WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
EXTENDED WORK SESSION

PUBLIC SERVICES BUILDING ROOM 120D | MARCH 10, 2020

8:30 a.m.  1.  Board and Leadership Communication
(30 min.)

8:30 a.m.  2.  Solid Waste Advisory Committee Appointment
(20 min.)
   -Marni Kuyl, HHS Director; Thomas Egleston, Interim Manager of Solid Waste & Recycling

8:50 a.m.  3.  Proposed Amendment to Commercial Food Scraps Collection Rates
(20 min.)
   -Marni Kuyl, HHS Director; Thomas Egleston, Interim Manager of Solid Waste & Recycling

9:10 a.m.  4.  Equity Office Organizational Action Plan as Required by Resolution 20-30
(20 min.)
   -Stephen Rhodes, Interim County Administrator

9:30 a.m.  5.  Strategic Facility Plan
(20 min.)
   -Jack Liang, Interim Director of Support Services, and Martin Granum, Facilities & Parks Services Manager

9:50 a.m.  6.  Executive Session (ORS 192.660(2)(h))
(30 min.)
   -Alan Rappleyea, County Counsel

10:20 a.m. BREAK – 15 MINUTES

10:35 a.m.  7.  Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative (TWEC) Update
(40 min.)
   -Stephen Roberts, Director of Land Use and Transportation, and Nora Curtis, Managing Director of Clean Water Services Utility & Services

11:15 a.m.  8.  Regional Transportation Funding Measure Update
(30 min.)
   -Stephen Roberts; Director of LUT; Chris Deffebach, Senior Policy Analyst; and Andy Shaw, Metro, Director of Government Affairs

LUNCH BREAK – RECONVENE AT 1:00 P.M.

1:00 p.m.  9.  Draft Significant Natural Resources Program Review and Assessment
(60 min.)
   -Stephen Roberts, Director of LUT; Theresa Cherniak, Principal Planner; and Michelle Miller, Senior Planner

2:00 p.m.  10.  Short-Term Rentals
(45 min.)
   -Stephen Roberts, Director of LUT; Theresa Cherniak, Principal Planner; and Suzanne Savin, Senior Planner

2:45 p.m.  11.  Bicycle Facility Selection for Basalt Creek Parkway Extension Project
(30 min.)
   -Stephen Roberts, Director of LUT, and Joe Younkins, Capital Project Services Division Manager

3:15 p.m. BREAK – 15 MINUTES

3:30 p.m.  12.  Tualatin Basin Joint Project Briefing (Clean Water Services)
(40 min.)
   -Tom VanderPlaat, Water Supply Project Manager; and Mark Jockers, Government & Public Affairs Director

4:10 p.m.  13.  Executive Session (ORS 192.660(2)(i))
(45 min.)
   -Holly Dober, Employee and Labor Relations Manager
WORK SESSION | ROUNDTABLE

WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Session Date: March 10, 2020  Length of Time Requested: 20 minutes

Title of Topic: SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Department: Health and Human Services

Presented by:
Name(s) & Title(s)
Marni Kuyl, Director of Health and Human Services
Thomas Egleston, Interim Manager, Solid Waste & Recycling

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
- Members/applicants matrix for Washington County Solid Waste Advisory Committee
- Applications from candidates (hyperlinked in the matrix)

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
To present applications for one industry member position for your Board’s review and appointment.

Authorize an action for the March 31, 2020, board meeting to appoint Vinod Singh to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee as an industry member.

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
As defined in Washington County Code Chapter 8.04, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) is currently comprised of six public members, three industry members and one non-voting representative of the Department of Health and Human Services. Terms are five years in duration with no current term limit.

One industry member’s term expires March 31, 2020. This member, Jeff Murray, has served on the SWAC since 1995 and is seeking reappointment. Jeff Murray represents the recycling processing sector and has over 30 years of experience in the solid waste industry.

Staff received three applications (attached) from individuals interested in the industry position: Vinod Singh, Amy Roth and Balpreet Singh. Vinod Singh is the outreach manager for Far West Recycling (recycling processing facility); Amy Roth is the resource director for the Association of Oregon Recyclers and is an independent consultant in the solid waste industry; and Balpreet Singh is an inspection technician at Genentech. Balpreet Singh does not have five years of experience in solid waste collection or disposal, as required for an industry position pursuant to WCC Chapter 8.04.

Based on Solid Waste & Recycling’s review of the applications, industry member experience requirements, and in the interest of incorporating shorter terms into appointments on boards and commissions, staff is recommending Vinod Singh be appointed to the industry position.
### Solid Waste Advisory Committee

**Description:** The nine-member Solid Waste Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Board of Commissioners on solid waste and recycling policy and program issues.

**Member Details:** Six members representing the public and three members representing the solid waste industry. A representative of the Department of Health and Human Services serves as a non-voting committee member.

**Term Length:** 5 years

**Vacancy Total:** 1

**Applicant Total:** 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Applicants Recommended for Appointment</th>
<th>First Appointed</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vinod Singh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members with Expiring Terms Seeking Reappointment</th>
<th>First Appointed</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Murray</td>
<td>2/07/95</td>
<td>3/31/20</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Roth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balpreet Singh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Foote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lafferty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Christy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashvin Nagaraja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Vargas-Duncan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Egleston**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expiring Terms (Not seeking Reappointment)**

**Mid-Term Vacancies**
None

**Other Vacancies**
None

*For information purposes only; members are not appointed by Commissioner District.

**Appointed by position and non-voting member

N/A indicates the person may not live in Washington County but has work interests in the County.
Session Date: March 10, 2020  
Length of Time Requested: 20 minutes

Title of Topic: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO COMMERCIAL FOOD SCRAPS COLLECTION RATES

Department: Health and Human Services

Presented by: Marni Kuyl, Director of Health and Human Services  
Thomas Egleston, Interim Manager, Solid Waste & Recycling

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
Presentation

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
To provide an overview of proposed Commercial Food Scraps Collection Rate changes to aid in implementation of the Board-adopted commercial food scraps collection mandate.

Authorize an action item for the March 31, 2020, board meeting to approve revisions to the garbage and recycling collection service rate sheets relating to commercial food scraps collection.

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:
Does your Board support adding commercial food scraps collection service to a bundled rate along with commercial garbage and recycling collection?

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
On June 25, 2019, your Board approved Resolution and Order (RO) 19-64 amending the Solid Waste & Recycling Administrative Rules to adopt a requirement that certain businesses collect food scraps separate from garbage. Pursuant to RO 16-64, implementation of the requirement will begin March 31, 2020. To aid in the implementation of the requirement and to contribute to a more regionally consistent collection service rate approach, staff recommends that commercial food scraps collection be included as an additional component of the current bundled garbage and recycling collection service for businesses. Current food scraps collection service standards (receptacle size and collection frequency) will remain unchanged at this time.

On February 13, 2020, the Solid Waste Advisory Committee unanimously recommended your Board’s approval of the proposal to bundle food scraps collection along with garbage and recycling.

Staff intends to use the normal rate review time period (March-June) to further analyze potential rate adjustments necessary to add commercial food scraps to the current bundle of collection service. This will result in a single potential rate adjustment on July 1, 2020, instead of a potential adjustment in April 2020 and again in July 2020.
Proposed Amendment to Commercial Food Scraps Rates

Thomas Egleston
Interim Manager, Solid Waste & Recycling
Context of proposed rate adjustment

- **July 26, 2018**: Metro adopts regional requirement that local governments require certain businesses collect food separate from garbage.

- **June 25, 2019**: your Board approves R&O 16-64, establishing requirement that certain businesses collect food separate from garbage.

- **February 13, 2020**: Solid Waste Advisory Committee recommends adoption of bundled food scraps collection rates.

- **March 31, 2020**: Notification letters for business food scraps requirement will be sent.
Summary of proposed changes

Current rate model

Proposed model

All other service standards (container size and frequency) remain unchanged.
Bundled collection service

- **Overview**
  - All commercial customers pay.
  - All commercial customers may participate.
  - Becomes part of regular collection service (similar to residential).
  - May result in smaller cost increase for individual participants since costs are spread over larger customer base.

- **Benefits of a bundled rate model**
  - Simpler for businesses to understand and take service.
  - Eases implementation of and aligns with commercial food scraps collection mandate.
  - Normalizes food scraps collection as part of regular service.
  - Consistent with treatment of recycling collection service.
## Regional approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Rate model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton, Tigard, Clackamas County, Milwaukie, Wilsonville, Happy Valley</td>
<td><strong>Bundled collection service</strong>: Customers pay one bill and receive garbage, recycling and food scraps collection service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro (<em>considering adjustment</em>), Unincorporated WashCo (<em>currently</em>)</td>
<td><strong>Stand-alone collection service</strong> for food scraps at garbage rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gresham, Lake Oswego</td>
<td><strong>Discounted stand-alone collection service</strong> for food scraps at 5-20% discount from garbage rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Thomas Egleston
Interim Manager, Washington County
Solid Waste & Recycling
Session Date: March 10, 2020  
Length of Time Requested: 20 minutes

Title of Topic: ORGANIZATIONAL ACTION PLAN AS REQUIRED BY RESOLUTION 20-30

Department: CAO

Presented by: STEPHEN RHODES, INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
Draft Organizational Action Plan for FY’s 19-20 & 20-21 to fulfill the requirements of the Equity Resolution #20-30

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
Board concurrence with proposed Action Plan

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:
Does the action plan satisfy the requirements of Resolution 20-30.

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
This action plan fulfills the requirement contained in Resolution #20-30 on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion for the County Administrator to “develop an organizational action plan through fiscal year 2020-21” to carry out the steps needed to begin the process of creating and staffing an Office of Equity, Inclusion and Community Engagement.

