

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

APPENDIX F

Technical Working Group (TWG)

Meeting Minutes



Document: Summary of Technical Working Group (TWG) Meeting Minutes for TWG Meeting #1, TWG Meeting #2 Part 1, and TWG Meeting #2 Part 2

Date of Delivery:

TWG #1 – February 12, 2013

TWG #2, Part 1 – May 23, 2013

TWG #3, Part 2 – June 5, 2013

Description

This document includes the summary notes of TWG Meeting #1, TWG Meeting #2 (Part 1), and TWG Meeting #2 (Part 2). TWG Meetings 1 and 2 (Part 1) were held at the Mt. Hood National Forest Headquarters building in Sandy. TWG Meeting 2 (Part 2) was held at David Evans and Associates' Portland office.

The other TWG Meeting Minutes (TWG #4 and TWG #5) are found in Appendix C because they focused on the Transportation Management Association (TMA) project and related issues.

Status Update

The TWG Meetings were key points in the MHMTP process. They allowed the TWG to perform their established roles of reviewing information for accuracy and completeness, confirming baseline conditions, providing input on community issues and preferences, and providing information on projects to move forward in the MHMTP final list.

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

Meeting #1 Summary Notes

Mt. Hood National Forest HQ
16400 Champion Way
Sandy 97055



February 12, 2013, 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

1:30 – 1:40

The meeting was held at the Mt. Hood National Forest building in Sandy.

Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara (DEA) convened the meeting and began with a round of introductions.

Elizabeth then began the presentation portion of the meeting, covering the Mt. Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan (MHMTP) workplan and schedule, and then explaining the roles and responsibilities of the Technical Working Group (TWG). She emphasized the fact that the TWG is meant to review technical information for accuracy and completeness and provide input on community issues and preferences. She noted that the TWG was not convening to talk about solutions or make decisions.

1:40 – 2:20

Adam Argo (DEA) followed Elizabeth's part of the presentation with a summary of the travel options for baseline conditions within the project study area. For the travel options portion of the presentation, Adam began with findings of the key constraints to travel solutions along the Mt. Hood Corridor (US 26-OR 35 from Sandy to Hood River), based on the Site Visit interviews with key personnel conducted on January 23rd, 2013 and in a phone interview conducted January 31st. [DEA has documentation of all responses to interview questions available]

As Adam went through the travel options portion of the presentation, TWG members offered corrections to information in the slides and additional points:

- Correction to Visitation Data slide – should read “2.0 million annual visitors to Mt. Hood National Forest in 2003, 5.1 million on 2009” – the Consultant Team noted the need to verify the visitation numbers.
- Update to Destinations slide – Add Ski Bowl as an “All Seasons” destination (suggested by Hans Wipper of Ski Bowl)
- Update to Visitation (Capacity) slide – indicate 3,990 as carrying capacity for Timberline under Permitted Capacity (suggested by John Tullis of Timberline). There was clarification that “Persons At One Time (PAOT)” is the number of people that the resort is approved to have capacity for at one time through their approved master plan. It is not necessarily consistent with the number of parking spaces. To illustrate the point that Timberline ski area capacity is greater than the amount of parking spaces assuming (2.6 people per auto., John noted that when Timberline is parked-out (when visitors have to be turned away because of full parking lots) the lodge will still has capacity for approximately 800 additional PAOT to reach the current 3,990 carrying capacity. Hans Wipper noted that the Ski Bowl bus mode split of 10% seems very high
- Update to Transit (Public Providers) – Teresa Christopherson (Clackamas County, Managing Agent of Mountain Express bus transit) provided additional information regarding the USFS/County-sponsored Service Enhancement grant through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). If the grant is awarded, there will be new buses purchased (as well as capacity to lease additional buses) to extend service from where the Mountain Express currently ends at Rhododendron to Ski Bowl/Government Camp/Timberline Lodge. Ski Bowl and Timberline are both contributing up-front “bridge” money to supplement the Mountain Express Service Enhancement grant with intention to drop their funded shuttle services for employees. Teresa noted that the planned service enhancement has been enthusiastically supported by local-area groups advocating for the elderly and disabled.

