

Commute Trip Reduction Board

Meeting Summary

August 22, 2008

WSDOT

HQ Commission Board Room (1D2)

310 Maple Park Ave SE

Olympia, WA 98504-7387

Board Members Present: Aurora Crooks, Matt Ransom, Kim Becklund, Matt Hansen, Joyce Phillips, Liz Warman, Ted Horobiowski, Marilyn Young Skogland, Bill Roach, Mike Harbour, Peter Hurley, and Robin Rettew.

Board Members Not Present: Brian Lagerberg, Charlie Howard, and Page Scott.

WSDOT Staff: Kathy Johnston, Keith Cotton, Casey Kanzler, Hiep Tran, and Jef Lucero.

Audience: Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council; and Diane Wiatr, City of Tacoma.

Introductions and Board Business

No board business.

July meeting summary

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

Public comment

Diane Wiatr mentioned that she received feedback from the City of Tacoma's Planning Commission that the term "affected" connotes negative things to some people less familiar with the concepts relating to CTR. She also commented that the same word doesn't seem to present well when talking to employers.

Legislative package

Kim began by noting that our overall ask is going to be smaller than that of a lot of other WSDOT programs, and that we have a whole series of arguments for where we want to land. She commented that as we go through this, we will need to be sensitive to the legislator's own ideas about how these pieces should be prioritized. Kim added it's okay if we don't have consensus on the rankings, because we'll have champions for each piece of the puzzle.

Keith then outlined the three things we're hoping to get through today: the decision packages that WSDOT will soon submit to OFM; the tax credit recommendations, carried over from the last meeting; and the Legislative package, including the priorities the committee put together earlier this morning.

WSDOT decision packages

We were directed by WSDOT's Moving Washington initiative to put together two packages to help support the key congestion corridors. The first package will go toward additional funding support for vanpools in urban areas (Central Puget Sound, Spokane, and Vancouver). This package would add an additional \$2.5 million to the expected funding level of \$6 million. The other decision package is for the GTEC program and

would carry funding forward from this biennium to the next. It would give us the opportunities necessary for performance measurement and continued delivery.

Matt Hansen asked where the package is in its process. Keith replied that it's unclear whether there will be one more round of internal agency review before this is submitted but the Governor's office's submittal deadline is the first week of September. Robin noted that it's appropriate for the board to submit its own request and that it doesn't have to be exactly in line with the WSDOT's request. She added that if the decision is made to fund more than what the agency requested for the CTR-related pieces, it will most likely go into the WSDOT budget because that's the simplest way to go.

Tax credit recommendations

Keith noted that there are five recommendations from the committee— three of which there is consensus on— and then walked the board through the staff evaluations, which included analysis of the number of applicants and awarded credit by size of application; a four-year breakout of the history of the credit; a comparison of CTR applicants to non-CTR applicants; and the program budget and maximum credit per applicant.

Bill commented that we're trying to tie our program to that at the federal level, and with a good marketing strategy we can be successful. Ted asked if we could distribute or disperse this more on a county-by-county basis. Matt Hansen replied that it would be very difficult to allocate that way, and that what we're proposing here— reducing the cap and the number of times the credit can be claimed— are sufficient means of avoiding proration, which is a clear goal of this recommendation. Aurora noted that she would like to see who the out-of-state companies are. Ted added that he would prefer that we keep this with in-state employers.

Kim noted that CTR employers are assigned a number that we might be able to reference to help us better reflect, track, and report statewide participation in the program. Aurora commented that she would like to see the application be made more comprehensive. She added that we should build into the application a mechanism for tracking where the money goes and how it's spent. Keith replied that the employers have to put their federal tax ID numbers on their applications. Matt Hansen added that DOR is good at following through on the accounting end.

Kim and Peter then began going over the recommendations. Aurora said to be sure we communicate these changes to the employers as clearly and quickly as possible, and added that she likes the compromises built into the new recommendations. Mike noted there's agreement on all four major areas of these recommendations, but disagreement as to how fast and to what extent the changes should be made. Marilyn commented that we need to find a way to get maximum distribution.

Peter walked the group through his idea of a \$2.5/1.75 million split across the two year period, suggesting that there is a high likelihood claimants won't ask for as much in the second year. He added that if there is money left on the table after the second year, we can ask that it be reallocated. Marilyn, Kim, and Matt Ransom cautioned that we should hold the line, not shock the system, and be mindful of business interests.

Motion: A motion was entertained to adopt Recommendation 1a, which would lower the program budget to 2.5 million. The motion carried, with two opposed.

