

## **Commute Trip Reduction Board**

Meeting Summary

December 5, 2008

WSDOT

HQ Commission Board Room (1D2)

310 Maple Park Ave SE

Olympia, WA 98504-7387

**Board Members Present:** Brian Lagerberg, Ted Horobiowski, Page Scott, Aurora Crooks, Matt Ransom, Kim Becklund, Matt Hansen, Charlie Howard, Liz Warman, Joyce Phillips, Bill Roach, Marilyn Young Skogland, Mike Harbour, Peter Hurley, and Lynn Frosch.

**Board Members Not Present:** Robin Rettew.

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

**Audience:** Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council; Diane Wiatr, City of Tacoma; Liz Kaster, City of Tacoma; and Gloria Newby, City of Redmond.

### **Introductions and board business**

Brian began by noting that the mileage reimbursement rate is decreasing in 2009 to 55 cents per mile. He added that the next board meeting on January 23 will be held at Intercity Transit before handing out the board's tentative 2009 meeting schedule. Kim then passed around two handouts on current development projects in Bellevue. She mentioned she'd email links to the handouts to the group.

Brian spoke briefly about the Governor's revenue forecast, indicating that focus of that report will be on jobs, growing the economy, and consumer protection. He asked that the board think about those three issues as it moves through its discussions today. brief update on the CAT report. Brian then gave a brief updated on the RideshareOnline RFP, for which WSDOT has selected the top three vendor candidates. The vendor demonstrations were held this week, with evaluations and scoring to come next week. WSDOT is moving this forward, and a contract is expected to be in place in January.

Brian then announced that the Governor's budget will be released December 20. All of the board's recommendations are being given serious consideration. Bill asked that WSDOT staff send it out once it's released. Keith replied that it's been discussed to have a legislative committee meeting immediately following the release of the budget, but that it will be so close to holidays that it might be pushed out until early in the new year.

### **More board business**

Brian noted the TDM-in-Schools study was bumped from the agenda since it is still under review. Kim mentioned that she and Liz were scheduled to meet with Senator Haugen this morning to discuss the study but cancelled due to time constraints. Keith added that he will send Dan Carlson board comments this weekend, and that Dan will work up a new draft incorporating that feedback. Keith will then email the draft to the board for review.

Kathy is working on binders for the board with such materials as bylaws, policy statements, legislative proposals, and more. The binders should be available in time for the next meeting. Liz offered to help with some surplus binders.

Bill talked about the Alaskan Way Viaduct (AWV) replacement project. He's followed closely how the project is going forward, moving away from a corridor-centric view to include bigger-picture issues. Brian added that he was in the AWV offices yesterday, getting a better idea of organizational structure.

Matt Ransom offered a quick Columbia River Crossing update and how WSDOT will be involved with TDM issues on that project. He noted that the importance of helping the managers on these mega-projects better understand the issue of TDM as a project component. He added that he'd like to better define the board's role on these mega-projects, at least on an advisory basis. Brian replied that Cathy Silins from WSDOT is spending two days a week in Vancouver working on the project, at the request of Secretary Hammond. Liz recommended that the board work up a TDM principle- not necessarily specific to every project, but an overarching principle.

Matt Hansen asked if the board would like to have a briefing from King County, the City of Seattle, and WSDOT on AWV plans, the central Puget Sound's long-range transportation plan, and other transportation projects. Matt Ransom added that it would be good to hear from all mega-projects in that briefing. Brian replied that we will add this briefing to January's agenda, and that the board will develop the TDM principle as well.

### **October meeting summary**

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

### **Public comment**

Diane Wiatr announced the American Planning Association has selected the Tacoma GTEC as a project to be presented at a national conference next year in Minnesota.

### **CTR funding policy**

Matt Hansen began by noting that we are trying to develop a formula that focuses on putting resources toward meeting the goals of the CTR Efficiency Act. Whereas the task force, historically, based funding on past performance, the board today is focused on setting goals and helping the counties achieve them. Aurora added that the committee kept its focus on base funding. Bill expressed concerns about accountability.

Peter mentioned that there's still no language included in the policy statement that speaks to VMT reduction. Charlie replied that we're going to allocate based on the number of trips reduced, and that VMT is not part of the current allocation formula. Keith added that number 5 addresses how to identify in the future the funding criteria that need improving or changing. Peter suggested that the board look toward including VMT as part of the formula as we move forward in the future.