The action plan lists all the tasks identified in the resolution but only assigns a timeframe for the first two tasks. The timeframe for the remaining tasks will be submitted to the Board after the Chief Equity and Inclusion Officer has commenced work for the County.
## Organizational Action Plan for FY's 19-20 & 20-21 to fulfill the requirements of RO 20-30

In fiscal years 19-20 & 20-21 the following actions are planned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of the Washington County Office of Equity, Inclusion and Community Engagement to be housed in the County Administrative Office</td>
<td>March 17, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of the Chief Equity and Inclusion Officer position description. Discussion of position will include an outline of the recruitment process</td>
<td>April 21, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Communities of Color Advisory Board</td>
<td>TBD after CEIO commences work in June or July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of staff Leadership Equity and Inclusion Council</td>
<td>TBD after CEIO commences work in June or July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of purchasing policy that provides access and opportunity for minority and women-owned firms to contract with Washington County</td>
<td>TBD after CEIO commences work in June or July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of workforce pipeline and training program</td>
<td>TBD after CEIO commences work in June or July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Date:</td>
<td>March 10, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Topic:</td>
<td>STRATEGIC FACILITY PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:**
PowerPoint Presentation

**PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:**
1. Provide a briefing concerning the County’s current objective to issue a Request for Proposal to procure a consultant to complete a Strategic Facility Plan
2. Request the Board’s endorsement to undertake a Strategic Facility Plan

**POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:**
N/A

**SUMMARY OF TOPIC:**
Since 2014, Washington County has grown significantly both in terms of staffing as well as services. One indicator being 13% overall staff growth and an example of new services is the Hawthorn Walk-in Center. The increase in staff and services has absorbed the majority of available space in County facilities. To prepare for the future, the County Administrative Office (CAO) and Support Services Facilities & Parks Services Division (FPS) propose to undertake a Strategic Facilities Planning effort.

The County envisions a Strategic Facility Plan (SFP) that will be rooted in an understanding of the community we serve through collaboration with all County Departments and Divisions with a deep understanding of the services they provide, as well as engagement with community partners and other agencies for possible collaboration and incorporating the values of the Board of Commissioners. The selected contracted partner (consultant) will deliver a Strategic Facility Plan and will include recommended vision proposals that will ultimately provide a roadmap for a funding strategy to recapitalize over the next decade and envisions a real estate portfolio well-positioned to provide County services to meet the needs of the community into the next generation.
Strategic Facilities Planning

Martin Granum
Facilities & Park Services Manager

Kristie Bollinger
Real Property Manager
Strategic Facilities Planning

Strategic Plan vs. Master Plan

What is the difference between a Strategic Facilities Plan and a Master Plan?

– A Strategic Facilities Plan is an organization's process of defining its direction and making decisions on allocating its resources to pursue this direction

– A good Master Plan incorporates information gathered from strategic planning
Strategic Facilities Planning

• Vision - Facilities that reflect County values and facilitate our service delivery models

• Mission - A Strategic Facilities Plan (SFP)

1. Establishes the long-term needs of every County Department including cross-collaboration between Departments
2. Board supported master planning effort starting in FY 21/22
3. Includes a Board-adopted capital investment strategy for implementation over the next two decades
Strategic Facilities Planning

Current Situation

• In many cases, we are unable to adequately house current services resulting in overcrowding and displaced staff (JUV, Community Corrections, Human Services, CAO, FPS, etc.)

• Most departments have zero growth capacity

• Increasing functional misalignment between the facility and service delivery model (JUV, DA, CC & others)

• Many buildings are deficient when viewed through the Employer of Choice lens
Strategic Facilities Planning

Goals

1. Envision the requirements for the next 50 years with two 10-year Capital cycles
2. Encompass the entire portfolio, including owned and leased properties
3. Link County strategic objectives to facilities; identify the location, functional type, and size of spaces needed
4. Propose facility rating system or framework to evaluate all facilities
5. Main components
   a. Current facility assessment
   b. Needs assessment
   c. Overall property ownership/occupancy strategy
   d. Facility locations complimentary to service requirements
   e. Recommended Strategic Facilities Executive Summaries
Strategic Facilities Planning

Values and Commitment

- An iterative process that engages departments, functional areas, CAO and BOC to develop a strategic facility plan that is supported by a capital investment strategy
- Envision the workplace of tomorrow
- County-unique values will inform the SFP
Strategic Facilities Planning

Washington County Values

• Employer of Choice
  – Diversity, equity, inclusion
  – Collaboration and partnerships
  – Innovation and strategic use of technology
  – Emergency preparedness
  – Health and wellness

• Sustainability
  – Healthier indoor space
  – Lower use of energy, water, and other resources
  – Better for building occupants, the community, and the environment

• Trauma-informed
  – Welcoming environments
  – Easily accessible
  – Resources and information readily available
  – Facilities that don’t promote trauma

• Smart Buildings
• Security and Safety
## Proposed Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Board Work Session Briefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement of Request for Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with CAO to Review PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC 1-on-1 Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC Presentation at Work Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Request for Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Onboarding in Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept / Functional Area Initial Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Review, Analysis &amp; Refinement of Initial Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Follow-Up with Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC Presentation of Discovery &amp; Initial Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC Roundtable; Feedback to Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Review, Analysis &amp; Refinement of BOC’s Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Follow-Up with Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC Presentation of Refined Discovery &amp; Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC Roundtable; Feedback to Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Follow-Up with Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Concept Development, Program &amp; Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOC Presentation, Final Strategic Facilities Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Strategic Facilities Plan, Consent Agenda Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- BOC Engagement
Strategic Facilities Planning

• Vision - Facilities that reflect County values and facilitate our service delivery models

• Mission - A Strategic Facilities Plan (SFP)
  1. Establishes the long-term needs of every County Department including cross-collaboration between Departments
  2. Board supported master planning effort starting in FY 21/22
  3. Includes a Board-adopted capital investment strategy for implementation over the next two decades
The Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative (TWEC) is a joint effort by multiple governmental and non-governmental organizations to collaboratively mitigate urban flooding and erosion issues. The effort is led by two co-coordinating entities: Clean Water Services (CWS) and the Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation (LUT). The cities of Portland and Beaverton, the Tualatin Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD), the Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District (THPRD), the Wetlands Conservancy (WC), the Tualatin River Watershed Council (TRWC), and Willamette Partnership (WP) also participate in staffing, planning and work implementation.

The TWEC’s objectives and work program are defined in the 3-Year TWEC Cedar Mill/North Johnson Creek Workplan (TWEC Workplan), approved by your Board on Feb. 26, 2019. Pursuant to the TWEC Workplan, TWEC’s flood and erosion mitigation activities are initially being piloted on Cedar Mill and North Johnson creeks, tributaries to Beaverton Creek, where flooding and erosion cause significant impacts to private property and public infrastructure. This pilot is intended to develop processes for potential replication in other parts of the County.

The presentation that accompanies this item details tasks in the TWEC Workplan that have been completed; tasks that are underway; and tasks anticipated in Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22.

(continued)
SUMMARY OF TOPIC: (continued)

The most significant tasks in this timeframe are:

- Implementation of technical and financial assistance programs for private property owners, such as runoff reduction, habitat enhancement, hazard awareness and floodproofing;
- Community outreach, including public events, to build public awareness and a shared vision for more resilient watersheds;
- Enrollment in the National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System, a program providing discounted flood insurance rates, first in the unincorporated County and potentially later in the City of Beaverton;
- Analysis of potential flood and erosion mitigation projects for mitigation benefits, watershed enhancement benefits and costs; and
- Analysis of funding and governance structures capable of supporting the TWEC work program in the long term.

CWS and LUT anticipate returning to your Board to deliver annual reports on TWEC progress; to request input regarding technical and financial assistance programs for private property owners; to request input regarding flood and erosion mitigation project priorities; to request direction regarding funding and governance structure options; and to request guidance at other appropriate program milestones. The anticipated timeline for these Board actions is provided in the accompanying presentation.
Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative (TWEC) Update

Board Work Session
March 10, 2020
Outline

• TWEC overview
• Work completed
• Work underway
• Work forecast
• Timeline through FY 2020-21
TWEC overview: objectives

• Mitigate flooding, erosion and other stormwater issues
• Promote healthy habitats and resilient watersheds
• Improve coordination between agencies and organizations
• Build public awareness and shared vision of successful outcomes
• Identify ways to replicate program elements in the greater Tualatin River basin
TWEC overview: members

Co-coordinators

Cooperating entities

Key partners
TWEC overview: geography

Cedar Mill and North Johnson creeks
• Pilot flooding and erosion mitigation strategies for potential replication in other parts of the Tualatin watershed

Unincorporated Washington County and potentially City of Beaverton
• Enroll in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Community Rating System (CRS) for flood insurance discounts

Urban Tualatin River Watershed
• Coordinate Clean Water Services (CWS) and Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation (LUT) capital programs to more efficiently address stormwater issues
Mitigation project and program examples

- Modify culverts and crossings to improve stream processes
- Ecosystem enhancements
- Water detention structures
- Water diversion channels
- Storm sewer modification
- Stream realignment

- Willing seller program
- Technical and financial assistance:
  - Runoff reduction
  - Habitat enhancement
  - Floodproofing
  - Erosion management
Work completed (2019)

• Adopted 3-year Workplan
• Assigned CWS and LUT staff
• Formed CWS/LUT capital program coordination team
• Published website: twec-or.org
• Created project storymap
Work underway (2020)

• Refine TWEC governance and decision-making processes
• Develop coordinated work plans, staffing plans and budgets
• Develop an Inter-Governmental Agreement (IGA) to detail CWS and LUT operating and accounting procedures and policies as Co-Coordinating Entities
• Develop capital improvement program coordination processes
• Initiate analysis of potential flood and erosion mitigation projects’ costs and benefits
Work underway (2020) continued

- Identify County CRS enrollment level
- Seek FEMA approval of County CRS enrollment
- Evaluate technical and financial assistance options for property owners
Work forecast (FY 2020-21 & 2021-22)

• Complete County CRS enrollment
• Potential City of Beaverton CRS enrollment
• Develop evaluation and prioritization criteria for flood and erosion mitigation projects
• Complete evaluation and prioritization of flood and erosion mitigation projects
• Analyze potential long-term TWEC funding and governance structures
• Public events, including educational symposiums
• Implement technical and financial assistance programs for private property owners (subject to partner commitments)
• Annual reports to Washington County/Clean Water Services Board
Timeline through FY 2020-21

- Educational Symposium 2020
- County Community Rating System enrollment
- Develop funding and governance options
- Develop preliminary flood and erosion mitigation project priorities
- Evaluate technical assistance and small grants
- Annual Report to Board
- Educational Symposium 2021
- Potential City of Beaverton Community Rating System enrollment
Thank you

Nora Curtis
Utility Operations & Services Managing Director

Stephen Roberts
Director, Land Use & Transportation
Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative
Cedar Mill/North Johnson Creek Workplan

I. Opportunity Statement and Proposed Collaborative Approach

- **Action is needed:** Chronic flooding, erosion, bank instability, and other detrimental stormwater impacts within the Cedar Mill/North Johnson (CMNJ) Creeks watershed affect the entire community by adversely impacting property values, diminishing quality of life for residents, and reducing the ability of businesses to succeed. Though multiple agencies continue to address these challenges through system maintenance and improvement as well as targeted watershed enhancement projects, flooding, erosion, and bank instability continue to present significant problems in the basin.

