

Commute Trip Reduction Board
Meeting Summary
April 25, 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, Liz Warman, Joyce Phillips, Marilyn Young Skogland, Bill Roach, Aurora Crooks, Matt Ransom, Mike Harbour, Peter Hurley, Matt Hansen, Robin Rettew, and Page Scott.

Board Members Not Present: Ted Horobiowski.

WSDOT Staff: Kathy Johnston, Keith Cotton, Casey Kanzler, Ed Hillsman, Anne Criss, Chris Simmons, and Jef Lucero.

Audience: Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council; Susan Whitmore, King County; Jonathan Dong, Perteet; Debbie Anderson, Community Transit; Jennifer Hass, Community Transit; and Diane Wiatr, City of Tacoma.

Introduction and Board Business

Brian began by announcing the resignation of Linda Ballew from the board, effective this morning. He added that we will begin the process of finding her replacement as soon as possible. He then spoke about Tuesday's GMAP briefing with the Governor. The Governor has read the CTR Legislative Report, and provided several comments about it. She spoke of the importance of management and accountability, but stressed the need and the importance of reporting outcomes. The Governor was very interested in the topics of vanpools, park and rides, and CTR. She read aloud the passage that cited the goal of 27,800 SOV's reduced by the year 2011 and then asked, "Is this aggressive enough? Can we incorporate interim steps or measures before 2011?" The Governor concluded by saying, "No, it's not enough. We need more than that."

Katy Taylor, Keith Cotton, and Chris Simmons recently attended a meeting in Bellevue to discuss vanpooling with the Eastside Transit Alliance. Also at the meeting was Kim, who mentioned that, historically, this group has not been a big supporter of alternative commute modes, but really seems to be coming around. She credited Katy and WSDOT staff with doing a great job, and said that Katy's previous work experience gives her credibility with business people, so much so that she's likely to be asked to come back to meet with them again.

Brian then mentioned that WSDOT Deputy Secretary Dave Dye spoke at the agency's leadership meeting yesterday, and that he provided two important CTR-related takeaways: first, he intimated that 'Managing Demand' is the first— and perhaps most critical— step in WSDOT's three-tiered 'Moving Washington' process; and second, he spoke briefly about climate change and how WSDOT must adapt to better integrate climate change into its approach and methodologies.

Charlie suggested that perhaps we could ask WSDOT Public Transportation staff to work with the Planning staff to talk about VMT trend lines to resolve conflicting information. He added that PSRC released its Traffic Choices study yesterday, a value pricing grant which looked at the feasibility of a GPS-based tolling system, and asked that the group take a look at it. Bill suggested we link to the study on the board website.

March Meeting Summary

Motion: A motion was entertained to approve the March meeting summary, with two minor changes. The motion carried.

Public Comment

Diane Wiatr said that she has reserved a room for the June board meeting, and has also arranged for several local representatives to speak. Bill noted that he would like to have them speak on the strategic plan, and Peter added that he'd like them to speak about the GTEC process. Both Peter and Matt Hansen would like to have a more informal discussion about the Tacoma GTEC, and Aurora asked what it would take for them to reach their goal. The board will also invite area legislators.

Development of legislative package

(Please note that the majority of this discussion was to take place during the afternoon's workgroup session)

Brian began by reiterating that the board's timeline for submitting its package to the Governor's office should correspond with that of WSDOT's. The budget is due to the Governor the first week of September, so we'll need to have this together by the end of August. We'll also have to consider Ecology's and CTED's perspectives. Robin asked whether we'd met yet with WSDOT's Assistant AG to discuss the board's legal rights. Brian replied that WSDOT was waiting to hear back on policy direction from the Governor's office before having that meeting. He added that they will meet before the next board meeting.

Strategic plan committee chair reports on work plan priorities

Matt Hansen began by noting that his team has raised a lot of questions on Item 6, but that we need to do of the work set forth in that portion of the plan. He added that we'll be working with the Climate Action Team to find out what we need to do to accomplish this part of the plan. Matt also said that there are two pieces of Item 7 that need to be addressed. The first is that WSDOT staff need to have the survey instrument ready to go. The second piece, he added, is that we need to determine what to do with the information we get, how we tell our story with it, and that we need to put it into a perspective that conveys that story in an easily understood way.

Matt Ransom then touched on Item 1, saying that our prime objective should be to determine what our communication plan is going to be. He added that we've talked a lot about clear messaging, but we need to work on the plan and the legislative push. We also need to compile a list of presentations we're going to give— as well as a list of whom we're going to give them to— and also what he called a master schedule of briefings. He added that we need to get to the RTPO's and identify a target set of presentations. He commented that this can be accomplished by the board if we adopt a sort of "divide and conquer" approach to get to as many people as possible. He also added that we can tie to the two climate bills (6580 and 2815) to link our message to those activities.

Bill asked whether the legislature is the main audience, and suggested that in advance of putting this in front of them that we should first get present it to local jurisdictions and employers. Matt replied that we should host some focus groups to test the messaging Robin commented— and Kim agreed— that another major area to look at for potential impact is the prioritization process within WSDOT for selecting projects. She asked how

the process incorporates the ideology of TDM. Robin added that she's not sure about statute or WAC processes as to how that's done, so a rigorous assessment of that might be in order. Bill added that both grant process and funding piece strategies should also be identified and looked at.

