

Mount Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan

APPENDIX C

TMA Materials (3 of 4)



Document: Summary of Mt. Hood Transportation Alliance/Technical Working Group (TWG) Meeting #4

Date of Delivery: October 23, 2013

Description

This document includes the summary notes of the Mt. Hood Transportation Alliance/TWG Meeting #4 held October 23, 2013, at the Mt. Hood National Forest headquarters building in Sandy, Oregon.

Rick Williams of the project consultant team presented an overview and best practices of Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) to the Mt. Hood Transportation Alliance. The outcome of the meeting was consensus from the Mt. Hood Transportation Alliance and the TWG to further explore formation of a 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

MT. HOOD TRANSPORTATION ALLIANCE/TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) #4

Meeting Summary Notes

Mt. Hood National Forest HQ
16400 Champion Way
Sandy 97055

October 23, 2013, 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

1:00 – 1:10

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

Teresa Christopherson (Clackamas County Social Services, Mt. Hood Express) convened the meeting and began with a round of introductions.

1:10 – 2:10

Adam Argo (DEA) then began the presentation for the Consultant Team's portion of the meeting. The main presentation topics were:

- 1) An update on the Mt. Hood Multimodal Transportation Plan (MHMTP, or "Plan"). Adam led this discussion.
- 2) An overview of Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) and the issues around forming a TMA. Consultant Rick Williams led this discussion.

Adam provided an update on recent outcomes and next steps for the MHMTP. Susan Law (FHWA-WFL) suggested Adam provide those in attendance who are not part of the Technical Working Group some background on the MHMTP. Adam cited the MHMTP's focus on strategies to promote travel options and safety. Kirsten Pennington (ODOT) spoke briefly to provide helpful context; mentioning how the MHMTP was an outcome of the 2009 Omnibus Public Land Management Act (Wilderness Bill) and how the MHMTP ties to previous studies and plans.

Adam mentioned there are projects in the Plan for which the lead organization has been identified (e.g. the four Project Partners: ODOT, Mt. Hood National Forest (MNF), Clackamas County, Hood River County) and there are projects for which a TMA may be necessary in order for those projects to be implemented, as there is no single agency to lead those projects. Instead, these projects require funding and support from both private and public partners.

Adam turned the presentation over to Rick Williams.

Rick talked through the slides he prepared for the presentation, which ended in a slide with discussion questions for the meeting attendees, allowing the last 20 minutes of the Consultant Team's allotted time for interactive discussion. The main topics for Rick's portion of the presentation were:

- 1) What is a TMA?
- 2) Benefits of a TMA
- 3) Summary of Success Factors
- 4) Questions to the Group
 - Is there consensus on what the purpose of a TMA would be for Mt. Hood? Are there factors for success in place to reach consensus on the feasibility of a TMA?
 - Is there a champion(s) that will step forward to make this happen?

- Will the partners be willing to put in the time and money to make a TMA a success? Is a collective approach better than separate entities?

Rick was asked how targeted outcomes for the Lloyd TMA (Portland) are measured. Rick responded that this is done through annual surveys, tracking of vacancy rates, building development, traffic counts, and assessment of building (property) values. The Lloyd TMA Member Businesses pay the TMA for providing these assessment and data collection services.

Jon Tullis (Timberline Lodge) asked Rick if dues-paying members are a required component of TMAs. Rick noted that there are several different organizational models; typically, a TMA is funded through a mixture of grant funding and some amount of member organization support funding, which can be dues or fees for a provided service.

Woody Hoye (Mt. Hood Meadows) asked Rick if a TMA is a membership organization and what the criteria is for membership. Rick said TMAs are member organizations and that the Board of Directors determines criteria for membership.

Greg Leo (Mt. Hood Meadows) asked Rick (and the audience in general) if a special district would be more effective than a TMA for garnering steady funds and carrying out the projects and programs being discussed. Rick said that in reality, there isn't a difference in effectiveness of funding generation between a TMA versus a special district; rather, the difference comes down to the fact that the establishment of a special district would require a community vote and a TMA would not.