- Teresa also noted that additional dollars in support of Mountain Express service enhancement may potentially come from ODOT Public Transit Division's Section 5311 (Rural and Non-Urbanized Area) Grant Program.
- Update to Transit (Recreation-Focused Service slide) – Hans Wipper noted that the Porch to Powder circulator service is free. Also, he gave a correction was to change "Snow Bunny" to "Summit" as one of the Porch to Powder stops. John Tullis noted that given the Fusion Bus and employee shuttle system serving Timberline, it is possible that Timberline's bus transit mode share is higher than the 5-6% reported. Hans commented that the Fusion Bus offers luxury accommodations to ticket purchasers.
- Update to Bikes/Pedestrians (Bicycle/Pedestrian Environment) slide - Joe Marek Clackamas County Traffic Engineer/Safety Program Manager) noted that the County is actively promoting bike access to trail systems within the County.
- When asked to comment on items the Consultant Team is missing or misunderstanding, Hans Wipper and John Tullis noted that lack of bus parking at Ski Bowl/Government Camp/Timberline is an issue needing to be mentioned.
- When Adam discussed ITS/Operations opportunities, Kirsten Pennington (ODOT Region 1 Planning Manager) wanted to be sure the TWG was aware of ODOT's programmed projects for the US 26/OR 35 corridors in 2014 and other improvement projects completed or planned in the next 1-2 years. ODOT is planning multimillion dollar ITS improvements. Adam directed the audience's attention to the "Safety Issues – Programmed Safety Projects" poster and slide version in the presentation which indicates these projects. He asked people to comment on the projects and add any we may be missing.

2:20 – 2:35

Scott Harmon followed Adam's portion of the presentation with a review of Safety Issues. Sue Dagnese (ODOT Region 1 Traffic Unit Manger) questioned the numbers indicated in the Overview of Crash Data slide.

2:45 – 3:30

Following a short break, Elizabeth directed audience members to choose among three "stations" for participation in the Values Exercise. Each station group was facilitated by the Consultant Team members (Elizabeth, Scott, and Adam) and asked an identical set of four questions to provide answers for as the facilitators wrote them out. Each station had a designated spokesperson to relate their group's answers to the questions at the conclusion of the exercise. The results are summarized following this page.

Elizabeth concluded the meeting with an outline of next steps to follow (points listed in the concluding slide of the presentation):

- Incorporate TWG input into Baseline Conditions
- Present at PMT Meeting #2
- Finalize Baseline Conditions
- Information gathering and analysis from TWG in support of MHMTP Implementation Framework
- TWG Meeting #2 to review implementation issues

Values Exercise - Major Themes

1. In 10 years, what changes do you envision on the mountain for transportation and safety?

TABLE 1:

- *SkiBowl – Timberline tram*
- *More tourism*
- *More year round tourism*
- *Development at Gov't Camp*
- *Safety education*
- *TDM promotion/education*
- *Personal technology, e.g. user- interfacing apps*
- *More real-time information/interfacing for transit*
- *Heightened ITS/safety implementation*
- *Staggered shifts/spreading the peak hour*
- *Flexible operations*

TABLE 2:

- *More P&R – below snow line*
- *Additional WB travel lane*
- *Tram*
- *Public transit*
- *Private transit*
- *Increased parking*
- *Downward trend in crashes*
- *Less congestion*
- *Transit friendly summer recreation*
- *More law enforcement*
- *Improved pedestrian & bicycle crossing of 26 in Government Camp*
- *Transit agency for mountain*
- *Improved cell communication (dead spots)*
- *Snow park capacity*

TABLE 3:

- *Extend Mt. Hood Express*
- *P&R System Private/Public*
 - *Partnerships PP*
 - ◆ *Govy*
- *Better Bike Connection*
 - *Government Camp – Welches*
 - *Sandy Corridor*
- *TMA*
 - *Transit District*
 - *Transit Authority – Access to Federal \$*
- *Parking Solved*
 - *Access*
- *Link Land Use & Transportation*
- *Potentially overnight accommodations – Government Camp*
- *Land swap to allow expansion of development north of Government Camp*
- *Better connection Government Camp to Timberline (Team?)*
- *Loop road Government Camp intersection interchange/US 26*
- *Off-ramp to Multopor E*
- *Better comprehensive community vision*