- **Chart a more sustainable path:** Although complete elimination of flooding is likely impossible in this urbanized basin, opportunities exist to reduce the risks and impacts from increased flows in the basin and build a community that can continue to thrive amid changing stormwater dynamics.

- **Improve coordination and collaboration:** Multiple agencies, jurisdictions, and non-governmental organizations often propose programs or capital projects with different goals in mind. What has been lacking in the past is an effort to actively engage program and project management teams from various agencies to review each other’s activities to see where coordination can occur, and to identify issues early in project development. Breaking down silos and requirements among agencies will result in a cultural shift for all. A key element of this plan is to develop a process that can be strengthened, refined and then replicated in other parts of the County.

- **Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative:** In June 2017, Oregon Governor Kate Brown designated the CMNJ Flood Remediation Collaborative as an Oregon Solutions project. Consistent with the Declaration of Cooperation signed at the close of that effort, a multi-disciplinary collaborative of six cooperating agencies and entities (including Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation (LUT), Clean Water Services (CWS), and three key non-governmental partners) has formed to implement a coordinated, programmatic, watershed-based approach to prioritizing and implementing activities and capital projects that will help mitigate detrimental stormwater impacts in this basin. The Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative (TWEC) CMNJ Team members are identified in Section IV.
II. Intent and Goals

A. Big Picture – Intent and Approach

The Tualatin Watershed Enhancement Collaborative (TWEC) program seeks to collaboratively develop workable, effective activities and programmatic approaches to flooding and drainage-related problems within the Tualatin River Basin and is a continuation of the work begun with the Oregon Solutions Cedar Mill/North Johnson Flood Remediation Collaborative effort. The TWEC CMNJ Team (CMNJ Team) is a multi-disciplinary, multi-entity group formed to collaboratively address flooding, stormwater, and related issues in the Cedar Mill/North Johnson Creek area at the watershed scale.

The CMNJ Team works with a set of shared values that includes:

- Utilizing a comprehensive and coordinated watershed perspective
- Aiming to improve long-term economic and environmental resilience in the watershed and community
- Improving the financial security of area residents and businesses
- Creating an interconnected network of habitats to support healthy ecosystems and community well-being
- Improving and maintaining safe, effective, and efficient infrastructure systems

B. Goals

The TWEC CMNJ Team’s overarching goals are to:

- Build a shared vision among cooperating partners and the public for a more resilient CMNJ watershed
- Develop a process among cooperating entities and key partners to coordinate activities including capital projects, in the interest of watershed and stream health.
- Develop decision-support tools that help establish a shared knowledge base from which the Team can identify, design, and prioritize potential actions
- Identify and implement a combination of coordinated programmatic, policy, and physical infrastructure actions that will help alleviate flood and stormwater resiliency challenges
- Coordinate investment in and implementation of those actions among cooperating entities and key partners, including capital project investments
- Continue on the previous collaborative effort to build an efficient, action-oriented coalition of government, private, and non-profit entities and partners that will invest staff and financial resources to accomplish this work and continue to function as new water management challenges arise in the basin

III. Objectives

The key work activities over the next three years have been grouped according to objectives the program is intended to meet.

Objective 1 activities begun in Fiscal Year 2019 will form the foundation for the three-year work effort. These are activities which can be implemented quickly and within existing technical and financial resources. The CMNJ Team has already begun the first four activities. Objective1 activities are high value actions that can be largely completed with existing resources and/or within existing program structures.
Activities associated with Objectives 2 through 6 will be based on the outcomes of Objective 1 activities. Remaining activities are sequenced and coordinated activities that require additional analysis and/or scoping to determine effectiveness, budget, and relative priority. These activities will require participation by all nine CMNJ members. These activities include concurrent and sequenced, multi-objective tasks that further evaluate the CMNJ watershed issues and develop, evaluate, and recommend specific actions. They may require additional resources and modified program structures to complete.

A. Objective 1: Implement Early Action Activities

1. Create Multi-Entity Capital Project Coordination Team

A Capital Project Coordination Team will be formed to integrate and coordinate capital projects between multiple entities. This work will begin with a team formed of Washington County LUT and CWS staff to evaluate and coordinate the proposed FY20 and subsequent Capital Improvement Plans of both entities and to establish a process and methodology that can be used with other entities as projects and initiatives supporting the CMNJ watershed are identified.

Washington County LUT and CWS will designate TWEC liaison positions within their organizations that will provide additional support for policy development and coordination of the activities identified in the workplan.

2. Evaluate FY19 and FY20 Resource Requirements

TWEC activities in January through June 2019 will lay the groundwork for the initial three-year workplan activities and prepare the team for a coordinated and funded FY20. These early action activities will define the estimated staff time, consultant resources, and other costs for the nine CMNJ Team members from January 2019 through FY20. CWS/LUT costs for FY19 will largely be staff time but FY20 costs will likely include both staff time and outside costs for surveying, data gathering, modeling, and small project construction. Small projects will be collaboratively selected based on factors such as:

- Ability to implement
- Beneficial outcome
- Stakeholder feedback collected to date

Ease of collecting required data to complete cost estimates

3. Create TWEC website

The existing CMNJ website (http://cedarmillcreek.org) will be updated and archived, and a new TWEC CMNJ website created. The archived CMNJ content will be available under a tab on the new TWEC website. Stakeholders will be notified when the new TWEC website goes live.

4. Create CMNJ Watershed Storymap

CMNJ Team members CWS, Willamette Partnership (WP), and The Wetlands Conservancy (TWC), assisted by Portland State University (PSU), are currently developing a web-based outreach tool called a “Storymap” that includes maps, narrative and graphics to communicate the history of some of the CMNJ issues. It will serve as a foundation for further community outreach.
5. **Begin Process to Enroll In FEMA Community Rating System (CRS)**

Washington County LUT is the entity that will enroll in the CRS program and lead administration. CRS participation can provide reduced premiums to property owners in urban unincorporated Washington County who must buy flood insurance. This process begins with a request from the senior elected official in the County, and then goes through a multi-year process that includes two visits from FEMA, tentatively scheduled in 2019 and 2020, before the CRS is applied to flood insurance rates. Based on the County’s experience, the City of Beaverton will evaluate whether this program is useful for their residents, and make a recommendation to City leaders.

**B. Objective 2: Develop and Implement Communications and Outreach Strategy**

The CMNJ Team will refine and implement a comprehensive and multi-layered outreach program concurrent with the initial three-year effort that addresses the needs of the Team, elected officials, agency and member managers, businesses, property owners and associations, local advocacy groups, and ratepayers. Annual reports summarizing previous year’s efforts and projecting next year’s efforts will be prepared.

**C. Objective 3: Develop Technical Assistance and Small Grant Programs**

The CMNJ Team will identify and recommend refinements or coordination among the nine TWEC members’ existing technical and financial programs in support of flooding and stormwater challenges. It will also identify and recommend implementation of new assistance or grant programs where they can be most effective within the CMNJ watershed.

**D. Objective 4: Develop Collaborative Finance and Governance Structures**

The CMNJ Team will explore and evaluate current and potential financial options and TWEC governance structures needed for TWEC to perform near-term projects and evolve into a long-term collaborative organization capable of program and/or capital project coordination and implementation. It will make recommendations to senior agency management for a long-term financing strategy to guide the formation of capital project recommendations for potential inclusion in the TWEC members’ capital budgets.

**E. Objective 5: Develop, Analyze, and Prioritize Capital Projects**

This objective builds on the work begun in Objective 1.e to identify and characterize coordinated capital projects that optimize use of resources while meeting watershed enhancement goals. The CMNJ Team will identify, evaluate, screen, rank, and provide working budget estimates for these potential capital improvements projects that work together to improve conditions.

**F. Objective 6: Finalize and Begin Implementation of Multi-Year Action Plan**

The CMNJ Team will incorporate feedback from the community outreach and the results of the financing analysis to develop scenarios and then finalize the recommended capital program, including bundling of projects; sequence and timing; long-lead predecessor activities; member roles for successful implementation; policy needs; costs and associated financing; and cost-sharing among the Team’s entities.
IV. CMNJ Team Membership and Process

A. Members

The TWEC CMNJ Team is responsible for maintaining core team functions and ensuring progress toward the goals outlined above. The CMNJ Team will consist of Cooperating Entities (publicly funded government entities) and Key Partners (non-governmental organizations) as outlined in the Declaration of Cooperation. Participation may evolve over time.
Current **Cooperating Entities** include:

- Clean Water Services (co-coordinating entity)
- Washington County Department of Land Use & Transportation (co-coordinating entity)
- Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District (THPRD)
- Tualatin Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD)
- City of Beaverton
- City of Portland

Current **Key Partners** in the CMNJ Team include:

- Tualatin River Watershed Council (TRWC)
- The Wetlands Conservancy (TWC)
- Willamette Partnership (WP)

The Objectives outlined above include development of a proposed long-term governance and finance structure for the collaborative CMNJ Team. Prior to finalizing that structure, in addition to the CMNJ Team, other standing and ad hoc subteams have been created including:

- **A Community Engagement/Technical Assistance Subteam** to develop and implement a communications and outreach strategy, as well as the website and Storymap, and to work with private property owners for localized actions.
- **A Finance and Governance Subteam** to guide and focus discussions on decision-making within the group, and lead efforts on meeting Objective 4. It will continue to work throughout the three-year period to recommend the necessary financing models and governance structures to address prioritized actions.
- **One or more ad hoc Technical Subteams** to be responsible for identifying the need for, acquiring, compiling and analyzing technical information needed to support progress toward all objectives. Membership will vary based on the geographical extent and the nature of the proposed actions.

