

Commute Trip Reduction Board
Meeting Summary
July 24, 2009

Statewide Videoconference
WSDOT HQ, Olympia
WSDOT UCO/Goldsmith Bldg., Seattle
WSDOT Regional HQ, Vancouver
WSDOT Regional HQ, Spokane
WSDOT Regional HQ, Yakima

Board Members Present: Brian Lagerberg (Olympia), Ted Horobiowski (Spokane), Aurora Crooks (Olympia), Kim Becklund (Seattle), Bill Roach (Seattle), Mike Harbour (Olympia), Peter Hurley (Seattle), Joyce Phillips (Olympia), Charlie Howard (Seattle), Matt Hansen (Seattle), Robin Rettew (Olympia), and Page Scott (Yakima).

Board Members Not Present: Marilyn Young Skogland, Lynn Frosch, Liz Warman, and Matt Ransom.

WSDOT Staff: Keith Cotton (Olympia), Kathy Johnston (Olympia), Joan Cullen (Olympia), Ron Gross (Olympia), and Jef Lucero (Olympia).

Audience: Diane Wiatr, City of Tacoma (Olympia); Mark Melnyk, Community Transit (Seattle); and Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council (Olympia).

Introductions and board business

Brian began by introducing Joan Cullen, who has been hired as the State Agency CTR Program Manager at WSDOT. He then talked about the Partners In Progress document, which was prepared in conjunction with a visit from the National Secretary of Transportation. He noted that CTR has a prominent place at the front of this 45 page document. Bill asked that it be distributed or made available online. Brian replied that he would follow up with Lloyd Brown, WSDOT's Communications Director, to see about its availability. Brian then mentioned that Intercity Transit has received the 2009 Outstanding Public Transportation System Achievement Award. Mike noted that the local award ceremony will be in Olympia on August 4. The public is welcome to attend.

June meeting summary

Motion: A motion was entertained to approve the June meeting summary. The motion carried.

Public Comment

Diane Wiatr gave an update on the Tacoma GTEC, which recently received a \$150,000 Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant (EECBG). The City also just got \$500,000 for implementation of its strategic mobility master plan, and they've also applied for another \$500,000 in grants. Matt Hansen added that King County Metro received \$150,000 in EECBG funding.

WSDOT Update

Keith began by going over some of the staff changes and transitions within the Public Transportation Division at WSDOT. Two new positions—CTR Specialist and Rideshare Program Manager— will soon be hired. Keith added that his goal is to have the CTR Specialist begin on August 16, and the Rideshare Program Manager on September 1.

Casey Kanzler then reviewed the status of the RideshareOnline project update. He noted that the beta launch is scheduled for October 26, with a soft launch scheduled for December 31. The project is on time, and the vendor has been updating and upgrading the base software while going through the requirements gathering process. Brian asked about when the requirements gathering process will be complete. Casey replied that it should be complete within two weeks. Peter asked about the status of Oregon and other states in the region. Casey replied that five states—Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming—are on board and engaged, adding that the launch date is the same for all five states.

Brian then talked about a TDM research project to establish demand management targets in major corridors. 520 is a case study for this project. WSDOT is working with a consultant to develop a suite of TDM target development methodologies that can be tailored to specific projects. This federally funded research project will be completed in September. Tight timeline helps keep the focus on applying specific objectives and achieving meaningful results. Brian noted that this work is very important, because in an era of tightening project budgets, it will be critical to demonstrate not only results but how TDM supports the overall objective of the project as well.

Robin asked about linkages with the financial planning process, adding that it's important to make sure it's integrated and not a separate, parallel process. Charlie replied that the urban partnership's immediate TDM focus is working with existing GTECs to market 520's additional transit service. He added there is a delicate balance between providing transportation alternatives and having enough travelers financing the bonds, as preliminary modeling indicates many commuters will shift to transit once tolling begins along 520.

Matt Hansen asked whether this study can be seen as means of "operationalizing" the TDM component of the Moving Washington strategies in a replicable way. Brian replied that it's not just the goal to accomplish that at the project level but in a broader sense as well. He added that WSDOT will set numerical targets, make the investments to reach them, and manage the strategies implemented to ensure they'll be reached.

Brian noted that identifying the strategies and goals is the focus for now, because without knowing what the goal is, it's difficult to know how much to invest. He mentioned a few of the full range of strategies, noting that it was important to first cast the net widely and work back to those which are measurable and manageable. One approach he mentioned was looking at filling the empty seats on buses and other vehicles. Aurora mentioned that she favored that approach as a concept the board should focus on more.