Marilyn expressed concern about the ability to capture VMT data, as some communities stand to be punished because they're smaller than those that are spread out, adding that there's currently no mechanism for compiling that data. Brian suggested that the work plan reflect that the board will reassess the funding policy before allocations for the next cycle.

Charlie noted that it would be difficult using projected VMT reduced to allocate funds, but that once the cycle ends, the board will be able to look back and measure VMT reductions as a performance measure of the programs. Ted noted that the word “collaboratively” appears three times, and that it should only be used once in the document, in number 5. He also suggested changing the phrase “legally mandated” to “mandated.” Both changes were made.

**Motion:** A motion was entertained to approve the CTR Board funding policy. The motion carried.

### **GTEC Legislative report**

Casey began by noting that Joe Hyer’s quotes from the City of Olympia’s presentation at the last meeting have been incorporated into the latest version of the GTEC folio. He has also added testimonials from Tacoma and Olympia. Casey continues to work with other program champions on more messaging. He asked the board members to provide any comments or suggestions they might have.

Bill asked if WSDOT has further considered renaming the GTEC program. Brian replied that local branding has helped eliminate some of the more esoteric problems, but he left open the possibility for the board to consider changing the name. Joyce added that she’s heard people starting to use the term. Keith replied that the folio does a good job of identifying GTEC as a program for small employers. Matt Hansen suggested that the board needs to focus on including personal, compelling narratives from each GTEC. He also suggested getting non-public sector, GTEC implementers or beneficiaries to tell the story to the legislature.

Casey noted that WSDOT staff members continue to work with contractors to analyze the survey reports to establish baseline data for each jurisdiction. This process has been challenging, and running down the data has contributed to holding up the legislative report. Casey added that he received data from the City of Olympia this week. Keith noted that the Secretary’s office is expecting the report December 22. The hope is to get it to the board for review, but turnaround time will be tight. Casey asked for board members to volunteer to review the report. Kim, Peter, Aurora, and Bill offered to help, though Casey indicated he would be sure to send the report to the entire board.

Casey then went over the local and regional recommendations: strengthening the land use elements in GTEC plans, establishing employment indicators; focusing on local sustainability, strengthening the roles for RTPOs and MPOs, and clarifying regional GTEC funding prioritization.

Bill suggested using different language other than Transportation Management Associations (TMA), should this be presented to the public. Matt Ransom suggested caution when applying standards to land use requirements, as they might vary between jurisdictions. Keith replied that the intent is to identify potential barriers to GTEC success, and the need here is for a longer-term vision for land use and its implications. Charlie suggested that generic, non-specific land use policy language be built into the report.

Brian clarified that these recommendations are a model for the criteria in the next GTEC selection process. He then suggested that the board work with CTED to develop more comprehensive land use policy language as it relates to GTEC. Matt Ransom suggested

exempting GTEC's from concurrency at the local level. Charlie replied that if it's based on a land use and roadway capacity connection, it would work, but that a land use and transportation connection would not.

Liz suggested that we refer to centers as "economic centers" and work on tying that into the overall message. Casey replied that one of the things that didn't make it into this presentation is having GTECs track economic development within their boundaries over time. Keith suggested that the board look at compiling employment indicators, such as vacancy rates, square footage, and new developments. Brian suggested changing "GTEC Recommendations" to "GTEC Findings". Page suggested changing CMAQ as a funding source to federal and state funds.

Casey then went over the local and regional recommendations: better integration with construction mitigation, standardized appropriate staffing levels, and allowing jurisdictions to petition to change their GTEC boundaries. Bill suggested changing "clarify staffing requirements" to "establish staffing requirements."

Casey then discussed the proposed WAC changes: updating and simplifying planning requirements in the WAC; removing references to dates, replacing them with "to be determined by the CTR Board"; addressing the use of public funds to provide incentives, and adding a requirement to provide goals for VMT reductions within each GTEC.

Casey then shared the Olympia survey responses, adding that WSDOT is getting data it's never had before. Peter suggested noting the amount of money the state is saving, and that a story be made of that. Bill noted that it might make more sense to talk in terms of choice- for instance, the vanpool numbers for Olympia are misleading since it's a less-viable option for the area. Casey replied that the survey results can be customized by choice.

Kim noted that she wants to have spokespeople ready to go before the legislative transportation committees at the appropriate time. Casey will email his presentation to the board and needs comments within the week. Bill suggested that more comparative data be included. Casey replied that this represents baseline data, so there's not much to compare it against. Matt Hansen suggested comparing it against what the CTR base program would yield.