**B. Proposed CMNJ Team Process**

This collaborative effort will allow all members to participate in problem identification and assessment, evaluation of actions, ranking and prioritization, and in deciding final team recommendations. All subteams will aim for a consensus-based decision process with all partners participating fully in decisions. Specifics on governance within the teams and within members’ respective organizations will be developed under Objective 4.
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WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Session Date:  March 10, 2020  Length of Time Requested:  30 minutes
Title of Topic:  REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDING MEASURE UPDATE
Department:  Land Use & Transportation
Presented by:  Stephen Roberts, Director;  Chris Deffebach, Senior Policy Analyst;
              Andy Shaw, Metro, Director of Government Affairs

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
• PowerPoint Presentation
• Aug. 19, 2019 letter from Commissioner Pam Treece to Metro Transportations Funding Task Force regarding proposed regionwide programs
• Feb. 14, 2020 Metro Preliminary Regionwide Program Concepts

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
• Update the Board on regionwide program concepts being considered for inclusion in a potential Regional Transportation Funding Measure.
• Solicit Board comments and input to share with the Get Moving Task Force and Metro Council.

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:
• Which of the proposed regionwide programs would you consider most beneficial?
• Would the Board like to propose any changes or clarifications to the content, management or administration of the regionwide programs?

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
Metro Council has charged The Get Moving Task Force with making recommendations to Metro Council for corridors, projects and programs to include in a Regional Transportation Funding Measure for the Nov. 2020 ballot. With advice from the Task Force in summer 2019, Metro Council directed staff to proceed with developing potential concepts for programs that would provide funding for investments in community priorities across the region. Metro staff have released preliminary regionwide program concepts and an administrative and management approach to allocate the estimated $50 million in annual funding over 20 years. The Task Force discussed the program concepts on March 4. Metro staff are now conducting engagement with a variety of community partners, stakeholders and the general public, to inform a refined staff recommendation to Metro Council in April.

(continued)
SUMMARY OF TOPIC: (continued)

Last summer, the Board reviewed preliminary regionwide program concepts and expressed priorities in a letter to the Task Force. The updated regionwide program concepts include the Board’s high and medium priorities with a few exceptions. While the board supported free transit passes for affordable housing residents, the updated concepts envision transit passes for students. While the Board supported funding to preserve and protect multi-family housing, the updated concepts also include missing middle housing.

Per the updated concepts, funding awards would be tied to outcome-based criteria and racial equity analysis. Geographic needs would be considered. Some of the funds would be administered by grants in three-year cycles; some would be managed by Metro and others in coordination with TriMet, housing partners and others.

Metro Council is expected to refer the potential Regional Transportation Investment Measure to the Nov. 2020 ballot in May 2020.
Measure structure

Corridor investments

Regionwide programs

Oversight & accountability

Advancing regional policy
What are we trying to do?

Key Council & Task Force outcomes

• Make major streets **safer** for everyone
• Make it **easier** to get around – however you get around
• Address **climate change** and support resiliency
• Prioritize investments supporting **communities of color**
• Support **clean air and water**, and healthy ecosystems
• Drive **economic growth**
• **Leverage** regional and local investments
#GetMoving Timeline overview

- **Corridors & outcomes**
  - Spring
- **Regionwide programs**
  - Summer
- **Tier 1 corridor projects**
  - Fall
- **Revenue mechanisms**
  - Winter
- **Oversight Tier 2 corridors Programs**
  - Spring 2020
- **Final package**
  - Late spring 2020

**Engagement:**
- Local Investment Teams
- Community Partnerships
- Engagement: Programs
Refresher: What are the programs?

Roots in regional policy
Benefits throughout region
Capital, technical assistance, and/or outreach
Allocations based on criteria
Ongoing funding
How we got here, what happens next

Spring 2019
- Exploring options
  - Regional policy forums
  - Community forums
  - Late spring survey

Summer 2019
- Selecting priorities
  - Task Force: Discuss 16 program options
  - Council: Proceed with 10 programs

Fall-Winter
- Refining concepts
  - Metro staff concepts Engagement report

April
- Staff Recommendation to Metro Council

Feb/March engagement
- Community workshops
- Community Partners
- Task Force discussion, 3/4
- Committee on Racial Equity
- Stakeholder conversations
Council direction, Sept. 2019: Programs to develop

- Safety hot spots
- Revitalizing main streets
- Regional walking and biking connections
- Safe Routes to School
- Anti-displacement strategies
- Affordable housing options
- Growth and transportation: planning for the future
- Better bus
- Electric buses
- Affordable fares for students
Better bus

- When buses are stuck in traffic, they move more slowly and can be less reliable.
- Investments could include dedicated bus lanes, bus priority signals, curb extensions at bus stops and features that make buses easier to board.
Electric buses

- Traditional diesel buses emit pollution, including carbon dioxide and harmful diesel particulates.
- Fund buses to run on electricity and other clean technologies, which would reduce climate impacts and improve air quality.
Affordable fares for students

• This program would provide free or discounted bus and MAX fares for students so they can get to school and activities affordably.
Anti-displacement strategies

• This program would fund strategies such as tenant engagement, anti-displacement services, business support services and job training where transportation investments are being made.

• Learn from successes of Southwest Equitable Development Strategy
Affordable housing options

- Investments would help ensure that there are affordable housing options near transportation investments.
Growth and transportation: planning for the future

• This program would support engaging communities and exploring options for the future of transportation in corridors as the region continues to grow.
Safe Routes to School

• This program would fund sidewalks, crosswalks and other investments near schools, as well as education and safety awareness programs.
Safety hot spots

• Funds would invest in things like crosswalks, signals, medians, bulb-outs, road re-striping and other improvements to make it safer and easier for everyone to share the road.
Regional walking and biking connections

- Potential investments would include pedestrian and bicycle bridges, connecting gaps in multi-use paths, and creating bikeways that are separated from car traffic.
Potential investments would include improved sidewalks and pedestrian crossings, seating, lighting, street trees and other improvements that make main streets more accessible.
Discussion questions

What outcomes would you like programs to advance?

What kinds of investments would you most like to see programs make?
Gather input from community members and partners

Survey open through March 12: bit.ly/GetMovingSurvey

Develop engagement report

Staff program recommendation

Metro Council work session: April 14
Timeline update: Highlights

March
- Council work sessions: 3/10 & 3/17
- Tier 1 questions
- Measure structure
- Task Force
  - 3/18: Tier 2 Corridors Feedback
- Engagement
  - Regionwide programs
  - Forums, Survey
  - Community Partners

April
- Staff Programs Recommendation
- **Council work sessions**
  - 4/7: Tier 2 corridors
  - 4/14: Programs
  - 4/28: Reconciliation
- **Task Force**
  - 4/1 & 4/15
  - Oversight & Accountability
  - Final input to Council

May
- Council work sessions
- Finalizing measure package, oversight & accountability
- **Late May:**
  - Council referral decision

DRAFT – Subject to change
August 19, 2019

Co-Chair Jessica Vega Pederson  
T2020 Task Force members  
Metro  
600 NE Grand Ave  
Portland OR 97232

Dear Co-Chair and Task Force Members:

Following discussion with my fellow County Commissioners, I am pleased to share my recommended priorities for the regionwide program concepts. As I will be unable to attend the Task Force meeting on August 21, please consider these comments along with input from fellow Task Force members in preparing recommendations to the Metro Council for regionwide program concepts for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Funding Measure.

The regionwide programs are an important part of the transportation funding measure. They provide additional opportunities to support the values and achieve the outcomes set by Metro Council and the Task Force and distribute benefits to communities more broadly than the corridor investments. Many of them can also provide early implementation opportunities to demonstrate the success of the funding measure.

In our discussions, the Board considered how the regionwide programs could deliver projects quickly, benefit communities across the County and support long-held values around safety, affordable housing, outreach and capacity building among vulnerable populations, climate change and mobility while meeting the needs of a growing urban population.

My recommendations are sorted by priority, following the guidance to identify five each in the top, medium and low categories, including comments and suggestions for modifications as the concepts are further developed.

The Commission believes the Community Strengthening concept is essential to support equitable development strategies to reduce potential displacement associated with the corridor investments. I therefore recommend the Community Strengthening concept be incorporated into every corridor project.
**My High Priority recommendations:**

**Safe Routes to School:** The County and its cities have unmet demand for additional capital and non-capital investments to support safe routes to schools and are well-positioned to use these funds.

**Active Transportation Regional Connections:** Additional funding would support completion of the active transportation network on the major roads and trails across the County. These targeted investments would address important safety and mobility needs, especially in communities of color. Critical connections along the Westside Trail, Fanno Creek and access to jobs and transit along Hall Blvd and 99W are only a few of these strategic projects identified in the 10-year Investment Scenarios for Connected Centers and Corridors developed by Metro in 2017.

**Main Streets Revitalization:** These funds would support the continued efforts by the County and its cities to transform roads into complete streets, supporting the needs of a growing urban population.

**Community Strengthening:** Funds are needed to facilitate engagement with local businesses, community organizations and others to identify needs and opportunities that can leverage the transportation investments with other strategies for the success of the community.

**Corridor Planning:** Funding for future planning recognizes that communities are at differing levels of readiness for investment and sets the stage for non-top tier corridors, such as 99W and Farmington Road, to be ready for success in the future.

**My Medium Priority recommendations:**

**Smart Cities:** This is an exciting new program area that could help the County and its cities get prepared to take advantage of new technology to improve the operation and safety of the transportation system. To deliver near-term, significant improvements, we would like to see the program expand to include regional deployments of more powerful field-computing devices and the communication infrastructure to support connectivity back to central systems. This will support the next generation of transit signal priority, and other connected and autonomous mobility applications.

**Safety Hot Spots:** These are small but important investments. Within the County, meeting our safety needs through other regionwide programs for SRTS, Active Transportation and Main Streets are a higher priority due to the opportunity for broader application and ability to leverage other investments for broader benefit.

**Better Bus:** While not widespread, potential applications of enhanced transit treatments exist throughout the County and additional identification, evaluation and investments could help improve transit travel time and mobility.
Transit Vehicle Electrification: Converting diesel buses to electric vehicle would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions directly. Though significant investments have been made, additional investments could further this goal.

Transit Fare Affordability – for affordable housing residents: Free fares for affordable housing residents provide a direct benefit for residents to access jobs, healthcare and other needs. Before making this a top priority, the Board encourages TriMet, the Housing Authorities and affordable housing agency partners to work together to sign up all eligible residents for the existing low fare program.

Protecting and Preserving Multi-Family Housing: Protecting and preserving affordable housing is an important complement to the efforts by Metro, the County and its cities to add new affordable housing units. Support continuing to develop the REIT as a new tool to meet this goal.