Peter then went over the CRC TDM plan, which has been taking shape over the last year. The CRC team has developed a three-phase program: 1) Preconstruction, which amounts to getting the TDM program up to speed; 2) Construction, which maximizes TDM through the range of strategies through adaptive management practices; and 3) Post-construction, which is more difficult to project due to the length of the project construction period.

Bill asked about the vanpool component of the TDM plan. Peter replied that neither transit agency has a robust vanpool program but that both are looking to expand their operations. Matt Hansen noted that vanpool programs often have a better chance when the transit system has a stake in those programs, adding that vanpool is a key metric to

success and funding. Peter noted that the majority of the vanpool market is on the Washington side, adding that C-TRAN appears committed to implementing stronger programs in a substantive way. Bill mentioned that several years ago Portland helped advance the concept of vanpool in its earliest stages, and asked why Tri-Met's focus has shifted away from vanpool. Peter suggested that land use reasons—light rail, bus service, etc.—may have played a role, adding that he would go back and look and when that transition occurred.

Peter then talked about the finance component of the CRC TDM plan, which includes a range of capital and operating expenses, both before and during construction. The recommendation will be to fund a number of funding avenues, including through the project itself. This will insure that TDM is included in the regular funding requests. He added that the next steps are to take this through the project sponsors council in September, integrating TDM into the project budget, and integrating TDM targets into the performance measures group. Peter noted that the project sponsors requested that a performance measures advisory group be established. That group's recommendations are due in December.

Kim asked if there are other places around the country doing this. Bill recalled a multimodal project in Denver called T-REX. Matt volunteered to gather information about the program and send it out to the board. He then noted that, in a hearing before a Senate sub-committee, the US Secretary of Transportation placed increasing commuter choices toward the top of a list of strategies for better air quality and reduced fuel consumption. Matt also mentioned some current federal bills, suggesting that if board members are working with federal relations people, they should talk to them about these. Matt will also distribute a white paper he prepared for ACT.

Robin volunteered to circulate most current PowerPoint presentation for Clean-TEA/Next-TEA (federal transportation reauthorization). She also talked about the Washington Transportation Plan and the notion of tying funding to measures. A third initiative underway is the JTC finance study, which the Board should keep an eye on. Bill talked about Representative Baird's mild interest in ACT a few years ago, suggesting that he might be interested in receiving some information. Peter volunteered to talk to Matt Ransom about Vancouver's efforts to brief the Southwest Washington Congressional delegation.

Legislative Discussion & Report

Kim began by saying that she and Liz have some dates in mid-August to meet with Sen. Haugen, Rep. Clibborn, and others. She noted that it is nearing time to start thinking about 2011, and plans to reconvene the Legislative committee in September. Aurora mentioned that Ron Kusler, who heads the Spokane GTEC, met with a state senator this week. She added that the meeting proved to be a great opportunity to do some of the reminding and reeducating that the Board often talks about, and was a good reminder that a constant dialogue with legislators is necessary for keeping this in front of them.

Bill asked if there are key committee members who the local jurisdictions should be meeting with. Kim replied that those who have GTECs in their district should always be looking to engage with their legislators. She added that it's always good to talk to "transit-friendly legislators," citing Sen. Murray and Rep. Simpson as good examples. Kim mentioned that she would like to set up a hierarchy of legislators that the Board should engage. Bill added that he wants to be sure the Board is engaging not only

legislators in the Puget Sound area but statewide as well. Aurora mentioned that it's important to find not only the legislators, but the key points of the message that pique their interest.

Kathy then went over the expected outcomes from today's discussion on the legislative report: to agree on the outline, the messaging, and the process to move it forward. She noted that there are four board meetings left this year, and three are away from Olympia. She proposed that a subcommittee be convened to work on the Legislative Report. Kathy went over the three key messages of the outline: we have the tools to meet the challenges, the tools are important to the communities they serve, and the tools continue to evolve.