2. Fill in the blank “Any project that moves forward to implementation must _____”

TABLE 1:

- *Improved safety/capacity – integrate all elements*
- *Have widespread support*
- *Public/private partnership*
- *Balance travel markets*
- *Balance natural area vs built solutions*
- *Fiscally realistic*
- *Balancing cost – benefit*
- *Shouldn't subtract/degrade from existing infrastructure*

TABLE 3:

- *Decrease crashes*
- *Improve safety*
- *Provide better access to the mountain*
- *Be funded*
- *Improve efficiency of resources – vehicle occupancy*
- *Reduce reliance on single occupancy*
- *Multimodal considerations*
- *ODOT support, LCD support, local & State support for implementation*

TABLE 2:

- *Sustainable fiscal, operations, maintenance*
- *Support economic development*
- *Effective projects*
- *Multiple benefits*

3. The top 3 things that should be considered when selecting projects are _____

TABLE 1:

- *Safety*
- *Capacity – but noted that given goal is mobility*
- *Maintain balance between natural features/areas and economic active*

TABLE 2:

- *Safety*
- *Environment*
- *Parking*
- *Political will*
- *Fiscally feasible*

TABLE 3:

- *Funding*
- *Safety*
- *Intuitional commitment*
- *Implementable*
- *NEPA process*
- *Increase access & mobility*
- *Pedestrian environment improved*

4. If I could pick one type of project (or specific project that would best reflect my needs or my constituents' needs, I would pick _____

TABLE 1:

- *Expanding public transit*
- *A project that increases mobility & is cost effective*
- *Safety improvements/specific locations*
- *Gov't Camp transportation hub*
- *Maintenance preservation of existing infrastructure*

TABLE 3:

- *Safety – all modes*
- *Transportation demand management – alternate modes*
- *Alternative transportation*

TABLE 2: (Ran out of time)

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan TECHINICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) Meeting #1

Mt. Hood National Forest HQ
16400 Champion Way
Sandy 97055



February 12, 2013, 1:30 PM - 3:30 PM

SIGN IN SHEET

NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	EMAIL
Elizabeth Mues O'Hara	CONSULTANT PM	DEA	exm@deainc.com
Dan Schwanz	Executive Dir	Hood River County Trans	ca+z@gonje.net
Shearin Coleman	RTC	ODOT - Public Trans	
Levi Mastromonte	Senior Planner	Clack Co. - DTD	lorim@clackamas.us
Scott Turvey	Project + Mobility Mgr.	MCEDD	scott@mcedd.org
DAN KEMPF	TRIN. TRANS MANAGER	METRO/ODOT	DANIEL.KEMPF@METRO.OREGON.GOV
HANS WIPPER	PUBLIC RELATIONS	MT. HOOD SKIBOWL	HANS@GO.SKIBOWL.COM
MIKE BURKART	TRAFFIC INV.	ODOT	MICHAEL.BURKART@ODOT.STATE.OR.US
Tom Keenan	Executive	Keenan & Partners	HKeenan@Keenanandpartners.com
Doug Baumgartner	Traffic Analyst	ODOT	douglas.g.baumgartner@ODOT.STATE.OR.US
Kirsten		ODOT	
Joseph March	Traffic Engineer	Clackamas County	joe.m@co.clackamas.or.us
Teresa Christy Johnson	Admin Services Manager	Clackamas Co.	teresachr@co.clackamas.or.us
Don Wiley	County Engineer	Hood River Co.	don.wiley@co.hood-river.or.us
Jim McNamee	tmm	ODOT/Boycamp	james.k.mcnamee@ODOT
SUSAN LAW	FHWA-WFL	Planning Team Leader	Susan.law@dot.gov
Julie Stephens	City of Sandy Transit	Transit Mgr	jstephens@cityofsandy.com
Rithy Bein	Civil Engineer	MHNF	rbein@fs.fed.us
Jon Tullis	Dir Public Affairs	Timberline	j.tullis@timberlineodge.com
Tom Torres	Eng	USFS	
Adam Aron	Transportation	DEA	ala@deainc.com

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

Meeting #2 Part 1 Summary Notes

Mt. Hood National Forest HQ
16400 Champion Way
Sandy 97055

May 23, 2013, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

10:00 – 10:10

The meeting was held at the Mt. Hood National Forest building in Sandy.

Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara (DEA) convened the meeting and began with a round of introductions.

Elizabeth then began the presentation portion of the meeting, covering the Mt. Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan (MHMTP) workplan and schedule, and then explaining the roles and responsibilities of the Technical Working Group (TWG). She emphasized the fact that the TWG is meant to review technical information for accuracy and completeness and provide input on community issues and preferences. She noted that the TWG was not convening to talk about solutions or make decisions.

10:10 – 10:30

It was noted amongst the TWG that there was no MHNF representation at the meeting (Rithy Bein was present for a portion of the meeting).

Elizabeth reiterated the Project Core Values and Project Management Team (PMT) process of rating projects/getting winnowed-down list.

Elizabeth noted results from the survey:

- Over 700 respondents
- Transit important
- Cell phone coverage

Jon Tullis (Timberline) asked the question of whether or not parking is considered a core value. He commented that increasing parking should be embedded into the project values. Elizabeth noted it is implied and embedded in core values (e.g., safety).

Tom Keenan (SkiBowl) said parking is a core value related to safety.

Elizabeth explained the Technical Working Group roles and responsibilities and charge for this meeting: to inform implementation aspects of this project. She noted that the TWG should use comment cards to address concerns.

Danielle (Clackamas County Tourism) said this is not a typical planning project that she has worked on. Why is it only 15 year horizon? She believes the project time span should be longer. There should be a section in the plan for longer-term projects, and a mandate that there should be regular review every few years. This section would be a place for "other longer term strategies" that we keep on the horizon. Please pass this suggestion on to the PLG. Elizabeth explained the shorter timeline was settled on, because the plan is focused on implementation of projects in the near term.

10:30 – 10:45

Elizabeth explained rolling nature of plan and some background context of how to make the plan achievable. She and the DEA team (Adam Argo and Scott Harmon) handed out Implementation Matrix document, the worksheet key, and explained the Mode/Topic categories.

Kirsten Pennington (ODOT) pointed out that the Implementation Framework (Matrix) is to help inform PLG.

Jon Tullis said there are too many safety projects versus the number of transit projects, though it was acknowledged that it appears that way because the Safety projects are on the front page of the Matrix handout.

Dan Kaempf (ODOT, Portland Metro) commented safety has to be a part for successful implementation of travel option projects.

Susan Law (FHWA-WFL) noted PMT has weighed both Travel Options projects and Safety projects.

Mike Mason (ODOT) noted just looking at the Matrix project list can be misleading.

Danielle (Clackamas County Tourism) said the project descriptions, modes and Implementation Requirement sections of the matrix all need more context and explanation. Also, the low, medium and high level of difficulty ratings need to be better explained. High level of "concern" is ambiguous.

Kirsten provided additional context regarding the MHMTP project charge.

Jon Tullis asked how long the TWG is sustained during the project; how long is the process? He also asked where the TWG fit into the project hierarchy. The TWG will meet in Phase 2 of the project, as well. That phase has not been scoped, but should be done by the end of the year.

Kirsten noted the PMT was in attendance at this meeting.

Will Ewing (ODOT Maintenance): rumble strips placed in areas where the shoulders are too narrow will cause difficulties and decrease safety for people biking. Don't place rumble strips in areas where shoulders need to be widened -- unless we do both at the same time

Elizabeth explained that the remaining portion of the TWG Meeting #2 would be spend with groups split to the Travel Options/ITS/other projects table or Safety/Bike and Ped projects table.

10:10 – 10:30

Transit Options Break-out Discussion:

Adam Argo led participants through the projects under Public/Private Transit, TSM/ITS, Parking and Organizations, Programs, and Legislation in the Matrix. Elizabeth co-moderated as Adam entered notes/feedback into the electronic Matrix spreadsheet.