Motion: A motion was entertained to adopt Recommendation 2, which would lower the credit limit to \$100K. The motion carried.

Matt Ransom voiced that he does not support the notion of limitations to the number of times an employer can take the credit. Marilyn replied that her rationale behind supporting the limit is that the employers and employees see this as a benefit by the end of that term and that they see a compelling need to keep it going, with or without tax incentives. Ted replied that in this day and age, people will jump on board. Mike noted that the tax credit is set to expire in 2013, so we will have opportunities to refine these modifications to the credit at that time.

Motion: A motion was entertained to adopt Recommendation 3b, which would limit the number of times an employer can take the credit to two awards, beginning in 2008. The motion carried, with two opposed.

Motion: A motion was entertained to adopt Recommendation 4, which would eliminate deferrals from the 2007 awards onward. The motion carried.

There was some discussion on the \$30K set aside for marketing, and whether it comes out of the \$5 million. Keith noted that, as it is currently structured, the money does come out of the budget. Matt Hansen noted that this is a unique revenue-backed situation in that whatever is not collected under this credit gets replaced.

Motion: A motion was entertained to adopt Recommendation 5, which would devote \$30K to marketing. The motion carried.

Legislative priorities

Keith then went over the remaining prioritization portions of the draft legislative package. He suggested the board have an up-down vote on the second priority, since the base package is, by consensus, the top priority.

Kim stated that she favored switching priorities 2 (vanpool) and 3 (GTEC). Peter noted that he supported Kim's motion to switch priorities 2 and 3 because he feels the legislature will lend its support to vanpools regardless of the board's legislative priorities. He added that we have a limited amount of political capital and that we should invest it wisely, and the wisest strategy is to push for strong support of the GTEC program. Joyce commented that land use needs to be a part of this discussion, and for that reason, she ranks GTEC number 2. Matt Hansen stated he feels the scale of change that we're able to reach through GTEC is more substantial. Liz agreed, saying we should work from the angle that the GTEC program will provide big changes for less money.

Mike disagreed, commenting that the board needs to support its partners, specifically the transit systems. Aurora agreed, saying that much of what she hears about from employers and employees is vanpools.

Motion: A motion was entertained to adopt the priorities package with priorities 2 and 3 transposed. The motion carried, with one opposed.

Kim requested that WSDOT put together a graphic that demonstrates the relationships between the CTR programs.

Keith then talked about next steps, the first of which is to reformat this package for submittal by the deadline, which will be done by WSDOT staff. He suggested that the committee now turn its focus toward messaging and outreach. Peter suggested we come back at some point in the next few months to discuss the pilot projects.

CTR Board work plan check-in

Kathy began by noting we've completed the legislative package portion of the plan. Much of the focus will now shift toward the statewide CTR plan policy framework for 2009. The development of new funding policies is also in the works. We are proposing that the GTEC portion be moved to early 2009, because the report is due before the end of the year. Coordinated efforts with the climate team are ongoing. We're going to ask that the Olympia GTEC representatives present at the October meeting.

Urban Programs staff have several projects they're working on, including deployment of the new CTR training materials. Our first wave of meetings with the local jurisdictions is to begin with Snohomish County in mid-September. In October, we are slated for legislative outreach, which will extend through the end of the year.

Kim asked if the report will be available in a folio format. Casey replied that that he is in the process of developing such a folio right now. Peter asked that any GTEC presenters we have talk about any policy issues in addition to marketing and outreach efforts. Mike suggested that Peter Thein from WSTA present at the October meeting. Joyce suggested we get an update on the state's efforts on the leadership piece. Peter reiterated that he would like 20 or 30 minute check-ins from the pilot projects before the legislative session.

Keith talked about the measurement and support side as they relate to the timeline this year. Bill asked if it would be of any benefit to have the board advocate on the agency's behalf for more staff support. Aurora cautioned that we be sure to leave plenty of time for the funding discussion. Kathy replied that she will incorporate the funding piece into the work plan for October.

Robin asked if the board would like the opportunity to review 12 draft policy papers OFM has received for the Transportation Reauthorization Act. There are tight turnaround times for these, but she would like to extend the opportunity for the board to weigh in on them. Peter mentioned that he would like an update on the VMT reduction law, and suggested that perhaps Charlie help with follow up. Peter will present on a paper at the board meeting in September.

