

Commute Trip Reduction Board
Meeting Summary
March 28, 2008
WSDOT HQ Commission Board Room (1D2)
310 Maple Park Ave SE
Olympia, WA 98504-7387

Board Members Present: Brian Lagerberg,, Kim Becklund, Charlie Howard, Joyce Phillips, Marilyn Young Skogland, Matt Ransom, Mike Harbour, Peter Hurley, Matt Hansen, Robin Rettew, Page Scott (via conference call), and Ted Horobiowski

Board Members Not Present: Aurora Crooks, Bill Roach, Linda Ballew, and Liz Warman.

WSDOT Staff: Robin Hartsell, Keith Cotton, Kathy Johnston, Casey Kanzler, Nancy Muir-Clouse, and Jef Lucero.

Audience: Genesee Adkins, Transportation Choices Coalition (via conference call); Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council; Monica Whitman, City of Kent; Diane Wiatr, City of Tacoma.

Introduction and Board Business

Brian began by talking about some recent meetings regarding construction mitigation and mapping out major highway construction projects through 2009. Brian explained that he's been brought into the discussion to help better define what the role of the Public Transportation office will be. Robin asked if this is an integrated process. Brian replied that yes, Stan Suchan in the Northwest Region is the lead on this, and that he's well-connected throughout the region from his days as its Communications Manager. Peter noted that the department has come along way in terms of learning the lessons of demand management. Brian replied that Paula and Craig Stone deserve a lot of credit for that, as they continue to lead a top-down message.

Brian then spoke briefly about Travel Washington. WSDOT continues to look at a few big crossings and their strategies (Columbia River, SR 520). We are also looking at the strategic plan and how it will drive our budget proposals. Robin added that the Governor's office is in the middle of major rewrites to the budget instructions.

Motion: A motion was entertained to change the May meeting date from the 23rd to the 30th. The motion carries with one opposed (Marilyn, who won't be available that day).

February Meeting Summary

Motion: A motion was entertained to approve the February meeting summary, with one minor change. The motion carried.

Public Comment

Diane Wiatr suggested that those jurisdictions working on GTEC's give a presentation at an upcoming meeting. Charlie then suggested that an upcoming board meeting be held in Tacoma, to which Diane offered to find a location. It was agreed upon among the group that one meeting per quarter will be held in a location with a GTEC. Staff will present a tentative schedule for the remainder of the year at the next board meeting.

Legislative update/Climate change

Brian began by saying that the FlexCar tax exemption proviso did not make it through the legislative process. However, the Kitsap County teleworking pilot program add-on made it through, and both he and Keith will attend a meeting on April 1 in Poulsbo with its economic development council. A Whatcom County measure went through as well. Brian has had conversations with Susan Horst and Werner Brog on the subject. Brian suggested that they make some sort of formal presentation to the board.

Karen Parkhurst added that TRPC received a \$150K grant to perform a study on how visitors travel to the capitol campus. Robin asked if it came from the Capital budget, to which Karen replied that it did.

House Bill 2815, known as the climate change framework green collar bill, passed. This bill creates VMT per capita goals. Brian had a long conversation with Secretary Hammond yesterday explaining the goals, which are that we're to reduce VMT by 18% by the year 2020, 30% by 2035, and 50% by 2050. Charlie noted some confusion as to how this is being calculated, as VMT rates have been flat since 1990. Brian replied that these numbers are based on projected population growth, and that we're looking at whether the baselines and goals make sense. Charlie asked what WSDOT's processes are for determining whether they do. Brian answered that we've had a meeting with Ecology Director Jay Manning, Secretary Hammond, and others to address those processes.

One group will be working on the VMT angle of this legislation, and a second will be composed to work on emissions per mile. Brian explained that there has been lots of push back on carbon standards. He noted that Secretary Hammond has said she'd be the lead on the transportation process. Peter asked to what extent the two work groups will look at land use, and where CTED fits in to this process. Matt Hansen replied that they're getting closer on land use. Brian added that the timeline is very limited, that we need to be done by October.

Charlie asked how the group members will be selected. Brian replied that we will look at three general criteria: what's required by 2815, who participated last time, and how best we can broaden the transportation representation. Peter inquired as to the implications for the board. Brian responded that we're likely to have at least one board member in the groups, and that we'll be engaged in the process. He added that, as soon as we have a work plan, we'll have a better idea, and that it should be ready in 5-10 days.

Regarding the Columbia River Crossing project, Matt Ransom noted that Oregon seems to have better defined statutory processes and asked if we can get representation from Washington to incorporate climate change, capacity expansion, and VMT goals. Brian replied that Secretary Hammond met with the ODOT Secretary to discuss the project. He offered to find the notes on that meeting, as it might be a good place to start.

Mike stated that lots of good things seem to be coming together. WSTA is getting its next legislative agenda together. He added that they will assess capacity and respond to demand. Kim asked Mike whether the data will reflect regional capacity gaps. Mike replied that any ideas or suggestions are welcome, as they are just beginning to assemble its 10-year capital program.