My Low Priority recommendations:

Air Quality Monitoring: Does not support the Task Force Values.

School Bus Electrification: Does not appear to be ready for implementation.

Transit Fare Affordability – for Students: Recommend completing the TriMet Pilot Program for student fares and increasing transit service to schools throughout the region before making free fares a priority.

Community Placemaking: Building capacity and a sense of community is an important goal. Suggest folding this specific tool proposed here into the Community Strengthening toolbox as applicable.

Equitable Transit Oriented Development: Support identifying parcels in public ownership to repurpose and directly benefit residents with the construction of additional affordable housing. The County has been actively doing this for the past several years with several projects in project development or under construction now. Suggest continued consideration of this program if the REIT concept proves unworkable or in partnership with it.

Thank you for including my comments. I look forward to learning about the final Task Force recommendations when I return.

Sincerely,

Pam Treece, Task Force Co-Chair

cc: Washington County Board of Commissioners
Stephen Roberts, Interim Director, Land Use & Transportation
Preliminary regionwide program concepts

Benefits beyond corridors: Regionwide programs

The Metro Council is working with partners and the community to develop a transportation funding measure that could make it safer, easier and more affordable to get around greater Portland. The potential 2020 Transportation funding measure includes projects in 13 travel corridors and 10 regionwide programs.

Metro staff drafted concepts for these programs based input from community members, partners, the Transportation Funding Measure Task Force and the Metro Council. Staff will work with community members and practitioners to further develop these programs, ensuring that they respond to the community needs and priorities they aim to address.

The program concepts are guided by the measure’s values and outcomes identified by the task force including:

- Improve safety
- Prioritize investments that support communities of color
- Make it easier to get around
- Support resiliency
- Support clean air, clean water, and healthy ecosystems
- Support economic growth
- Increase access to opportunity for low-income Oregonians
- Leverage regional and local investments
Get Moving 2020 Regionwide Programs - Preliminary Draft

The proposed funding measure includes regionwide programs that would make investments throughout the greater Portland area. There are concepts for 10 programs within three focus areas: 1) Safe and Livable streets, 2) Community Stability and 3) Future Transit.

1. Safe and Livable Streets

*Making targeted safety and livability improvements in areas outside of the corridors funded through the measure*

Programs:

- a. Safe Routes to School
- b. Safety Hot Spots
- c. Active Transportation Regional Connections
- d. Main Street Revitalization

Types of projects funded:

- Capital transportation improvements
- Technical assistance
- Outreach

Possible funding: $20 million per year, across the four programs. Funding would be allocated as needed in a three-year grant cycle for a total of $60 million every three years. The allocation would be distinct from the federal Regional Flexible Funds allocation, but timing would be coordinated as needed.

2. Community Stability

*Preventing displacement and stabilizing communities by leveraging investments along corridors and in regional centers*

Programs:

- a. Anti-displacement Strategies
- b. Multi-family and Missing Middle Housing
- c. Future Corridor Planning

Types of projects funded:

- Local strategies to prevent displacement
- More affordable housing in areas at risk of displacement
- Rezoning efforts
- Housing strategies and economic development before transportation investments are made

Possible funding: $10 million per year for Multi-family and Missing Middle Housing and Future Corridor Planning, in addition to separate funding for Anti-displacement Strategies in the corridors.

3. Future Transit

*Making transit more clean, affordable, reliable and a convenient choice for more people.*

Programs:

- a. Better Bus
- b. Bus Electrification
- c. Student Fare Affordability

Types of projects funded:

- New and converted clean transit vehicles
- Student transit passes
- Planning, design and capital projects to improve transit speed, capacity and reliability

Bus electrification and Student Fare Affordability would be administered by the transit agencies with oversight from Metro. The capital portion of Better Bus could be combined with the programs in the Safe and Livable Streets program to simplify administration and reduce redundant applications.

Possible funding: $15 million per year across the three programs.
How would the programs work?

The proposed programs build from Metro’s many years of work with community members, partners and stakeholders to improve the transportation system. Metro has a long history of managing grants for planning, capital and operations funds in a fair and transparent manner. Across all programs, Metro would administer the programs based on:

- **Outcome-based criteria.** Evaluation of each program would rely on performance criteria developed through community input and informed by related plans and policies to assess a project’s impact and effectiveness in addressing the problem (e.g., traffic safety).

- **Racial equity analysis.** Each program would consider Metro’s equity goals as defined by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as a lens through which to allocate funds and prioritize projects. The collective impact of the programs in addressing social inequities would also be considered.

- **Geographic needs.** Metro would take into account the unique and various needs of people traveling throughout the region, as well as the overall geographic distribution of funding.
SAFE AND LIVABLE STREETS

1a. Safe Routes to School

Purpose
The Safe Routes to School program would expand the reach of Metro’s existing program to support investments that make it possible for all students to get to school and travel around their communities safely, affordably, and efficiently by walking, biking and taking transit.

Need
Two thirds of school districts report funding as the primary challenge to implementing Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure improvements, and 83 percent of districts named traffic safety as the primary concern for students walking and biking. In addition, schools with more than 50 percent of students on free or reduced lunch see a 30 percent higher rate of collisions within one mile of the school. The need for Safe Routes to School investments across the region is hundreds of millions of dollars.

Potential benefits
Targeted education activities at historically underserved schools and increased funding for safety improvements across the region could significantly improve conditions for students to walk and bike to school safely. Safe Routes to School investments reduce congestion by reducing car pickups and drop-offs at schools. Nationally, school travel accounts for as much as 14% of car trips during morning rush hour. Safe Routes investments also help students get their daily physical activity and support improved classroom learning.

Types and scale of projects
- Capital improvements such as sidewalks, crosswalks and safe places for children to access school. (Typical project cost range: $5,000 to $5 million)
- Outreach and education (expansion of Metro’s existing program). (Typical project cost: $20,000 to $300,000.
- Technical assistance to support jurisdictions in developing project lists and identifying program needs for Safe Routes to School in their community.
SAFE AND LIVABLE STREETS

1b. Safety Hot Spots

Purpose
This program aims to reduce death and serious injuries from traffic related accidents, while addressing the disproportionate impacts of serious crashes on people of color and low income people. Safety Hot Spots would be a data-driven program that provides funding for capital improvements at high injury locations ("hotspots") across the greater Portland area.

Need
A majority of high injury corridors go through areas with higher concentrations of people of color, people with low incomes and English language learners. Funding is needed for small, localized and strategic capital improvements that can reduce crashes and injuries. Using crash data, Metro has identified both high injury corridors and high injury intersections in the region in order to prioritize needs. While there is a federally-funded program administered by ODOT to address hot spots, there is not enough funding to meet the need.

Potential benefits
This program could create safer roadway conditions, especially for the region’s most vulnerable community members. In addition to improving safety, safety hot spot investments typically improve walkability and livability in the surrounding neighborhood.

Types and scale of projects:
- Capital improvements such as signalized cross-walks or re-striping of an intersection to improve turning movements. Investment in multiple hotspots on one roadway can be combined into one project for cost efficiency. (Typical project costs: $2 to $5 million)
- Outreach and education.
SAFE AND LIVABLE STREETS

1c. Active Transportation Regional Connections

Purpose
This program would fund investments that increase equitable access to regional pedestrian and bicycle networks that provide safe, direct and comfortable access to transit, town centers, employment, education and other locations people travel to daily.

Need
Many gaps and barriers remain across the region that prevent people from being able to walk and bike. The construction of large, meaningful projects like bridges and trails are difficult to fund through existing funding sources (such as small federal and state grants). Without investment in significant regional connections, there will continue to be major gaps in the active transportation network.

Potential benefits
Active transportation regional connection projects would help to reduce vehicle congestion by providing safe active transportation routes over long distances. The program would fund projects based on outcome-based criteria, which may include but aren’t limited to: equity, regional connectivity, and safety and congestion relief.

Types of projects and scale
- Capital improvements such as pedestrian and bicycle bridges, missing segments of multi-use paths, and separated bikeways on high crash corridors. (Typical project cost: $1 million - $15 million depending on complexity and phasing)
- Outreach and education.
SAFE AND LIVABLE STREETS

1d. Main Streets Revitalization

**Purpose**

This program would provide grants to cities and counties to improve safety and mobility, and to support economic growth across the greater Portland area by investing in main streets and city and town centers. Projects funded through this program could either improve existing downtowns or help develop a new downtown main street where one doesn’t currently exist.

**Need**

As the region’s downtown centers grow and change, they need investments that provide transportation options, support local businesses, and promote vibrant and healthy public spaces. Every city and county in the Metro area has one or more center or main street, but many struggle with deferred maintenance, safety concerns, and limited capacity for transit. When main streets cannot support planned land uses, businesses, housing, other development may stagnate. Successful main streets are walkable and have access to multiple modes of transportation.

**Potential benefits**

Main streets can provide neighborhood gathering places, shops and services that nearby residents can walk and bike to, which reduces dependence on automobiles, greenhouse gas emissions and traffic pollution. These investments would support local entrepreneurship, make communities safer and strengthen existing community. Plans for investments made under this program would consider anti-displacement strategies and equitable development outcomes.

**Types of projects and scale**

Main street grants could fund improvements such as:

- Seating and other amenities at transit stops
- Enhanced pedestrian crossings
- Bikeways
- Pedestrian-scale lighting
- Street trees and vegetation
- Street seating, art and other placemaking elements.
COMMMUNITY STABILITY

2a. Anti-displacement Strategies

Purpose
This program would fund development strategies and projects focused on preventing displacement and encourage equitable development investments in corridors funded through the measure (TV Highway, 185th Ave, 82nd Ave, Burnside, Powell, 122nd Ave, 162nd Ave, McLoughlin Blvd, 181st/Clackamas-to-Columbia, Highway 212/Sunrise, Central City, Albina Vision). This program would establish a Regional Equity Coalition of partner organizations that would allocate resources and provide direction for strategies in each corridor. Community members who live and work in the corridors would advise Metro and its partners through corridor-based implementation committees.

Need
Transportation investments can support and improve the quality of life for the people who live in a community. However, those same investments can also have unintended negative consequences on the people they are trying to serve. Public infrastructure investments can spur increased land values that price people out of their neighborhoods. Displaced residents and businesses often relocate to areas that are more affordable and lack access to transportation options and community amenities.