TMA

- Unknown commenter: Regarding the TMA: what are the underlying needs and interests? The TMA mission needs to be defined.
- Hans Wipper (Ski Bowl): The TMA should run the public transportation element of the plan.
- Unknown: Maybe there should be a transit district. Parking management plus transit are key issues to take on for a TMA.
- Several TWG members: There seemed to be agreement that the Mt Hood Transportation Alliance, which grew out of the Forest Service Study, would be the basis for a TMA or some type of transportation management group.

Sno Park Fees

- Unknown: Why fees? Variable fees could be used to help pay for transportation demand management measures.
- Jon Tullis: getting the legislature to look at this would be very controversial and difficult. He said the entire Sno Park fee system was almost lost during the past year.

Gondola

- Unknown: Call it an Aerial Transportation Link (ATL) rather than Gondola.
- Several TWG members: There was agreement that: funding is private, some grants might be available.
- Tom Keenan: The ski areas have consulted with the developer/developer of the OHSU tram.
- Several TWG members: Permitting: Full NEPA/EIS process. But this is tied to the Mt Hood Meadows/Forest Service land swap. The swap must be completed first before environmental work is done. An aerial transportation system would need a Special Use Permit from the Forest Service (for the footings etc.). It would need an ODOT Access Permit.
- Hans Wipper: Process for building the ATS:
 - Land Swap completed
 - EIS
 - Build
- Hans Wipper: The ski areas would welcome any funding or partnerships with agencies (recognizing that overall funding is private).

- Larry Olson (ODOT District 2C Manager) asked about corridor-wide versus locally-focused project; is one prioritized over the others?

Safety Projects Break-out Discussion:

Scott Harmon led the participants through Safety and Bike/Pedestrian projects in the Matrix. Overall the group agreed with the data in the Matrix. They modified the descriptions of some of the projects to provide more detail and asked that we provide a landmark type location description for all mile post locations as only ODOT folks seem to know where the MP locations are. The safety location map was very helpful. It was noted that some of the safety projects, specifically the rumble strips, may actually have a negative impact on bike use as the additional safety features may use space on the shoulder or reduce the available shoulder width. In some cases, the City projects may negate the need for a project listed in the matrix.

- Clackamas County would like the Still Creek Suspension Bridge near Road 10 in Rhododendron added to the project list. The bridge has relatively high pedestrian use, as it provides a direct connection to a local store, but the bridge is in need of repair.
- Projects in City of Sandy should be coordinated with local street signal and circulation improvements.

12 Noon

Elizabeth adjourned the meeting with acknowledgement from ODOT and TWG participants that another meeting was necessary to work through the remaining projects in the Implementation Framework Matrix.

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

TECHINICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

Meeting #2

Mt. Hood National Forest HQ
 16400 Champion Way
 Sandy 97055



May 23, 2013, 10:00AM - NOON

SIGN IN SHEET

NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	EMAIL
Dan Schwamy	Ex. Dir	Hood River County Transp	Dist cat1@gorgo.net
Doug Baumgartner	Traffic Analyst	ODOT	douglas.g.baumgartner@ odot.state.or.us
MIKE MASON	Planning	ODOT	Michael.W.Mason@ odot.
Danielle Cowan	Ex Director	Clack Co Tourism	danielle@mt Hood kintony.com
Tereca Christopherson	Admin Services Mgr	Clack Co. Social services	tereac@clackamas.or.us
DAVID KAEUMPF	TRANS. MANAGER	MEIRO	DAVID.KAEUMPF@meiro.com
Jan Tullis	Dir. of Public Affairs	RLK @ Timberline	jtullis@timberlineadge.com
Karen Buehry	Trans Plan Supervisor	Clackamas	—
LARRY OLSON	DIST. 2C MGR	ODOT	larry.olson@odot.state.or.us
SUSAN LAW	PTWA - WFL	PLANNING TEAM LEADER	SUSAN.LAW@MTGW
Tom Keenan	Consultant	Keenan & Partners	tkeenan@keenanandpartners.com
HANS WIPPER	PUBLIC RELATIONS	MT. HOOD SKIBOWL	HANS@GO.SKIBOWL.COM
Joseph Mavak	Traffic Engineer	Clackamas County	joseph@co.clackamas.or.us
Scott Turney	Mobility Manager	MLEDD	Scott@medd.org
MIKE BURCHETT	TRAFFIC REG 1	ODOT	MICHAEL.BURCHETT@ODOT.STATE.OR.US
Rithy Bein	ARCHITECT Engr	MHNF	rbein@fs.fed.us
Andi Howell	Transit Assistant	City of Sandy	ahowell@cityofsandy.com
J. Mastriantonio	CLACK Sr Planner	Clack Co	lorim@clackamas.or.us