Brian moved on to House Bill 6580, the growth management/climate change bill. Robin will find out whether it's been signed yet. Joyce noted that two studies are required of

this bill, the first of which will be completed by December 1, 2008. There is enough funding for one or two pilot studies.

Charlie brought up another bill that might have CTR implications: House Bill 3096, which is the SR 520 bridge replacement bill. He noted that there are opportunities to partner from the CTR perspective, as three GTEC's are in that corridor. Peter asked about tolling, and whether there's any update there. Charlie replied that two bills passed: House Bill 1773, which established the Transportation Commission as the tolling authority and set some guidelines and policy parameters; and House Bill 3096, which speaks to user contributions of \$1.5 to \$2 billion. Careful discussion must be had- it's transparent and open. He noted that the big issues here are diversion, toll rates, revenue targets, and traffic improvement.

Robin noted that the Governor vetoed two sections of the budget that would've had the Transportation Commission look at tolling in the budget, as she felt strongly that it should be departmental responsibility.

Attainment Report

Robin began by noting that several offices have been preparing different reports. Five overarching goal areas have been established by the Legislature. Robin and Geri Beardsley have been working on this draft report, which has become an ongoing effort. Robin noted that they really rushed to get this out, and in the future, they'll reach out much more aggressively to the jurisdictions. She added that there are different measures and objectives for different goals, and that once WSDOT submits its budget, it will be tied into the mission.

Peter asked if VMT is in this report. Robin replied that it is and that they are trying to show how we are "moving the needle" on VMT. She added that VMT will be a big piece of the report down the road, but that there are no firm VMT measures yet. Mike suggested that special needs transit should be included. Robin responded that suggestions are welcomed, but asked that the group consider whether the data necessary to support those suggestions is at a high enough level.

Matt Hansen suggested highlighting that emission rates are going down (p. 25), and that perhaps some metrics on how the customer thinks the state is doing could also be integrated. Robin replied that, though, a good idea, that might be hard because our customer base is so broad. She also suggested that any comments be directed to Geri. She noted that we've also been asked to work closely with MPO's so that we can get our data aligned with theirs.

Strategic Plan

Robin Hartsell began by stating that what he'd like from the board today is an approval as far as the substance of the plan goes. He's willing to make changes if any must be made, but that we need to move forward with the approval and then work on plan development and timeline development.

Ted suggested switching appendices 1 & 2, to which Robin agreed. Matt Hansen suggested that we have it proofed by someone who isn't tied to it, that we might need some fresh eyes. Brian noted that Secretary Hammond would like presentations on everything in the CTR report, and added that Katy Taylor is very effective in engaging the Secretary on key issues.

Motion: A motion was entertained to approve the Strategic Plan. The motion carried.

CTR Board Work Plan

Keith began by noting that this represents a first draft of the 2008-2010 board work plan, and that it should be expected that it might bear little resemblance to the final edition once it's complete. The board's strategic initiatives are outlined, and both board and staff activities are broken out month by month. Keith added that there will be ongoing program updates. He noted that construction mitigation is not included here, but is likely something the board will want to be kept in the loop on. He asked the group to consider what other strategic plan elements should be included: climate change, the legislative agenda, policy framework, etc.

Robin asked what specific types of deliverables should be brought back to the board. Peter asked whether it would make sense to work in the context of a legislative committee. If so, he said, he'd like to see us convene in May or June so that we can really get after our legislative agenda. Kim added that we should start vetting early, and suggested we meet even in April. Robin noted that she'd have to recuse herself from legislative or budget issues.

Mike asked why there was no mention of the communication plan in the work plan and added that it would be nice if it was broken out by committee. Keith clarified that not every component of the strategic plan is in the work plan. Matt Ransom inquired as to when things need to be done in order to get them into the budget request. Kim noted that finalizing our funding policy by November seems kind of late, and that getting it done much sooner is that much better. Keith agreed, noting that this change will be reflected in the final version of the work plan.

Robin stated that there is a deadline as far as the Governor's budget is concerned, and that whether we want to go through that at all is another question. Keith replied that the timelines are all going to be tailored around the varying deadlines as set by other agencies. Brian suggested that we should be looking at the end of August as the deadline for legislative and budget proposals. Robin noted that we should keep competing interests in mind, and that CTR is seen, at least departmentally, as a function of WSDOT.

Mike identified three processes that we should be involved with: the WSDOT process, the OFM process, and the legislative. Marilyn cautioned that we should be concerned about getting hung up in the processes. Kim asked if someone could send her some templates so that we can start drafting something. She added that this is a great opportunity to integrate some of the WSTA work with some of the GTEC work.

Keith noted that VMT and climate change aren't listed here because there's nothing specific to those plans yet, but added that monthly updates will be folded in. Peter suggested that if we know the CAT schedule, we can better operate within that framework.

Keith asked the group to consider what's in the plans and what they are trying to accomplish. He's asked the program managers to identify those things at a few different levels: statewide, regional, or GTEC-specific. He added that we've got to frame it in a way that translates well to legislators, so we must be sure that we're showing progress. Peter added that there has been lots of discussion on policy and funding pieces, and that

we need to pull out those components most likely to need legislative support. He noted that we also need to be able to report out across the next 10 years as well, we have to show them what we'll need not just next year but over the next decade.