Potential benefits
The scale at which this effort is funded would determine the level of impact. Outcome-based criteria would be needed to guide grant-making activities that support equitable development initiatives for each corridor. It is critical that these efforts are guided by community, so the existing level of community infrastructure would determine the pace at which this work can be done.

Potential project types and scale
The scope of each strategy would be proportional to the investment in each area. Resource allocations could be organized into the following action areas:

- Equity + Social Justice (tenant engagement, anti-displacement services)
- Equitable Housing (pre-development and other affordable housing investments)
- Business Stabilization (business support services, lending and capital access)
- Workforce Stabilization (job training, career coaching)
- Community Empowerment/Leadership Training (cohort-based intergenerational leadership training)
- Community Investment + Placemaking (sub-grants to invest in neighborhoods and placemaking)
COMMUNITY STABILITY

2b. Multi-family and Missing Middle Housing

Purpose
This program would advance racial equity by mitigating potential displacement pressures and creating housing stability for households in changing neighborhoods.

Need
For the past decade, population growth has far outpaced new housing construction in the region. This has resulted in rising housing costs and increased the risk of displacement for households with low and middle incomes in rapidly changing neighborhoods. In some cases, neighborhood gentrification and housing instability has been accelerated by public investments such as new transit lines and infrastructure improvements.

Households with low or fixed incomes have been forced out of apartments with nowhere to turn for more affordable rents. Households with stable incomes can’t save enough for homeownership, which is also increasingly out of reach. Stabilizing rents and creating pathways to homeownership for first-time homebuyers are two important anti-displacement strategies.

Potential benefits
The region is planning for major investments in transportation. It is necessary to concurrently plan for housing stability so that families who live in these changing neighborhoods today can continue to afford to have stable housing. Supporting current residents to become homeowners in these neighborhoods in the future would build family and community equity for generations to come.

Types of projects and scale
This program could fund two types of anti-displacement strategies: A regional revolving bridge loan fund and a capital grant fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTENTIAL INVESTMENTS</th>
<th>REVOLVING BRIDGE LOAN FUND</th>
<th>CAPITAL GRANT PROGRAM</th>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase land near a corridor to develop affordable housing</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>A $1 million bridge loan would fund approximately one site acquisition at a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase a building in a changing neighborhood to prevent the displacement of low income tenants</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A $3 million bridge loan would fund acquisition of approximately one 50 unit building at a time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop permanent affordable homeownership opportunities in a changing neighborhood</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A $1 million capital grant would provide gap financing for approximately 10 affordable homes for first time home buyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop affordable housing with community activated ground floor commercial space along a corridor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>A $3 million capital grant would cover the increased costs in an affordable rental building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY STABILITY

2c. Future Corridor Planning

Purpose
This program would connect the planning for major transportation projects with community priorities while coordinating investments across agencies for the smart stewardship of public funds. Corridor plans guide investments and policy decisions, including those related to local planning and zoning. It is critical that such plans are developed with a robust community engagement process to ensure that the experiences and values of current residents are well represented.

Need
To prepare for growth and protect livability there is a need to coordinate local, regional and state investments to get the most out of public and private resources. Corridor planning provides a process that brings together government, community, and business to create a shared plan of action for important transportation investments.

Potential benefits
The program could support transit oriented development in mixed use areas, high capacity transit and other transportation improvements, and the integration of freight and active transportation into multimodal corridors. This program would allow Metro to support more communities to advancing projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Types of projects and scale
Future Corridor Planning would support Metro’s ongoing involvement in local and regional transit and roadway project conception, funding, and design. Without this program, Metro’s work in an investment area would typically be funded by local resources. Funding amounts would vary by corridor, but for reference: corridor planning for the Southwest Corridor Plan is approximately $1 million per year over about five to seven years; corridor planning in Powell Division ranges from $500-750 thousand per year over three to five years.
FUTURE TRANSIT

3a. Better Bus

Purpose
This program would fund relatively low-cost and quickly implementable capital projects that would improve transit travel time, reliability and capacity.

Need
Buses are getting stuck in traffic causing increasingly unreliable and slow transit trips. New growth is happening in areas in need of better transit service and access. However, ridership is not growing adequately to support additional service. Better bus will improve transit service for current riders while helping to attract new riders.

Potential benefits
Better Bus improvements would increase reliability and decrease travel time for bus riders, making transit a more convenient choice for more people. In 2018, a 2-year, $5 million pilot program successfully made improvements in several locations in the Portland Central City, including SW Madison Street, NW Everett Street, NE Grand Avenue, NE MLK Boulevard and on the Burnside Bridge. These projects increased the speed of the outbound trips from downtown Portland for over 4,300 riders every weekday evening. The Madison and Everett projects together save over 37 hours of total rider travel time daily, or about 8,300 hours annually. The Better Bus program would provide similar benefits to other routes across the region.

Types of projects and scale
Better Bus would focus investments in rapidly growing, heavily-congested corridors, and employment areas that demand a higher level of transit service but are not current candidates for light rail and other high capacity transit. Investments would include:

- Capital improvements such as dedicated bus lanes, bus priority signals, curb extensions at bus stops, and level boarding. (Typical project cost: $100,000 - $1 million)
3b. Bus Electrification

Purpose
The program would support transit agencies in replacing diesel buses with new electric or low-carbon buses.

Need
Traditional buses emit large amounts of greenhouse gas emissions including carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide, and harmful diesel particulates. The impact of this pollution is felt more acutely by communities along bus routes, which are primarily in denser neighborhoods with a higher concentration of residents. For this reason, TriMet has set a goal of phasing out their diesel fleet over the next twenty years. SMART (South Metro Area Regional Transit in Wilsonville) also has goals of converting its fleet into low-carbon vehicles.

Potential benefits
Electric buses and other low-carbon transit vehicles greatly reduce emissions and improve air quality. Assuming a battery electric bus is operating 120 daily miles per day (current industry standard), replacing a diesel bus with an electric bus includes a total greenhouse gas reduction of 405 metric tons per year. Other benefits include less vibration, less noise, zero exhaust, and lower operations and maintenance costs.

Types of projects and scale
For $5 million dollars, TriMet and SMART could replace five diesel buses with five new electric or low-carbon buses a year. This funding would ensure that TriMet meets its goal of replacing its current fleet in 20 years. The exact types of buses and charging models have not been finalized, but multiple options exist and battery technology is continually improving. Metro would transfer funds to the transit agencies to purchase the buses.
3c. Student Fare Affordability

Purpose
This program would allow for free or discounted student fares in greater Portland.

Need
Students make their way to and from school by various modes: walking, biking, in a car, a yellow school bus or on public transportation. For some families, buying a transit pass can be a financial burden or out of reach altogether. TriMet currently has reduced fares for youth ages 7-17 and students in grades 9-12 or pursuing a GED.

One school district in the region, Portland Public Schools (PPS), is exempt from state requirements to provide regular yellow bus service for high school students. Instead, PPS currently offers all high school students a free transit pass during the school year. That transit pass program is paid for through a joint effort by TriMet and PPS (PPS is partially reimbursed by the Oregon Department of Education). Currently, all other school districts in the region run a yellow school bus program for their high schools and consequently are not financially able to offer a transit pass to their students. Because transit service does not provide sufficient coverage in all districts, removing the yellow school bus program is not a viable option.

Research suggests that helping young people access and become familiar with using public transit at an early age makes them more likely to be regular transit users later in life. For students who are unable to drive, access to transit can also help expand job opportunities and make it more possible to participate in extracurricular activities that might otherwise be inaccessible.

This program would be administered in partnership with transit agencies and local school districts.

Potential benefits
This program would provide transportation options to youth. The program would fund transit fare passes.

Types of projects and scale
- The size and scale of a program could vary based on how many students are served.
- The funding raised by the measure for Student Transit Fare would be additive and not replace existing funding for student fare programs, such as the funds allocated for Student Youth Pass.

Considerations for future discussion
- Existing funding for school transportation
- Transportation needs of high school students in contrast to middle school students and/or elementary school children (7 and over)
- Needs of students that go to public school compared to private school
- Needs of low-income students
Session Date: March 10, 2020
Length of Time Requested: 60 minutes

Title of Topic: DRAFT SIGNIFICANT NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAM REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT

Department: Land Use & Transportation

Presented by: Stephen Roberts, Director; Theresa Cherniak, Principal Planner; Michelle Miller, Senior Planner

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
- PowerPoint presentation
- DRAFT Significant Natural Resources (SNR) Program Review and Assessment Report (SNR Report), published Oct. 4, 2019
- Public comment summary will be provided at the Work Session

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
- Review the SNR Report’s key findings and staff recommendations
- Update Board of Commissioners (Board) on community comments about the SNR Report
- Provide an opportunity for Board questions, discussion and comments
- Receive Board direction on staff recommendations and proposed code amendments
- Inform Board about next steps as the SNR Report is finalized

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:
Should the Board consider changes to the Community Development Code and other Comprehensive Plan elements based on issues identified in the SNR Report?

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
As a 2019 Long Range Planning (LRP) Work Program task, the Board directed staff to prepare an in-depth review and assessment of the County’s program for the protection of natural resources in the urban unincorporated area pursuant to Statewide Planning Goal 5. The SNR Program Review and Assessment was distributed Oct. 4, 2019 and public comments were taken through the end of the year. The SNR Report describes the history of the County’s compliance with Goal 5, the County’s land use review process for sites with SNRs and concerns about existing protections for SNRs and trees.

The report concludes with key findings, discussion of options to address issues raised and recommendations for further action. The SNR Report contains staff recommendations for amendments to the County’s SNR requirements in response to community and developer input and a recent Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) decision.

Staff presented the Draft SNR Report at a Work Session Dec. 5, 2019. This follow-up Work Session is intended to respond to the Board’s questions and comments, consider the community comments and request Board direction for code amendments and other changes to SNR requirements based on the Report’s key findings.
Significant Natural Resources (SNR)

Program Review and Assessment

Board of Commissioners Work Session
Mar. 10, 2020
Overview of presentation

• Overview of SNR Assessment
• Summary of public comments and online open house survey responses
• Discuss options and recommendations
• Board feedback on options and recommendations
• Discuss next steps
Overview of SNR Report

- Board-directed assessment of SNR program
- Address community and developer perceptions about SNR regulations
- Focus on urban unincorporated area
- Consider tree removal/protection as an interrelated issue
- Address the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) decision related to SNRs
SNR terms

• Water area and wetland
  – 100-year floodplain, drainage hazard area, pond

• Fish and wildlife habitat
  – Identified sensitive habitat and forested area coincidental with water area and wetland

• Riparian area
  – Area adjacent to a water area, or at minimum, the 25-foot area on either side of a channel
SNR map example - Bethany
Statewide Planning Goal 5

NATURAL RESOURCES, SCENIC AND HISTORIC AREAS, AND OPEN SPACES

To protect natural resources and conserve scenic and historic areas and open spaces.

