

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

APPENDIX C

TMA Materials (4 of 4)



Document: Summary of Technical Working Group (TWG) Meeting #5

Date of Delivery: December 3, 2013

Description

This document includes the summary notes of TWG Meeting #5 held on December 3, 2013, at ODOT Region 1 headquarters, where Rick Williams of the project consultant team presented on the formation of a Mt. Hood Transportation Management Association (TMA).

Status Update

Stakeholders have shown an interest in exploring the formation of a Mt. Hood TMA in the near future and can use this information as a starting point for that effort.

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) #5

Meeting Summary Notes

Conference Room A/B
ODOT Region 1 HQ, 123 Flanders St.,
Portland, OR 97209

December 3, 2013, 11:00 AM – 12:30 PM

11:00 – 11:10

The TWG Meeting #5 was held at ODOT Region 1 Headquarters.

Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara (DEA) convened the meeting and began with a round of introductions. She then provided a brief update on the where the Mt. Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan (MHMTP) is in the process.

Jon Tullis (Timberline) asked Elizabeth if the Project Leadership Group (PLG) meeting scheduled for December 19 wasn't redundant, given that the PLG adopted the list of 38 projects in the Plan in September. Elizabeth explained that the December 19th meeting involves agreement of prioritization of projects based on the MHMTP Implementation Plan.

Jon suggested that the Park and Ride Analysis project (Project # *PubT-4*) be in two phases: a first phase for sites with infrastructure in place, and a second phase for sites requiring development of new infrastructure.

Julie Stephens (City of Sandy (SAM) Transit) asked Elizabeth if a Transportation Management Association (TMA) has been approved to form as result of the meeting of the Mt. Hood Transportation Alliance/TWG held October 23, 2013, or if the agreement from the meeting was to explore formation of a TMA. Elizabeth clarified that the agreement was for TMA formation to be explored.

11:10 – 12:25

Elizabeth turned the meeting over to Rick Williams (Rick Williams Consulting) for his presentation on forming a TMA.

The main topics for presentation were:

- 1) What is a Mt. Hood TMA (brief recap of the presentation he delivered to the Mt. Hood Transportation Alliance/TWG held in October)?
- 2) Benefits of a TMA for Mt. Hood
- 3) Projects that "fit" a Mt. Hood TMA
- 4) Stable Funding (Special Service District or Business Assessment/Improvement District)
- 5) The process to form a TMA (feasibility assessment)
- 6) A budget to target (formation and organization)
- 7) Fatal Flaws
- 8) Next Steps

Rick emphasized that a TMA delivers services which are outcome based, such as mitigating congestion, improving access, and managing trips. The Lloyd TMA, for example, has a stated goal to reduce the single-occupant vehicle rate of all trips taken to workplaces w/in the TMA District Boundary to 33% by 2015. Sherrin Coleman (ODOT) asked Rick how the Lloyd TMA meets Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) reduction targets. Rick said that the Lloyd TMA manages distribution of TriMet universal transit passes and tracks the distribution. The Lloyd TMA also tracks the data recorded from employers completing the Employee Commute Options (ECO) surveys to assess single occupant vehicle rates.

Jon Tullis asked Rick how public agencies fit in the TMA model, e.g., what is their “role” as the “public” partner in the “private-public partnership”. Rick said that public agencies participate in most TMAs in different capacities. Public agencies are involved in the formation of a TMA to determine the mission, goals, and objectives – Rick cited the goal of “mitigating congestion in the Mt. Hood corridor” – that serve the public interest. Rick also noted that public entities may have an “ex officio” role, where they coordinate and cooperate with TMAs but do not have member voting privileges. Rick mentioned that TriMet has such an ex officio relationship with the Lloyd TMA.

Julie Stephens (SAM) raised the question of how a TMA would be able to manage transit operations. Rick mentioned that TMAs manage contracts with entities that actually provide the services. He noted a TMA in California manages the largest vanpool service in the US.

Sherrin Coleman commented that a TMA seems to be a good mechanism for bringing people to the table for travel options advocacy and education. She said it is not clear that a TMA can secure funds for transit from ODOT Public Transit Division (and currently, ODOT Public Transit cannot provide funding to TMAs). She said that ODOT Public Transit funds organizations that provide enhanced mobility services to special needs, elderly and other transit-dependent populations, which includes funding for Mobility Management programs. She asked Scott Turnoy (MCEDD) how a Mobility Management program (Scott is Mobility Manager for the Mid-Columbia Economic Development District) compares with a TMA. Scott said his work program seems to be very similar to the types of services and resources provided by TMAs.

