



Meeting Summary

Transportation System Development Charge Working Group Meeting #4

April 28, 2016, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Clackamas County Development Services Building, Room 232, 150 Beaver Creek Rd, Oregon City, OR

Participants – Committee Members

Doug Bean – *Doug Bean & Associates*

Karen Buehrig – *Clackamas County*

Tom Ellis – *City of Happy Valley*

Abbot Flatt – *Clackamas County*

Matt Grady – *Gramor Development*

Monte Hurley – *AKS Engineering*

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 working group member feedback from an online survey; and to review and discuss the project team's proposed framework and criteria to use to develop the TSDC project list.

Jimmy reviewed the Working Group purpose and project history. Clackamas County recently updated its Transportation System Plan (TSP) that puts a greater emphasis on multimodal travel and other goals. Happy Valley is 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.

Working Group Online Survey Feedback

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement, presented the [results of an online survey](#). TSDC Working Group members were invited to participate in a survey in to provide their input on criteria to be used to develop the TSDC project list. 14 members completed the survey.

The survey asked members to prioritize the criteria and goals that were used to develop three project lists in the Clackamas County and Happy Valley areas:

- Clackamas County Transportation System Plan project list
- City of Happy Valley Transportation System Plan project list
- Clackamas Regional Center Connections project list

The survey also asked questions about additional considerations that should be used to further narrow down the TSDC project list.

The project team used input from the survey and Working Group meetings to develop the 3 draft TSDC project lists.

TSDC Project List Prioritization

Staff Presentation

Deb Galardi, Galardi Rothstein Group, made a presentation on the framework the project team used to develop the draft TSDC project lists.

The team started with the full project lists from the Clackamas County TSP, Happy Valley TSP, and Clackamas Regional Center Connections project. This represented hundreds of projects with a cost of nearly \$3 billion. The team selected the top three to five goals and criteria from the online survey results for each of the three project lists, and set baseline scores for each of these selected criteria. Projects that met these baseline scores went on into the preliminary draft project lists.

Deb presented the lists for each process:

- **Clackamas County TSP**
The Clackamas County TSP includes a \$2.8 billion project list. The team applied the following criteria to the TSP project list, which resulted in a \$600 million draft prioritized TSDC project list:
 - Create a **direct connection** from a highway or other major facility to an **employment area**.
 - Are located in or near existing or future **employment areas**.
 - Are most **cost-effective**.
 - Improve **safety** on roads.
 - Increase **connections to daily needs** and services.
 - Help **implement local land use or development plans**.

Project TSP Category	Total TSP		Preliminary Prioritized	
Upgrade	\$1,950,546,000	69%	\$276,755,000	46%
Upgrade - Active Transportation	\$458,660,000	16%	\$214,810,000	36%
Multi-Use Path	\$93,030,000	3%	\$52,460,000	9%
New Roadway	\$127,780,000	4%	\$29,950,000	5%
Upgrade - Vehicle Capacity	\$32,298,000	1%	\$14,300,000	2%
Bridge	\$76,840,000	3%	\$10,940,000	2%
Safety	\$66,890,000	2%	\$5,410,000	1%
Study	\$935,000	0%	\$400,000	0%
ITS	\$1,500,000	0%	\$0	0%
Multi-modal	\$33,000,000	1%	\$0	0%
Other	\$90,000	0%	\$0	0%
Total	\$2,841,569,000	100%	\$605,025,000	100%

- **Happy Valley TSP**

The Happy Valley TSP includes a \$176 million project list. The team applied the following criteria to the TSP project list, which resulted in a \$159 million draft prioritized TSDC project list:

- **Mobility**
- Provide for **efficient movement** of goods and services
- Meet the city's **transportation performance measures**
- Are developed in **cooperation with adjacent agencies**; consistent with available funding
- Improve **safety**

