens; and easier for staff to administer.

The project team also met with the Happy Valley City Council. Michael Walter reported that City Council feedback echoed that of the BCC.

## Overview of Project Lists

---

Carl Springer, DKS Associates, handed out a [spreadsheet of projects](#) as a starting point for thinking about what to include in the list of projects that may be funded by TSDCs. The spreadsheet includes:

- Tier 1 projects from the Clackamas County TSP
- Projects from the Happy Valley TSP
- Projects that have been identified to improve active transportation in the Clackamas Regional Center area

A member suggested that the project team verify some of the estimated costs for accuracy and to make sure they include all costs (such as right of way acquisition). The project team noted that there are likely some projects, such as roundabouts, that are estimated too low and can be adjusted.

Deb Galardi, Galardi Rothstein Group, explained that the SDC project list has three primary purposes (as required by Oregon Revised Statutes 223.297-223.314): 1) form basis for calculation of improvement SDCs, 2) determine authorized expenditure of improvement SDC revenue, and 3) determination of projects eligible for SDC credits for “Qualified Public Improvements”. Deb also noted that the project list may be updated at any time, provided that if the SDC increases as a result of additional projects, notification is provided to interested SDC parties.

## Project Prioritization

---

### Staff Presentation

Deb Galardi explained that the main purpose of the meeting was to discuss how to prioritize projects for inclusion in the TSDC-eligible project list. Later in April, the team will determine the portion of each project that will be TSDC eligible. In May, the project team will present a draft TSDC project list to the Clackamas County BCC and Happy Valley City Council meetings. After that, the team will establish TSDC rate calculations.

The development of project lists for the Clackamas County and Happy Valley TSPs included comprehensive prioritization processes. Deb and Carl presented the goals and evaluation criteria that were part of the Clackamas County and Happy Valley TSP project list prioritization processes, as well as performance measures and objectives that were used to develop the list of projects specific to the Clackamas Regional Center area.

Abbot Flatt briefly explained how the Clackamas County TSP project list was developed. The County started with a list of over 500 projects, and scored each project for how well it meets the six County TSP

goals. Staff then ranked the projects, using input from stakeholder and technical working groups to help refine the scoring and ranking. The top 15% scoring projects became the Tier 1 TSP list, the next 15% went into Tier 2, and the remaining 70% went into Tier3.

Carl Springer explained the process for developing the Clackamas Regional Center project list. The project team used the Clackamas County TSP metrics, and added specific metrics to prioritize projects that improve walking, biking and transit in the area. The process turned out a list of 38 additional projects that come up to \$20 million.

Deb noted that it is important to create a set of criteria to guide the development of the TSDC project list that builds off of the work and public process that went into developing the TSP and Clackamas Regional Center lists. The set of criteria could further constrain the TSP project lists, in order to create a set of projects that meet the TSDC purpose and goals. Some **examples of criteria** that could be used to develop the TSDC project list include:

- Timeframe, i.e., is the project needed in the 5, 10, or 20 year timeframe?
- Extent of capacity needed for growth
- Availability of other funding
- Potential for developer credits
- Geographical representation
- Community or business priority

### Working Group Discussion

#### Members discussed:

- *What criteria should be used to further constrain the projects that have already been identified as highest priority by County and Happy Valley, for purposes of developing a TSDC project list?*
- *Should the TSDC-eligible project list include any projects from the Clackamas County Tier 2 and 3 lists? If yes, what criteria should be used to select those projects?*

#### Comments and Discussion:

- It is important to have a **mechanism** to add projects onto the list of TSDC eligible projects **after development of the original TSDC project list**. The criteria developed through this process could be applied to future capacity projects to give them a chance at inclusion on the project list.
- The Clackamas County TSP Tier 1 project list includes many rural projects that are not located near development; these likely do not need to be included in the TSDC project list. One criteria could be **proximity to development or potential development** (i.e., does the project improve access new development). Another factor could be to prioritize projects that **provide access to denser areas of development**.
- One way to develop criteria that respects the TSP prioritization process would be to review the TSP project scores, and **give higher weight to select TSP goals** or metrics that are most related

to the TSDC purpose. Those projects that score highest on those select goals could be included in the TSDC project list.

- Members discussed whether **Clackamas County TSP Tier 2 or 3 projects should be eligible for TSDC funding**. Members wanted to respect the public process that resulted in prioritizing the Tier 1 projects. At the same time, a member wanted to include select Tier 2 and 3 projects that are important to providing transportation connections or are in areas that the county receives a lot of complaints about. Members felt comfortable including select Tier 2 or 3 projects as long as they meet very clear criteria explaining why these projects are a good fit for the TSDC project list.
- Prioritize projects that **provide jobs-housing balance**. The criteria could look at a project's proximity to existing or future employment area AND to residential areas.
- Question about how to consider **multi-use paths in rural areas**.
- When doing **rate calculations**, the SDC-eligible percentage of each project should directly correlate to the project's percentage of growth.

Members discussed the **example SDC considerations listed in the PowerPoint** and had these comments:

- **Timeframe:** Members agreed that the TSDC project list should be limited to projects needed in the next 5 to 10 years (not 20 year projects). Prioritize immediate need/impact projects, and do not include projects that have no likelihood of being built in the next 10 years.
- **Extent of capacity needed for growth:** Members agreed that high priority should be given to projects that have a high growth share. There was some concern about how to measure this, and how to take into account all modes within the growth factor.
- **Other Funding:** Members generally prefer to not exclude projects from the list if they lack a separate funding source. It is acceptable to give somewhat higher priority to projects that have other secure funding available, but projects should not be removed from TSDC-eligible considerations simply because they lack a separate funding source. Some members said it makes sense to exclude projects that require local match for grants, since winning grants is so uncertain.
- **Potential for developer credits:** Members agreed that priority should be given to projects that have potential for developer credits.
- **Geographical representation:** Members said that projects with close proximity to development should be given high priority. This is one of the most important considerations. A member noted that this factor should not be limited to considering proximity to development within unincorporated Clackamas County; but also whether a project provides access to development in adjacent cities.

- **Community or business priority:** Members noted that it is important to respect the public process that resulted in the TSP project lists. They suggested that the TSDC project list criteria use the Clackamas County TSP goals and metrics as a starting point. The project team will circulate a short online survey to gather input on which TSP metrics should be given highest priority in developing the TSDC-eligible project list.

## Types of Projects and Project Cost by Mode

---

Deb briefly reviewed the types of projects included in the TSP project lists. These include bridges, new roads, safety, multi-use paths, upgrades to existing facilities, among others.

Project type is relevant to determining a project's growth share. The approach for determining growth share for capacity projects, for example, is different from the approach to determine growth share for safety projects. At the next Working Group meeting, the project team will present and seek feedback on how to determine growth share for each project type.

## Next Steps

---

The next meeting of the TSDC Working Group will occur towards the end of April. This meeting will focus on criteria to determine the capacity and non-capacity portion of projects; as well as the methodology to determine the portion of project costs that are attributable to growth.

The project team will circulate a survey to members to identify Working Group dates for all remaining meetings.

The team will also develop a short survey to gather input on which TSP metrics should be given highest priority in developing the TSDC-eligible project list.