Julie Stephens (City of Sandy Transit) commented that in weighing a special district versus a TMA, a district would be unlikely to get voter approval.

Dan Schwanz (Columbia Area Transit) commented that a special transit district can get federal dollars. Both Greg Leo and Dan noted that a special district allows for the leveraging of grants and partner agency match funding. Dan also commented that the boundaries of such a district are key to the amount of funding.

Sherrin Coleman (ODOT) commented that commissioning a special district doesn't guarantee grants/partner match funding, and that in fact special districts are hard to fund. She said there are recently formed special districts in Oregon which have yet to receive any public funding.

Jon Tullis asked Rick if TMAs have been successful in areas like Mt. Hood where there are several unincorporated town/villages (or "hamlets"). Rick indicated that yes, there are TMAs serving resort areas having a number of villages like in the Mt. Hood area which have been effective.

Woody commented that while villages don't have local governance authority per se, it could be perceived as a benefit that they have Board Members on a TMA. Rick said that this is a good point but that a Board needs to ensure it has Members who can make decisions at the policy level.

Audience members generally thought that there are two fundamental questions relating to the proper organization/entity:

- Who is served by the organization?
- Who is paid/receiving benefit?

A special district is best when those that vote for it receive the benefit. In the case of Mt. Hood area, benefits of the projects needing an organization are geared to customers/visitors.

Nick Rinard (Gov't Camp Community Planning Organization President) commented that Gov't Camp has formed a special roads district.

Tom Keenan (SkiBowl) said that, speaking on behalf of SkiBowl, he supports exploration of a TMA.

Greg Leo said that he believes there is consensus on going forward with forming a Mt. Hood-area TMA based on history. The feasibility of creating an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) has been a long-running issue which hasn't seen any results.

Woody asked if there are examples of TMA bylaws and funding/budgeting processes. Mike Mason (ODOT) noted that the MHMTP Scope of Work accounts for Rick providing some TMA-related information.

Rick was asked if TMA Board Members need limited liability insurance. Rick indicated that yes, this was standard practice.

Woody asked if area transportation service providers (e.g. TriMet in Portland) participate on TMA Boards. Rick responded that generally, yes, transit agencies have representatives on TMA Boards. Alternately, transit providers may provide in-kind services for a TMA. Rick noted the understanding is "we all have skin the game" when it comes to respective organizational missions and targeted outcomes.

Julie Stephens commented that as an operations manager for transit service who is also responsible for writing and securing grants, she sees benefit of an organization model such as a TMA, which can assume the work of grant writing and allow for her focus on day-to-day operations. She also said that a successful organization (be it TMA or service district) would be one that can assess a 10-year horizon of sustainable funding.

Teresa Christopherson (Clackamas County Social Services, Mt. Hood Express) said that while Clackamas County Community Social Services is supportive of the advancement of management alternatives, their core competency does not include managing the operation of transit service or a TMA.

Several members of the Alliance commented that in addition to the formation of a TMA, the question needs to be addressed on the long-term strategy of creating an ACT. There were extended comments on the effectiveness of each of the management alternatives (special districts, ACT, or a sub component of an ACT, and TMAs). More information needs to be explored as to the efficacy of these alternatives as it relates to the goals of the MHMTP.

To conclude the Consultant Team's portion of the meeting, KC Cooper (DEA) asked the Alliance members if they would support and participate in a management entity: the consensus of the Alliance is that the formation of a TMA or other alternative should be further investigated. The audience agreed that it should be further investigated.

END

Next Steps/Action Items

The Consultant Team was asked to send the following materials on TMAs:

- The spreadsheet of transit case study interviews conducted by ODOT which include TMAs
- Additional links/information on TMAs based on an email Adam sent KC Cooper earlier in 2013
- Example "templates" of TMA bylaws and funding/budgeting procedures