GTEC update

Casey began by noting that all of the seven funded GTEC's are underway with their implementation efforts. Most will be rolling out their full-scale programs this fall. They have rebranded themselves with catchier names and slogans. The budget proviso requires that we compile a legislative report, though there's little we can yet report on quantifiably. We continue to work through that issue and are making progress.

Each contract requires in their project report a line-by-line narrative description of deliverables. Casey asked the board for input as to how they'd like to see this reporting structured. He also asked the board to determine which committee is best suited for the review. He has set September 19 as a due date for the first draft, with final review due on October 22. The final report must be approved by October 31.

Keith noted there's no specific deadline for this, but that we want to have it done in time for the session. Robin reminded the committee that the Governor's budget comes out mid-December, so the sooner this is finished the better. Casey added that he's asked the implementers committee to revisit its timeline for policy changes so that we can incorporate those into this report. Kim mentioned that we should include anecdotal messaging from mayors regarding GTEC performance.

Casey reminded the group that the communications committee will be doing a first-cut review, with the board providing final comment. Karen Parkhurst asked whether there will be opportunities for the GTEC's to comment on any barriers they've encountered with regards to state policy.

Casey then talked about the first wave of survey responses. School surveys will be conducted online and we expect a high return rate. Aurora asked why the other GTEC's aren't included with these survey responses. Casey replied that these three— Tacoma, Spokane, and Vancouver— were the first to go out, and that the others will follow.

Casey reiterated that most of the funding discussions will be pushed back until next year since the report is due at the end of 2008. He added that we also have to revise the WAC that governs the GTEC program, specifically the requirement that the RTPO's submit a GTEC plan by April 1. Casey asked that the committee determine when it will next discuss funding policy. Keith replied that it's scheduled for September, but it will now happen in January.

Climate change update

Keith began by noting that the CAT continues to focus on addressing the statutory goals to reduce emissions. The TIWG is focused on implementing HB 2815. That group has a report due to the Legislature late this fall. The TIWG is working on three main strategies: T1 (transit, ridesharing, and commuter choice) T4 (land use and transit oriented development), and T3 (tolling and pricing). WSDOT is a co-lead on the TIWG. Keith continues to work with them on such programs as vanpools and rural CTR. TIWG will then carry forward its recommendations to the CAT which in turn will forward its own to the Legislature. Keith added that his main role in that discussion is to explain GTEC as a potential incentive-based model.

Kim asked about the funding strategy for T1 and where the money is going to come from. Keith replied that, at this point, only informal discussions have been held, but the conversation is less about finding revenue sources than identification of need. He added that the state/local partnership piece is in the discussion. Bill suggested cap and trade as a mechanism to provide resources for an incentive-based program. He added that we should advise the Governor's office on the inclusion of transportation in the cap and trade process, as a board.

Joyce suggested that Janice Adair and Tony Usibelli talk to the board about the Western Climate Initiative and the cap and trade mechanism. Peter suggested that Joyce or Keith have a conversation in the interim with either of those two to determine what's useful, if anything, for us to bring to the discussion.

Joyce then passed around a document relating to climate benefit districts, a concept similar to the GTEC. The document was developed by a group of business

representatives that met with Joyce last week. She also spoke about a group called the Land Use and Climate Change Advisory Committee, which has met three times to discuss such growth management strategies as climate friendly development in urban centers and conservation of resource lands. This group will meet two more times.

Within the committee there is also a technical team, which consists of staff from WSDOT, CTED, Ecology, WSDA, DNR, RTPO's, and transit associations. Together, the committee and its tech team are developing seven concept papers still in draft status. All work must be completed and turned into the tech team by September 2. The committee will get the materials from the tech team September 4, then meet again September 12. At that time they will determine which of the ideas outlined in the concept papers should be moved forward.

Action item review

- Legislative package – repackaging, submittal, and outreach
- Communications team – will work on legislative package and GTEC report
- Peter's request for pilot programs update
- Robin's request for white paper reviews- she will send out via email
- Funding committee meeting set for September 19
- Kim's request for a GTEC folio – Casey is developing
- Climate change follow up – Joyce or Keith will talk to WCI reps
- Charlie or Peter to follow up on VMT
- Kathy will add funding piece to work plan
- Kim will work on anecdotal mayoral messaging for GTEC
- Mike's request for Peter Thein to speak at October board meeting
- Joyce's request for update on state leadership piece
- Jef will send out December meeting date

Agenda for Next Meeting

- Legislative package
- Proposed TRPP model
- Climate change update
- Reinvent Your Commute update
- Draft CTR funding policy
- GTEC report
- Peter's mobility efficiency rating system presentation

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.