Kim cautioned that this reads too much like the Board no longer needs the assistance of the Legislature. She suggested that language that says "we have the tools to meet the challenges" not be included, adding that there's no mention of employers and jobs in the outline. She suggested talking about how the state's leverage and partnerships with employers and local government. Bill said that the rebranding efforts should be in the outline. Kim and Charlie both liked the notion of rebranding GTECs as "Expanded Growth Centers." Charlie added that the key messages might not be exciting enough. He made these suggestions: Characterizing efficiency as critical to the transportation system; CTR programs are proven methods that improve transportation efficiency; and that CTR is a part of a bigger picture- not so insular, but solving problems in a broader world.

Robin said that the key messages should be about proven results. Matt suggested that a good way to regroup or rebrand the message is to find the points within other high priority policies—Moving Washington, climate plan goals, etc.—and apply a CTR context to them. He said that he would look for other non-CTR reports that have utilized different ways to tell their own stories. Matt suggested that more personal narrative be included in the next report. Bill noted that better visualization of the CTR context would be very useful. Kim volunteered to take the key messages and work it down to a "song sheet", then bring it to the group next month.

Matt Hansen noted that the timeline is critical, and suggested the 2007 report be referenced as a model. Kathy commented that everything will go under the CTR umbrella, as Robin suggested after the end of this year's session. Mike cautioned that we consider this report's true audience and that this document not be too focused on emotional appeal. Kim replied that we focus on the narrative and the more personal approach on the outreach piece, not necessarily the report itself.

Aurora stressed the importance of showing real results with real people. Ted noted that many of the same concepts and terminology (congestion, clean air, oil dependence) still apply and are still the foundation of the message. He added that a fourth component in cost has been added, and that the cost of trips and emissions reduced could be quantified graphically.

Peter asked about the timeline and what major policy issues need to be dealt with. Kathy replied that the policy issues include the major employer definition, program measurement and the RTPPO role, and state agency leadership. Peter then asked if staff will put a proposal together in time for the September meeting. Keith replied that the second committee Kathy proposed will keep the process focused and moving forward, as timelines are tight. He added that another function will be to engage the TAG in order to leverage resources and look at policies quickly. Peter suggested another committee, one

to focus on policy, the other on communications and outreach. Keith replied that he's assigning the Legislative Committee to key messages and outreach strategy, and the Legislative Report Committee to data analysis, policy issues, and employer anecdotes. Aurora volunteered to work on compiling anecdotes. Kim reiterated she'd develop key messages.

Brian suggesting telling employer anecdotes such as Joe Hyer's in a sidebar. Ted suggested taking a look at past legislative reports, figure out what worked well, hone it, and pull items of interest. Kathy replied that she gleaned much of this from the last three reports. Keith added a big departure for this report is the CTR umbrella alignment concept. Ted noted that it would be useful to look at the unique characteristics in each community that make it work. Kathy replied that the local concept falls under "what we've learned." Kim suggested an executive summary component. Kathy replied that there will be one.

Keith then called for volunteers for the Legislative Report Committee: Joyce, Aurora (who will work with LeAnn from the TAG), Matt Hansen, and Peter. Matt Ransom was volunteered to serve as chair.

Meeting wrap up

Ted brought up new legislation that could affect the Board, on such topics as vehicle electrification and fleet biodiesel usage, and whether the Board should be engaged in any discussions on them. Brian replied that they'll be addressed that in the policy discussion. Bill asked about the Board's role on pricing policy. Brian replied that pricing issues could be addressed through the Legislative Report. Bill suggested the Board get out in front and be engaged earlier in the discussion and help shape the policy. Charlie noted that it's a complex issue and that the board might not be able to take a unanimous position. Kim agreed, saying that the Board might be better off staying on the sidelines right now. Bill disagreed, saying the Board should at least look at it and determine whether it's part of the report or not, adding that this Board should play a role.

Matt Hansen noted that Link Light Rail, Seattle's light rail service, commenced operations last week, unveiling its service along ten stops between Tukwila and downtown Seattle.

Action item review

- Matt H. to send out info about T-REX, and white paper for ACT
- Robin to send out PP presentation about Next-TEA and ask for input
- Peter talk to Matt R. about briefing congressional delegation on CRC, and about chairing CTR Report Subcommittee
- Kim to reconvene Legislative Committee in September, take a shot at key messages, song sheet, and work with Liz on Legislative Matrix
- Brian to talk with Lloyd Brown about getting copies of "Partners in Progress" report distributed to Board or put on website
- Kathy to convene Report Subcommittee and Legislative Committee
- Aurora to work with LeAnn and TAG on collecting community/employer stories

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.