Peter then suggested that we compose a Legislative committee. Matt Hansen stated that there's merit to keeping the structure, but that we need the fourth committee. Peter amended his suggestion by proposing that the Policy committee become the Legislative committee. The general response was that the majority of the board's composition should likely be included in any such Legislative committee.

Kim suggested that we should at least hear from the committees on any updates or as to where each stands at the rest of our meetings this year. She noted that we should be having lots of phone calls, maybe a working session, too. Peter suggested that perhaps we should amend the way the meetings are structured, with committees meeting 10-12 and the board meeting to follow. Brian replied that he'd like to keep this at the board level as much as possible, and that WSDOT staff need to be engaged in these conversations. Mike suggested that the other committees not meet for awhile so that the board can focus solely on its legislative agenda. Brian suggested we reform the committees so that everyone is where they want to be.

CTR Plan updates & next steps

Kathy began by noting that WSDOT staff have been going through the plans and noticing trends, extrapolating them to see how they might play out. We continue to facilitate meetings to bring people together where some technical assistance might be needed. There are some concerns on the part of the jurisdictions, but overall, WSDOT has gotten a lot of positive feedback. The implementation guidelines will be distributed by April 1.

Brian asked whether the plans are working. Kathy replied that, as these jurisdictions look at the plans more closely, they're starting to see more flexibility within them, which might compel them to want to update sooner than later.

Peter asked which of these are administrative changes, and which are legislative. Kathy replied that we're looking at it from that perspective already. Brian asked if a change needs to be made to the statute or changes that need to be made at the local level. Kathy reasoned that we need to be cognizant of the implications of those types of decisions before they are made.

GTEC update

Casey Kanzler began by reporting on the three voluntary GTEC's: Kirkland, Puyallup, and Tukwila. He has been working with them on such issues as parking and land use. He continues to prepare them for the next funding cycle. Of the seven contracts sent out to funded GTEC's, five are back in WSDOT's offices. WSDOT is still waiting on some legal issues to be sorted out for the others. WSDOT will now be sending out invoices and will be expecting quarterly progress reports.

Brian mused as to why we would fund GTEC's if local governments are volunteering to do it themselves. Casey replied that we're only preparing them for the next funding cycle. He added that he's met with each of these jurisdictions and their councils and asked them to lay out their GTEC's. Brian asked whether Casey sees the need for additional GTEC's and, if so, where they should be. Casey responded that there is a

need, and they should be along our state's most congested corridors. Keith noted that there's nothing in Snohomish County, which speaks to the need for others.

Brian suggested that we meet in Tacoma and talk about this. He asked the group to consider whether we need to better define what a GTEC is, and whether the board should take specific actions to ensure the GTEC projects succeed. Further, he wondered what would happen if a potential GTEC applied for funding under TIB. Kim cautioned that we need to be careful about funding anything that's not a center. Ed Hillsman replied that we rely on the PSRC designations.

Peter stated that it is critical for the Legislative committee to start thinking about what will likely end up being limited resources. He suggested that we need to start thinking about alternate funding sources as well. Karen Parkhurst commented that one thing that's changed is WSDOT's three-legged approach and the fact that CTR is such a huge piece of it. We are now an integral part of the process instead of a peripheral piece of it. She added that the board needs to take advantage of its newfangled position in the statewide approach. Kim replied that, ostensibly, we can ask the Legislature for whatever we want. We might not get everything we ask for, she noted, but we shouldn't be afraid to ask anyway. She added that 2009 will bring with it the most important legislative session ever for setting the climate change agenda.

Matt Ransom stated that we also need to look at things happening at the federal level, that we need to be on "full-spectrum alert". He added that the Association for Commuter Transportation has an event in the offing, and that he was involved at the last one, and that Bill chaired it. He's planning on going to the next one armed with the CTR annual report, and that we need to get all the leverage we can out of the good story we have to tell. Ed replied that one addition to the "to do" list at the federal level is the likelihood of a climate change initiative, and suggested that we should really start thinking now about how this state represents itself.

Robin asked if there wasn't a new WSDOT liaison to the federal government. Joyce added that there will be a three-day federal conference in August. Robin asked if we can get a list of who the key players will be, and suggested that we should compile our lists of contacts into something of a master list that we can pull from. Brian suggested that should be an important piece for the communications committee to keep in mind.

Board business

There are four members whose term expires this year in June: Page, Aurora, Bill, and Marilyn. All are eligible to reapply for another term, but must send their résumés and letters of interest to Kathy, who will forward the information to the Governor's office. House bill 6580 is tentatively scheduled to be signed April 1. Matt Ransom suggested that, if we're going to schedule future board meetings around the state, that we should hold them in GTEC areas. He added that Vancouver could host but not until late in the year or early next year. Matt Hansen stated that three GTEC's all have new service in their transit systems at peak hours thanks to the GTEC program. He also thanked staff for sending the report to the highest ranking officials in each jurisdiction. He added that he'd really like to have the WSDOT Secretary come and take part in this process with us at one of our next meetings.

Meeting adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.