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

Meeting #2 Part 2 Summary Notes

David Evans and Associates (DEA), Inc.
2100 SW River Parkway
Portland, OR 97201

June 5, 2013, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

1:00 – 1:10

The meeting was held at David Evans and Associates (DEA) Portland Office.

Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara (DEA) convened the meeting and began with a reminder to attendees that the purpose of the meeting was to work through the remaining projects in the Implementation Framework Matrix.

1:10 – 3:00

The group worked through the following MHMTP Projects (by Project ID): PubT-1, PubT-2, PubT3, PubT-4, PriT-1, Park-2, Park-3, ITS-3, PB-1, and PB-4.

Main points brought up by the group on the projects in their current definition include:

- PubT-2 (Public transit extension of Mountain Express service to the ski areas) – Tom Keenan (Ski Bowl) commented that the contribution to Mountain Express by Ski Bowl and Timberline is annual. Larry Olsen (ODOT) said that the long-term goal of this project needs to be to connect public transit to Mt. Hood Meadows.
- PubT-3 (Public Transit transfer hub) – Danielle Cowan (Clackamas County Tourism) commented that there is a good candidate for a hub in Welches which could be serviced by Clackamas County as a park-and-ride and which could receive Clackamas County investment dollars. Multiple people noted that the site is also a candidate for ODOT “Enhance-It” program funding. The site could be a true regional hub and may be invested in as a public-private partnership program. It was acknowledged that establishment of a hub in Government Camp would be more difficult.
- PriT-1 (Intra-forest transit service on Mt. Hood with transfer hub on the mountain) – it was noted by the group that the impetus behind this concept was to benefit ski resort parking and operations; as such, this project requires a public-private partnership. Making this a private-only project would make the concept unlikely to move through the MHMTP project process.
- Park-2 (Sno-Park Management/Enforcement) and Park-3 (Parking education) – the group agreed that these two projects are related and could be consolidated to one project. Dan Kaempff (ODOT, Portland Metro) said that these projects present an opportunity to employ demand management technology.

Elizabeth concluded the meeting, mentioning that the TWG comments are to be incorporated for the Project Management Team (PMT) to consider for their upcoming meeting where projects will be evaluated for inclusion in the final MHMTP project list.

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

TECHINICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)

Meeting #2 - Part 2

David Evans and Associates, Inc.
 2100 SW River Parkway
 Portland, OR 97201



June 5, 2013, 1:00 PM - 3:00 PM

SIGN IN SHEET

NAME	TITLE	COMPANY	EMAIL
Don Wiley	County Engineer	Hood River Co	
Mike Mann	Planner	ODOT	
MIKE BURKETT	Traffic	ODOT	
Dan Schwanz	Transportation	Hood River County Trans Dist	
JAW KAEMPF	TRANS. MANAGER	METRO / ODOT	
Tom Keenan	Consultant	Mt Hood Skibow	tkeenan@keenanandpartners.com
Danielle Goun	Clack Co	Ex Dir Tonsen	danielle@mt Hood Territory.com
LARRY OLSON	DIST. MGR	ODOT	larry.olson@odot.state.or.us
AVE TAYAR	ODOT Reg. 1 Traffic	ODOT	ABRIHAM.TAYAR
Teresa Christopher	Admin Services Co. mgr	Clackamas Co Social Services	teresa chr @ co. clackamas. or. US