Local governments shall adopt programs that will protect natural resources...for present and future generations....
Title 13 and Tualatin Basin Program

• Metro Title 13 – Nature in Neighborhoods (2005)
  Requires policies to protect water quality and riparian habitat and encourage habitat-friendly development

• County amends comprehensive plan to implement Tualatin Basin Program (2006)
  Consistent with CWS’ existing Design and Construction Standards for water quality sensitive areas and vegetated corridors and development options to minimize impacts
Primary concerns

1. CDC standards for development within or near water-related SNRs are subjective
2. CDC standards for development within or near *Wildlife Habitat* are subjective
3. The County’s existing tree protection standards are limited
4. Standards for SNRs and trees in UGB expansion areas are limited
Online open house comments

- 63% (34 responses) in favor of increasing habitat protection for water-related areas
- 69% (37 responses) in favor of expanding standards for *Wildlife Habitat* in addition to incentives and voluntary measures
- 65% (35 responses) in favor of new tree protection requirements for trees for new development, with emphasis on tree protection in SNR areas
Community outreach

• Attended Committee for Community Involvement (CCI) and 6 Community Participation Organization (CPO) meetings in Fall 2019
• Home Builders Association of Metro-Portland & Westside Economic Alliance presentations
• Social Media outreach, including project website
• Public comment period Oct. 7-Dec. 31
  – Received 10 individual, 4 CPO & 4 group comments
CPO comments

- Update Goal 5 inventory & protect 100% of all remaining SNRs
- Clear and objective standards for SNRs
- Tree code is needed immediately, especially in Cooper Mountain area
- Revise SNR categories & definitions for consistency
- Support third party habitat delineation & review by independent agency
- County resources are needed to protect habitat
Other community comments

- Comprehensive SNR update warranted; should include stakeholders to evaluate alternatives
- Current voluntary incentives inadequate to encourage SNR protection
- Support added SNR protections, especially for *Wildlife Habitat* & important wildlife corridors
- Updates to submittal materials needed
- Original Goal 5 inventory excluded important habitat, new tools available to prepare update
Other community comments

• Tree protection is a primary concern and highly related to overall SNR protection
• Trees serve multiple purposes, including addressing environmental and livability concerns, flood prevention & canopy cover
• Need a tree code as a safeguard for upland wildlife SNRs
• Protection is necessary for tree groves and older native trees
Developer comments

• Support report’s recommendation for CWS review of water-related SNRs
• SNR requirements need clarification
• Consider onsite/offsite tree mitigation
• Interested in Habitat Friendly Planned Development to address incentives
• New residential development adds trees and landscaping to individual properties
1. Water-related SNR recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommends</strong> adding references to CDC that are consistent with CWS’ existing <em>Design &amp; Construction Standards</em> for water quality sensitive areas and vegetated corridors</td>
<td>• Develop new clear and objective standards for areas beyond CWS vegetated corridors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Tree protection recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Staff recommends** developing more extensive tree protection requirements for trees within SNRs | (a) Continue current limited tree protection requirements  
(b) Develop more extensive tree protection requirements for all new development |
## 2. *Wildlife Habitat* options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: Voluntary + Trees</th>
<th>Option 2: Mandatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Follow Tualatin Basin Program decision to rely on incentive/voluntary measures only</td>
<td>• Develop clear &amp; objective standards for <em>Wildlife Habitat</em> mitigation, in addition to incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand on incentives, including Habitat Friendly Planned Development, density transfers, reduced setbacks</td>
<td>• Could be based on Metro Model Code provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarify measures are voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Recommend companion regulations to protect trees in SNRs
- Could also include companion regulations to protect trees
4. SNRs in new UGB areas options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply County SNR regulations, including any new or modified SNR or tree</td>
<td>• Include Metro inventoried upland habitat (similar to wildlife habitat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations within the UGB expansion areas, to new development</td>
<td>for new UGB areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep SNR areas as currently identified on County maps and Metro</td>
<td>• Beaverton also requests additional regulations to address protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riparian areas</td>
<td>of riparian and upland habitat independent of a development application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beaverton also requests additional regulations to address protection of riparian and upland habitat independent of a development application
Additional recommendations

• Modify CDC to:
  – Clarify that applicants must field verify SNRs
  – Clarify and standardize submittal and Habitat Report requirements
  – Clarify SNR categories/definitions for consistency across jurisdictions/agencies (2021)

• Start new database for SNRs and tracking system for monitoring and enforcement
Enforcement order

• Petition to Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) regarding invalidation of Sec. 422 provisions, Goal 5 compliance

• Hearings Officer recommendation to LCDC:
  – County out of compliance with Goal 5 because of invalidated provisions
  – Address invalidated provisions by end of ordinance season
  – No interim injunction

• LCDC hearing Mar. 19
## Next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today</th>
<th>Board direction on options and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar/Apr</td>
<td>Finalize 2020-2021 Work Program tasks, subject to Board direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Jun</td>
<td>Work with environmental consultant, current planning staff, agency partners and stakeholders to draft regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Oct</td>
<td>SNR ordinance hearing/adoption process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions & Discussion
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Title of Topic: SHORT-TERM RENTALS

Department: Land Use & Transportation

Presented by:  
 Stephen Roberts, Director; Theresa Cherniak, Principal Planner;  
 Suzanne Savin, Senior Planner

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
PowerPoint presentation  
Issue Paper 2020-01: Short-Term Rentals (provided Feb. 25) and Public Comments portal link

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
- Review short-term rentals (STR) issue paper background information and key findings.
- Outline public outreach and comments from stakeholders and interested parties to date.
- Discuss options and staff recommendations to address identified issues.
- Provide opportunity for questions and initial comments from the Board.
- Obtain Board direction on STR options outlined in the issue paper.

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:
Should the Board consider directing staff to develop STR-specific regulations? If so, what policy objectives should form the basis of these regulations?

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
Over the last five years, unincorporated County residents have submitted comments on the topic of STRs. Many jurisdictions regionally and nationally have defined an STR as a dwelling unit or portion thereof that is rented or leased for less than 30 days. The County, however, does not currently define or regulate STRs.

Many community member comments have been from people living near active STRs. Concerns have included noise, on-street parking, traffic and trash. Several people have requested that the County adopt regulations to protect adjacent residents from negative impacts of STRs. The adopted 2019-20 Long Range Planning (LRP) Work Program identified preparation of an STR issue paper as a Tier 1 task.

The STR issue paper summarizes positive and negative community impacts of STRs, information about the number and location of STRs in the unincorporated County (as of Jan. 2020), STR regulations and approval processes in other jurisdictions, as well as STR enforcement issues. The issue paper concludes with a discussion of options to address resident concerns about STRs and preliminary staff recommendations for further action.

The issue paper represents a starting point for discussion of potential STR regulations. Staff expects to receive additional comments from residents and STR operators during the issue paper public comment period, which runs through March 26, 2020.
Short-term Rentals Issue Paper

Key findings and initial staff recommendations

Board of Commissioners Work Session
March 10, 2020
Reason for issue paper

- County does not define or regulate short-term rentals (STRs)
- Community concerns about STRs
  - Noise
  - On-street parking and trash impacts
  - Requests for STR regulations
- 2019-20 Long Range Planning Work Program included STRs issue paper
What are STRs?

- No official federal or state definition
- Often defined by local governments as **housing units or portions of housing units that are rented or leased for less than 30 days**
- Advertised on websites (Airbnb, Vacasa, HomeAway)
Potential STRs benefits

• Provides homeowners or long-term renters with supplemental income
• Contributes to area economy by promoting tourism and bolstering lodging tax revenues
• Provides additional lodging options for visitors
Potential STRs negative effects

• Excessive noise and on-street parking conflicts
• May increase housing costs by removing housing from the long-term rental or owner-occupancy market
STRs outside cities (Feb. 2020)

Courtesy of Host Compliance
STRs listing and unit types outside cities (Feb. 2020)

**Listing Types**
- Single Family Home: 81%
- Multifamily Home: 12%
- Unknown Home Type: 7%

**Unit Types**
- Entire Homes: 63%
- Partial Homes: 34%
- Unknown Room Type: 3%

*Courtesy of Host Compliance*
How the County treats STRs

- County does not regulate STRs
- Community Development Code (CDC) does not differentiate among dwellings occupied by owners, long-term renters or short-term renters
STRs and Transient Lodging Tax

• Finance collects Transient Lodging Tax (TLT)
• STRs qualify as transient lodging
• Online platforms remit TLT to Finance on behalf of STR operators; no information on number of STRs, their locations or nights booked
Early community feedback

• About 45 comments submitted since 2014
• Most focused on negative impacts of fewer than 10 STRs in urban unincorporated area
• Concerns included: noise, traffic and parking associated with parties and events, strangers, number of people in STRs
• Requests for STRs regulations to: limit group size, prohibit large outdoor events, enforce with warnings, fines and permit revocation
Opportunities with regulation

• Provides mechanism for:
  – Preventing or reducing potential negative neighborhood impacts
  – Maximizing retention of affordable long-term rental and owner-occupied housing
  – Facilitating safe operation of STRs
  – Enforcement of violations, and potential to revoke permits on problem properties
  – Monitoring payment of appropriate taxes
Challenges with regulating STRs

- Potentially contentious process for establishing standards, since variety of stakeholders do not always agree on how STRs should be regulated
- Ensuring compliance with regulations
- Addressing operators of “problem” STRs given County’s existing limited enforcement resources
STRs impacts on housing

• Do STRs impact the supply or affordability of housing available for long-term renters?