### **Location Efficiency**

Peter began by noting that built into the board's legislative request are two pilots, one of which is the Land Use and Transportation project. This project will focus on location efficiency and parking management. Brian noted that commute distances and house prices are increasing, and those factors are driving changes in land use. So while people have become more innovative in their commute modes, they are travelling greater distances. Brian then used a roadway pricing example to demonstrate differences in the costs of transportation.

Peter noted that the main thrust behind this program is to develop better outreach and determine best practices for employers to establish incentives for employees to buy or rent homes within a certain radius of where they work. Matt Hansen noted that he knows of two projects that didn't get funded in King County because of parking limitations and ratios. He suggested that part of the scope of this should be to explore some model policy language, so that you don't have lenders unwilling to underwrite loans to finance

projects. Peter replied that this program is being developed from a best practices standpoint, and that the parking issue will be looked at as the second component of this project.

Matt Hansen also mentioned that the timing for this pilot is good, as it fits in nicely with CAT as it prepares to unveil its own recommendations to the legislature. Liz and Lynn talked about the importance of this program from the large employer standpoint.

### **CTR Board Legislative outreach**

Kim began by passing around the latest version of the two-page handout for legislators. Kim added that she and Liz met with Jeff Simpson and Judy Clibborn earlier this week. They will work to reschedule with Mary Margaret Haugen in January. Kim noted that Representative Clibborn was very receptive and that the handout worked very effectively. Everything sounded good to her: parking strategies, base funding, vanpool, the tax credit, and performance. Kim noted that she seemed eager to take on the part of CTR champion.

Liz mentioned that Representative Simpson cautioned that the transportation budget is somewhat set, yet didn't think it was out of line for the board to be doubling its request this time, so long as the achievements of these programs are effectively demonstrated and articulated. Liz added Simpson suggested that in the wake of its successful passing in the last election, the board highlight how these programs relate to—and contribute to the success of—Prop 1.

Charlie noted that PSRC's Transportation Policy Committee (of which Liz is a member) meets next week, and CTR is on the draft list of its legislative recommendations and agenda. Matt Hansen suggested that it is a good idea for legislators to hear this story from many different voices, and urged that the board take a proactive if not aggressive position in telling it. Bill asked if the Association of Washington Cities (AWC) has yet seen this. Kim replied that she is going to meet with them in two weeks, but this is not a front-burner issue for them.

Liz mentioned the Regional Access Mobility Program (RAMP)—headed by the Port of Tacoma, Pierce County, and the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce—and suggested that its leadership meet with representatives from the Tacoma GTEC. Liz suggested that the board consider identifying some small employers from the Association of Washington Business (AWB) with which to work. Diane Wiatr replied that RAMP discussed its legislative agenda a few days ago, and asked that Kim send her any information as soon as possible. Matt Hansen suggested pulling in Bill LaBorde from TCC to work on legislative issues.

Keith announced that he will set up a legislative committee conference call on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, right after the Governor's budget is released. Matt Hansen then talked about the idea of ramping up the board's CTR agenda at the federal level. He added that he will send out a draft federal package as soon as something is available.

### **Action item review**

- Kim will email TOD/Bellevue stuff
- Kathy will provide an update on state agencies w/ Joan Cullen
- Casey will email the Olympia GTEC presentation to the board
- Kathy will continue to compile the binders

- Casey will email the GTEC legislative report, which Kim, Peter, Aurora, and Bill will review (assembling champions list)
- Matt Hansen will put together the King County briefing for the next meeting
- Casey will email today's presentation to the board, with comments due by 12/12
- Jef will revise and email the 2009 meeting schedule, along with the new mileage rates
- Jef will coordinate video conference for February
- Brian and Keith will follow up with Liz and Kim on the schools study, then send out the report for comment
- Liz's TDM principle suggestion will be incorporated into the work plan
- Per Bill's request, the Governor's budget will be emailed to the board
- Kim will email legislative information to Diane Wiatr
- Matt Hansen will begin developing federal messaging for CTR/ACT

#### **Agenda for Next Meeting**

- Discuss 2009 work plan, including the board, the TAG, and WSDOT staff
- State agency CTR program update with Joan Cullen
- Commuter calendar demonstration with Robin Hartsell
- WCI update with Tony Usibelli
- Discuss regional progress reports
- Legislative update

#### **Adjournment**

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