Project TSP Category	Total TSP		Preliminary Prioritized	
Widening	\$82,384,300	47%	\$82,384,300	52%
New Roadway	\$69,800,000	40%	\$69,800,000	44%
Intersection	\$7,200,000	4%	\$7,200,000	9%
Bike Widening	\$11,910,000	7%	\$0	0%
Sidewalk Extension	\$4,220,000	2%	\$0	0%
Total	\$175,514,300	100%	\$159,384,300	100%

- **Clackamas Regional Center Connections projects**

The projects identified through the Clackamas Regional Center Connections project include a \$20 million project list. The team applied the following criteria to the CRC Connections project list, which resulted in a \$15 million draft prioritized TSDC project list:

- Improve **movement by vehicles** by ensuring that vehicle volumes do not exceed capacity at intersections.
- Improve **movement by vehicles** by improving intersections to provide adequate motor vehicle queuing.
- Improve **safety** by meeting critical crash rate standards.

Project Category	Total		Preliminary Prioritized	
Vehicle	\$14,140,820	71%	\$14,140,820	93%
Bike/Ped	\$3,630,215	18%	\$0	0%
Safety	\$1,135,864	6%	\$1,135,864	7%
Ped	\$1,100,428	6%	\$0	0%
Total	\$20,017,327	100%	\$15,276,684	100%

TSDC Project List Considerations

Deb explained that the first step in narrowing down the TSP and CRC Connections project lists resulted in a preliminary prioritized TSDC project list that needs to be further narrowed down. The online survey proposed six considerations to further refine the TSDC project list:

1. Prioritize projects that are most **important to the communities** and businesses of Clackamas County and Happy Valley (i.e., projects that were highest priority in the TSP project lists).
2. Exclude projects with **large dedicated funding sources** already secured (e.g., bonds, tax increment financing).
3. Prioritize projects that are **located in close proximity to development**.
4. Prioritize projects that **improve vehicle capacity** or the level of performance on **existing facilities**.
5. Prioritize projects that have a **potential for developer credits**.
6. Prioritize projects that **improve vehicle capacity** or the level of performance on **new facilities**.

The project team asked for input on what metrics could be used to determine whether a project meets those six considerations.

Working Group Discussion

Members discussed:

- *Did the project team use the right process and criteria to narrow down the Clackamas County TSP, Happy Valley TSP, and CRC Connections project lists into preliminary prioritized TSDC project lists? Are there other suggestions to use to further refine these lists?*
- *What metrics should the project team use to determine whether a project meets the additional six TSDC considerations?*

Clackamas County TSP Project List Comments

- Overall, members generally felt that **the process the project team used** to arrive at the prioritized list of TSDC projects **represented the values and criteria that are important to the community and to working group members**.

- There was some concern that the resulting list **does not include many projects that improve walking, biking and transit.**
- Members requested more clarity around what is included in each of the TSP project categories. Staff explained key differences between the categories. The “multi-modal” category includes just one project, an aerial tram, which is not being recommended for the TSDC project list. Members noted that there may be a lot of **overlap between project categories**, and it would be useful to have a better understanding of project types. For example, new roads are generally designed to be multimodal, so the “new roadway” and other categories may include some active transportation projects that are not readily apparent by simply looking at the category list.
- A member asked how the team will prioritize projects in the **Clackamas Regional Center Mixed-use Multimodal Area (MMA)** if it has a different SDC overlay (particularly active transportation projects).
- Members made **recommendations on how to further refine the County TSP project list:**
 - **Remove maintenance-only bridge projects;** although there is concern about picking and choosing projects. Bridges may provide critical access to employment lands and should not necessarily be removed from the list.
 - **Prioritize the TSP project categories** in terms of which are most beneficial to development. For example, projects in the “Upgrade” category are likely more supportive of development than other categories.
 - **Remove projects that are safety audits,** particularly those that are just reports or studies.
 - Segregate projects by their design, planning and construction components.
- Suggestion to **develop two or three project lists for review:** that range from an expensive, comprehensive project list that would help provide a complete system, versus a less expensive project list that would result in a lower SDC but not provide a complete transportation system. Working Group and County and Happy Valley Council members could then weigh in on these list options.