• Core issue: whether people who list homes on STRs platforms would otherwise rent them for longer terms

• Some studies have linked increases in STRs listings to increases in housing prices and rents
STRs impacts on housing

• ECONorthwest 2016 report: Impact of STRs on housing affordability in Portland
  – Concluded STRs have negligible impact on housing affordability

• Assuming report’s conclusions can be extrapolated to County, they suggest STRs impacts on local housing supply and affordability may be minimal at this time
Other jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>NOT REGULATED; CONSIDERED RESIDENTIAL USE</th>
<th>STRS CONSIDERED LODGING OR HOME OCCUPATION USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF EUGENE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTNOMAH COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAMHILL COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF BEAVERTON</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF HILLSBORO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF TIGARD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Other jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
<th>STRS LICENSE, PERMIT OR REGISTRATION REQUIRED</th>
<th>STRS LAND USE APPROVAL REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLACKAMAS COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLATSOP COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILLAMOOK COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF HOOD RIVER</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LAKE OSWEGO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOD RIVER COUNTY</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF PORTLAND</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF BEND</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MILWAUKIE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regulated STRs elements

- Quiet hours / limits on noise
- Group events
- Minimum parking
- Maximum occupancy
- Trash management
Regulated STRs elements

- Primary residency
- Inspections
- Renewal
- Eligible dwelling types
- Rural district requirements
Process options for granting STRs approvals

Two options, each with a different set of implications:

1. License, permit or registration
2. Land use approval
License, permit or registration

• More straightforward process can encourage STR operators to obtain approval
• Easier to administer than land use permit
• Allows flexibility in assigning department to administer program
• Does not include public notice of application receipt; low opportunity for public input prior to decision
Land use approval

• May cause preexisting STRs to become nonconforming uses, not subject to new regulations
• Likely more staff time and administrative costs, lengthier process and higher STR permit cost
• May have higher opportunity for public input prior to decision, but may create false expectations from neighbors that they can stop STR through the process
Monitoring/enforcement challenges

• STR listings are spread across more than 50 online platforms
• Manual monitoring of STR listings is difficult without sophisticated databases
• Most STR platforms do not provide street addresses for their listings
• Difficult to determine amount of transient lodging tax owed by each STR operator
Host Compliance services

- STR street address identification
- STR compliance monitoring
- STR rental activity monitoring and transient lodging tax calculation support
- Mobile-enabled STR registration and tax collection
- Dedicated STR hotline
Public input

• STR briefings at CPO 1, 4B, 4K, 7 and 3 (upcoming)
  – Community members expressed concerns and supported STR regulation
  – STR operators expressed guarded support for some degree of regulation, but urged against overly restrictive requirements

• About 48 comments submitted online since issue paper publication
Factors to consider

• Community member comments to date focused on a limited number of “problem” STRs in urban unincorporated area

• Unclear whether comments to date represent broader community perspectives and concerns about STRs

• Unclear whether STRs should be allowed to operate in exclusive farm use and forest conservation districts
Factors to consider

• Numerous STRs currently operate in the County, but represent only a small fraction of County’s total dwellings
• Most STRs are not registered with the County and it is unknown how many are paying TLT
• If County develops STR regulations, implementation will require technical expertise and assistance with monitoring and enforcement
Guiding policy objectives

• Proposed policy objectives:
  – Minimize likelihood of community impacts, including “party houses,” noise, parking, trash
  – Increase accountability of STR operators; provide path to “close down” problem STRs

• Provide direction on the following policy objective as foundation for regulations:
  – Ensure that long-term rental properties are not converted to STRs
### Options for Board consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status quo</th>
<th>Strengthen existing regulations</th>
<th>STR license</th>
<th>STR land use permit</th>
<th>Prohibit in certain areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRs not regulated</td>
<td>Strengthen noise control, parking regulations and enforcement</td>
<td>Adopt STR regulations with approval through registration or license</td>
<td>Adopt STR regulations with approval through land use permit process</td>
<td>Prohibit STRs in certain land use districts, such as urban and rural residential districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

Today
Board input and direction

Mar. 26
Public comment period for issue paper ends

Early April
Report on public comments;
Board decision in Work Program

Summer/
If directed, staff development of
Fall
STR regulations with public input, as appropriate
Questions or comments?

For more information, please contact:

Suzanne Savin, Senior Planner
suzanne_savin@co.washington.or.us
503-846-3963
Noise violations and enforcement

• County’s noise control regulations less stringent than those of cities

• Noise complaints about STR guests are either:
  – Not a noise violation (slamming car doors), or
  – Only a violation between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. (amplified music, shouting)

• Noise violations occurring between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. are enforced by Sheriff’s Office (SO)
Parking violations and enforcement

- Enforced by SO
- Violation: vehicle blocking driveway or fire hydrant; parked within 10 feet of mailbox; having expired registration or deflated tires
- Not a violation: large numbers of vehicles parked on street in conjunction with parties or events
- If STR regulations developed, they could include prohibition of group events at STRs
Trash disposal violations and enforcement

- Enforced by Health and Human Services (HHS) Solid Waste and Recycling Division
- High threshold for what constitutes a residential solid waste violation
- Trash container in street is not a violation
- No requirement for regular trash collection service
- If STR regulations developed, could make sense to require STRs to have trash collection service
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Length of Time Requested: 30 minutes

Title of Topic: BICYCLE FACILITY SELECTION FOR BASALT CREEK PARKWAY EXTENSION PROJECT

Department: Land Use & Transportation

Presented by: 
Stephen Roberts, Director
Joe Younkins, Capital Project Services Division Manager

LIST OF ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS OR PRESENTATIONS:
- PowerPoint presentation
- Bicycle facility alternative exhibits

PURPOSE & DESIRED OUTCOME:
Review bicycle facility alternatives and obtain Board direction regarding the bicycle facility selection for this upcoming federally-funded capital road improvement project.

POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER:
What type of bicycle facility does the Board prefer for this facility? Staff recommends the multi-use path (Alternative C).

SUMMARY OF TOPIC:
Resolution & Order 17-2 documented the Board’s preference for separated or protected bicycle facilities on County-funded capital road improvement projects in urban areas when appropriate. LUT staff present an evaluation of bicycle facility alternatives, to include at least one separated or protected bicycle facility, to the Board for each urban County-funded capital road improvement project at or before the 30 percent design milestone.

Key factors to be considered in the evaluation include: project location and context, existing adjacent bike facilities, safety and function, costs and available project funding, and other agencies’ preferences (cities or ODOT) for roads under their jurisdiction.

This project falls within the Basalt Creek Concept Plan area. The street is the future boundary between the cities of Tualatin (north) and Wilsonville (south). Each city’s bicycle facility preference is noted in the attachment.
Basalt Creek Parkway Extension
(Grahams Ferry Road to Boones Ferry Road)

Bicycle Facility Alternatives

March 10, 2020 Work Session
Land use

Project Limits

- City Limit
- Tapman Creek
- Significant Natural Resource
- Agriculture & Forest District
- Exclusive Farming Use
- Future Development
TSP Functional Classification
Bikeway designation

Project Limits

City Limit
Enhanced Major Street Bikeway
An Enhanced Major Street Bikeway is an urban Arterial or Collector roadway that has, or is planned to have, buffered bike lanes or cycle tracks on one or both sides of the road as illustrated in the Washington County Bicycle Facility Design Toolkit.

Major Street Bikeway

Proposed Major Street Bikeway
Traffic data

- Transportation System Plan designated freight route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OPENING (2023)</th>
<th>FUTURE (2043)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume (AADT)</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>18,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Truck Traffic</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conflict points

2 Signals at Intersections

0 Side Streets 0 Existing Driveways 0 Bus Stops
Bicycle facility alternatives

- Alternative A: Buffered bicycle lanes
- Alternative B: Buffered bicycle lanes with separator
- Alternative C: Multi-use paths
- Alternative D: One-side bikeway and sidewalk
Alternative A: Buffered bike lanes

- No planter strip on the bridge
Alternative B: Buffered bike lanes with separator

- No planter strip on the bridge
- City of Wilsonville preference
Alternative C: Multi-use paths

- No planter strip on the bridge
- Project Team recommendation and City of Tualatin preference
- Matches facility being designed on Tualatin-Sherwood Road
Alternative D: One-side bikeway and sidewalk

- No planter strip on the bridge
## Criteria analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Alternative A: Buffered bicycle lane</th>
<th>Alternative B: Buffered bicycle lane w/ barrier</th>
<th>Alternative C: Multi-use path</th>
<th>Alternative D: Bikeway and sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist protection level</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☏</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of maintenance</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety conflict points</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/permitting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight compatibility</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with existing facilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction cost estimate</td>
<td>$27.8 million</td>
<td>$28.5 million</td>
<td>$27.1 million</td>
<td>$26.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

○ Less favorable  
◐ Somewhat favorable  
● Favorable

**Recommendation**
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Questions?

Thank you!

Renus Kelfkens, Senior Project Manager
renus_kelfkens@co.washington.or.us
503-846-7808
Alternative A: Buffered bicycle lane

- No planter strip on the bridge
Alternative B: Buffered bicycle lane with barrier

- No planter strip on the bridge
- City of Wilsonville preference
Alternative C: Multi-use path

- No planter strip on the bridge

- Project Team recommendation, and City of Tualatin preference
- Matches facility being designed on Tualatin-Sherwood Road
Alternative D: One-side bikeway and sidewalk

- No planter strip on the bridge
On February 25-26, 2020, Clean Water Services and the Tualatin Project repayment partners met with staff from the Bureau of Reclamation in Boise, Idaho, to evaluate three options for reducing seismic risk and securing Washington County’s primary water supply at Scoggins Dam/Hagg Lake. The partners determined all three options are technically feasible, but due to the complexity and cost of the alternatives, chose not to select an engineering preferred alternative until additional information can be gathered on costs, risks and other factors.

Reclamation is committed to working with CWS and other repayment partners to protect public safety and reduce risk at Scoggins Dam. In the coming year, the Joint Project partners (Reclamation and CWS) will focus on engineering design, risk evaluation, costs, permitting and related factors.

Reclamation and CWS are working together under Reclamation’s Joint Project authority secured in the 2016 Consolidated Appropriations Act to consider design options that will concurrently address dam safety and meet the long-term water needs of the community. There are three options at two locations under review:

- **Option 1 - Dam safety only and Option 2 - Modify the existing dam**: Reclamation is leading the dam safety engineering and environmental review of modifying and raising Scoggins Dam.

- **Option 3 - Construct a new downstream dam**: CWS is coordinating the engineering and environmental review of a proposed concrete dam downstream of Stimson Mill.