Sherrin said that what is not desirable is for a TMA to be competing with Mt. Hood Express for local private dollars. She said ODOT desires Mt. Hood Express to continue receiving funding from the private sector.

Teresa Christopherson (Clackamas County Social Services/Mt. Hood Express) said that she sees a TMA as an opportunity for constructive coordination between transit providers and the public, but from her perspective, the chief concern is the fact that a TMA cannot directly receive funds to operate transit, but instead must utilize “pass-through” organizations. She shares Sherrin’s concern about a TMA directly competing with Mt. Hood Express for local dollars which are required as matching funds for federal grant funding.

Rick said that it is important to understand that the scope of a Mt. Hood TMA goes beyond Mt. Hood Express; Mt. Hood Express represents just one project. He also noted that TMAs have led efforts to form service districts such as transit districts.

Jon Tullis said that a major factor for considering an organization like a TMA is that Clackamas County may not be able to continue managing and securing funds for the Mt. Hood Express. Teresa said that she is not able to say how long the County would fund and support the Mt. Hood Express past a 2-4 year horizon; that is a decision to come from executive-level County officials and the elected representatives. Jon said that a TMA or special district’s priorities may best be thought of as short-term and long-term, with short-term being to ensure the Mt. Hood Express remains in service and long-term being major projects such as transportation hubs serving the mountain and the gondola.

Rick discussed two approaches to funding a TMA program budget: 1) “legs of a stool” which typically starts as a lump sum amount to be distributed between partners, and 2) the “widgets” approach which spreads costs across a larger user base (e.g. ski passes, parking stalls) with programs that align benefits and services.

Greg Leo (Mt. Hood Meadows) commented that there are important questions to answer in considering how to make an informed “go/no-go” decision for a TMA or similar organization:

The ski resorts are currently spending money in support of enhancing travel options, managing parking, etc. Is it being spent efficiently? Would a TMA be a means to spend that money more efficiently?

What scale of budget is appropriate for a TMA? Transit operations are on the large end of the budget spectrum; educational programs and website/phone apps, as examples, are on a different part of the budget spectrum.

Rick pointed to his prepared Draft Start Up Budget (3-year budget forecast) where in the first year there is a Feasibility Contribution (estimated at \$45,000), where a consultant produces a business plan which answers questions on the scale of the budget and the organizational model (e.g. number of staff, staff compensation, office space) which is the best fit. Rick said the TMA must identify all costs beyond operation of the organization.

Nick Rinard (Government Camp CPO) asked Rick how the benefits of TMA services (e.g. the “widgets”) can be sold to those homeowners who live outside of the area, as well as to those residents who do not want more people coming to Mt. Hood. Rick said that the TMA partners must consider the geography of their service benefit area to be able to capture service appropriate to that benefit. This is why a TMA with an assessment/improvement district may be a better option than a special service district – a TMA

service boundary could be focused on commercial/recreational services where the geography is bounded to the resorts and hospitality.

Joe Merrik (Clackamas County) commented that broadening the TMA vision should increase the opportunities for a TMA's funding and programs.

Jon Tullis asked Rick about what a typical TMA service area might be. Greg Leo said that the Warm Springs Tribes should be considered as part of the service area as there are Warm Springs residents who commute to the ski areas for work. George Fakaris (WFLD) mentioned that if Warm Springs was included, Tribal Transportation program dollars can be used as local match funds.

12:25 – 12:35 (Next Steps/Action Items)

The meeting ran over time in order to address next steps. Rick pointed to the four "fatal flaws" in TMA formation which must be understood:

- 1) Lack of Executive level participation
- 2) Lack of measurable benchmarks
- 3) Failure to commit to time necessary to assess feasibility and set consensus goals, targets, and priority projects
- 4) Failure to commit in advance (pending Go/No-go) that shared funding must be a key outcome of feasibility/formation process

Jon Tullis commented that defining the "legs of the stool" was an important next step, and that it should be considered that most public sector entities don't fit the "widgets" definition.

Mike Mason (ODOT) said that a key next step question is: who leads the TMA effort? Elizabeth additionally clarified that the MHMTP doesn't classify the TMA project (Project ID "Org-1") as a project ready for implementation. However, the project is a Group A project and can be moved into implementation if a project champion and funding sources are identified.

The TWG attendees discussed making a recommendation to the Project Management Team to fund analysis and work plan for the TMA. It was acknowledged that there is no budget in the MHMTP contract for the Feasibility Contribution (\$48,000) component Rick listed in the Draft TMA Budget.

The consensus from the TWG attendees was that the TMA Project needs to continue to be explored and that the \$48,000 Feasibility Contribution should be pursued among the project partners (primarily the ski resorts at this juncture).

END

Attachments:

Sign-in sheet