

**Meeting Notes**  
**Transportation System**  
**Group Meeting #5**  
**July 23, 2014**

This meeting included:

- A message from Executive Board Member Andy Beerman
- Vision and Goals: Polling Results
- Metrics: Discussion and Polling
- Mapping Exercise on Idealized Systems

### Executive Board Message

Regarding cost, Michael Gallis recently gave a presentation to the Accord Executive Committee and reminded the group of the thought to “remember your mission.” Phase I of Mountain Accord: our mission is to create a vision and ideal scenarios. Think big now. There will be a way to pay for it from a combination of a variety of sources. Use common sense.

### Vision and Goals Polling Results

Jon Nepstad introduced the vision statement which was revised after the last SG meeting and which the members voted on via Survey Monkey after the last meeting.

#### Vision Polling: 30 Participated

- 1) Concur (70%)
- 2) Concur with minor point of contention (23.3%)
- 3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (0%)
- 4) Dissent (3.3%)
- 5) Waive or Abstain (3.3%)

*Comments from members that dissented or that disagreed with outcome but consent to move forward:*

- Related to the issue of cost brought up at the last meeting. Feel the vision needs to include a statement about “cost effectiveness” or “not a burden to the tax payer.” This person also has the same concern with the Goals.
- Andrew Gruber added that it is absolutely essential that cost be included in the discussion. The question is when and how--independently in transportation, or later as part of a broader group discussion?
- Vision statement has “dynamic and sustainable” (envr., economically, social, etc. sustainability). We should think about sustainability in a broad view.
- There needs to be a description as to why we are doing this. Broader context. We can add an introduction to this statement.
- The statement lacks a statement of air quality. This is a key issue.

Goals: Group was polled on Goals via Survey Monkey after the last System Group meeting.

### **Goals Polling: 30 Participated**

- 1) Concur (84.6%)
- 2) Concur with minor point of contention (11.5%)
- 3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (0%)
- 4) Dissent (3.85%)
- 5) Waive or Abstain (0%)

*Comments from members that dissented or that disagreed with outcome but consent to move forward:*

There was a lengthy discussion about cost by the group. It was proposed to include an order of magnitude cost analysis during the Ideal Scenario phase. There were differing opinions regarding using cost as a screening tool here, or in the NEPA (Phase II) phase. Some thought it best to “think big” while others were concerned about how to pay for something [expensive] that may come out of this first phase as a recommendation. It was suggested that the group figure out what is best for the system, then worry about cost. Finally, for cost, for anything the group prepares/proposes, the team should include capital, operating, and user cost.

### **Metrics Discussion and Polling**

Goal 2, Metric 1. This metric needs to be more specific to stating the problem (largely avalanches).

Goal 2, Metric 2. Parking is difficult (Robin). Lots of times it is designed to reach a larger objective.

[Aside] Travel time is not included anywhere. Response: Travel time is built into other elements in terms of competitive travel time. If we achieve mode shift or higher transit, then we achieve it.

Goal 3, Metric 2. Clarify: avalanche. Ingress/egress.

Goal 3. Add a metric to address air quality (Copy the Environment System Group Air Quality metric).

Goal 4. Leave it better, not the same. Recreation is also an “intrinsic value” and is not incorporated in these metrics. There is nothing in any metric addressing recreation, yet transportation is a key component of the recreation experience. Add Recreation areas to this metric.

Metrics were revised in the SG meeting and were voted on by the group.

### **Metrics Polling: 31 Participated**

- 1) Concur (48%)
- 2) Concur with minor point of contention (45%)
- 3) Disagree with outcome but consent to move forward (3%)
- 4) Dissent (3%)
- 5) Waive or Abstain (0%)

*There were no comments from members that dissented or that disagreed with outcome but consent to move forward.*

### **Mapping Exercise on Idealized Systems**

Time ran out and the groups weren't able to break into groups. Rather, Jeff Heilman explained the handouts and the mapping exercise and how we will get to the Ideal Scenario in the next three months. Members were assigned homework to review the distributed information and come prepared to come next time and work on a charrette.

An interim meeting will be scheduled by Jon Nepstad to work through ideas.

### **Action Items**

- Develop a narrative to support the Vision and each Goal and Metric.
- Include glossary (susceptible, operational, capacity)
- Goal 3. Add a metric to address air quality. Copy the Env. SG air quality metric.
- Email revised Vision, Goals, Metrics to group.
- Schedule and interim Transportation System Group working session.