Happy Valley TSP Project List Comments

- The total number and value of projects will likely increase once the project team adds in County **facilities located in the joint Clackamas County/Happy Valley area.** (These facilities are not included in the current list).
- Members made some recommendations on how to further refine the Happy Valley TSP project list:
 - **Include only near and mid-term projects** on the TSDC project list.

Clackamas Regional Center Connections Project List Comments

- Members made some recommendations on how to further refine the CRC Connections project list:
 - **Remove projects that overlap** between this project list and the Clackamas County TSP list, to see how this reduces the project list total amount.
 - Remove projects that are funded by **urban renewal funds**.

TSDC Project List Considerations Comments

Members discussed the six TSDC considerations:

- Consideration #1: Prioritize projects that are important to the community
 - Members discussed a proposed option of **including only Tier 1 projects** on the TSDC project list. Staff explained that during the Clackamas County TSP development, projects went through a voting process and those with more support were included in Tier 1.
 - Members were concerned that the tiering process may not accurately reflect community desire, and that Tier 2 includes many projects that are important to the community. If the project team does decide to differentiate between the tiers, this should be the last filter in the project list refinement process.
 - Members expressed concern about applying different criteria to the different tiers because it would be difficult to have a fair process if there is a need to add projects to the list in the future.
 - Suggest using all other filters and criteria and then using “importance to community” as a **final filter** if the project list needs to be further refined.
 - The project team will work internally to develop potential ways to measure “importance to community.” One suggestion is to score projects based on how well they meet goals from the recent **Clackamas County strategic planning process**. This would require aligning the strategic plan goals with the Clackamas County TSP metrics. A similar process could be used for Happy Valley projects.
- Consideration #2: Exclude projects with large dedicated funding sources
 - Members agreed that the project list should **exclude projects with secured 5-year CIP funding and urban renewal funds**.
- Consideration #3: Prioritize projects that are located in close proximity to development
 - Deb asked members for input on the project team proposal to limit the TSDC project list to **projects that scored a “2” under TSP goals 2 and 3**. Members were concerned that this proposal would only cover projects under the Clackamas County TSP (not Happy Valley TSP and CRC Connections projects).
 - Members suggested other metrics to measure this consideration:
 - Consider the **roadway class**, and prioritize projects that improve arterials over projects that improve collector roads.

- Eliminate projects outside of the **Urban Growth Boundary**.
 - Pick a **baseline distance** from development as a threshold.
- Consideration #4: Prioritize projects that improve vehicle capacity on existing facilities
 - Members noted that some projects **add vehicle capacity without road widenings** or lane additions. The prioritization process should be careful to not exclude these projects.
 - Suggest **eliminating ITS projects** from the TSDC project list.
- Consideration #5: Prioritize projects that improve vehicle capacity on new facilities
 - Even though members did not rate this consideration as very important in the survey; they suggest **using this filter as a final refinement** (i.e., do not remove projects that improve capacity on new facilities unless needed to reduce the TSDC project list even further, after all other criteria and considerations are applied.)
- Other considerations: members provided these final considerations for prioritizing the TSDC project list:
 - Exclude projects that are likely to never be built.
 - Spot check projects to see if there are any overinflated or unrealistic costs.
 - Consider developing a map of projects on the final TSDC project list

Next Steps

The **next steps for the project team** in the TSDC process include:

- Identify criteria and metrics based on the Working Group conversation to further refine the TSDC project lists.
- Determine the growth share/actual TSDC eligible share of each project on the list.
- Calculate the SDC rate.
- Further refine project list if needed (based on the resulting SDC rate).

The **next meetings of the TSDC Working Group** are tentatively scheduled for:

- Wednesday, 5/18/2016, 2:00-4:00pm
- Tuesday, 5/31/2016, 10:00am-12:00pm
- Thursday, 6/30/2016, 9:00-11:00am
- Tuesday, 7/19/2016, 1:00-3:00pm