Brian mentioned that there's an all-day meeting today to discuss the 'managing demand' component of Moving Washington, focusing on sets of strategies to meet the demands of specific corridors, and in today's case specifically, the Eastside corridors. Matt Hansen asked about the Regional Mobility Grant process. Mike replied that the grants are due in October. Brian added that we're hiring consultants to look at issue papers for those grants.

Robin said OFM staff are still working to get the budget instructions out by the end of April. One of the things in those instructions for WSDOT is that they've identified 15 different geographic corridors that the agency must report cumulative impacts on. She added that they've also really worked to address the grant programs along those corridors. This approach, she added, represents a paradigm shift in the way OFM prepares the agency budgets. Robin also offered to send a map of the 15 corridors to the board, and will need any feedback next week. She will send them to Brian, who will send it to the group along with a deadline of next Friday.

2008 Work Plan

Keith began by stating that he has updated the work plan based on suggestions and feedback from the last board meeting. At that time discussion centered on the legislative focus of the plan, so we've tailored it to meet that expectation. The final legislative package will be together by the end of August. We've also added a column which speaks to committee work on the legislative process.

Kim noted that the interim legislative meetings will be held in August, so it might be beneficial to incorporate that into the work plan. Keith replied that we can bump up the legislative package to the end of July, with a draft due in June. Robin noted that the interim dates for both houses are September 11 and 12 and December 4 and 5, but that we really need the JTC interim dates.

Aurora commented that she would really like to involve Cathy Silins and the funding committee between now and July. We need to set a hard date for that, as we have already promised to have this done. Keith replied that he had separated the funding policies from the legislative package, but added that the two can still be tied back together.

Robin noted that OFM is really up against severe financial pressures with this budget, and whatever the board asks for might be obscured by a lot of competing interests. She also cautioned that the board not just consider the fiscal requests but the policy bills as well. Bill noted that we're aware of funding shortfalls, but that plays to our strength, as this is where this board has something to offer. Mike added that we need to be aggressive as we pursue these things.

Keith clarified that he will tie the program funding policy discussion back to the legislative package discussion, so he suggested bumping the funding piece up to May in the work plan. He asked the group to recognize that this has been a difficult conversation to have historically, so we need to be aware that we have to reach resolution quickly. Kim offered that she'd like to be involved with that discussion. Peter brought up the

overall size of the funding request, but also that of the distribution piece as well. Aurora added that we want to make sure we have the policies in place. Keith replied that, from the staff perspective, this will be a lot of work, so we must be clear on what the expectations are. It was then agreed upon to keep the funding piece in the same spot on the work plan.

Keith then pointed out the TRPP work plan piece in relation to the tax credits. It's been a requirement of the board in the legislative report, but we didn't do it in 2007. However, it's something we could do this year so it's been added to the work plan beginning in May as the program assessment piece. Brian asked the group to consider whether the tax credits could be used in a more effective way, and suggested that, as a board, we make a recommendation one way or the other.

Keith then mentioned two other bigger items: the CTR policy framework, and the state CTR plan, for which there is no deadline in statute right now. He asked that, as the board approaches the legislative package, it considers how best to integrate the state plan, which the board is scheduled to adopt by the board late this year. Aurora replied that whether we get the money or not, the plan is still going to be there.

Peter stated that he has two suggestions for next month's meeting. The first is that we need to have a better sense of some of the policy changes we might want to consider. The second is determining what kind of process we should put together to get us to a bigger number than the 27,800 SOV's reduced, as noted by the Governor. He asked, what type of resource and program changes would be required to make that happen? Brian replied that we've never had tangible goals for the 'manage demand' component before, but now we do. The statewide CTR process needs to fit into that plan, and that we need to demonstrate how our process befits our long-term plans and goals.

Kim wants to update our image a bit, as we're dealing with things on old terms and in language we barely use anymore. She noted that CTR and TDM have become vaguely arcane terms, and that at some point we should consider more broad-based terminology to convey our message. Bill followed up by saying that it's time to embrace the notion of VMT as a new set of objectives, especially in terms of climate change, as opposed to just CTR. Matt Hansen reiterated that Item 6 in the Strategic Plan— which asks if we're strictly about CTR or do we envision for ourselves a bigger role— needs to be handled immediately. He then asked Keith to briefly offer a cursory summary of the work plan as a living document. Keith obliged and acknowledged that there are a lot of moving parts along the course of the work plan.

Matt Ransom observed that we should strive to push the state CTR plan up, then asked whether we can get to the distribution policy in place this year, based on everything else we have on the table. Keith replied that it has to be done by the summer of 2009, so the distribution piece should likely be completed well in advance of that, perhaps around January. Bill asked whether we have the resources and staff capable of supporting this. Keith replied that he is confident that WSDOT staff are more than capable of doing this, but that we are waiting to see what the climate change process will do this plan. Matt Ransom suggested a "Top 5" list of outcomes for 2008.

Motion: A motion was entertained to approve the 2008 Work Plan. The motion carried.

Board business

Kathy began by going over the draft of the RTPO progress report. She noted that there will not be a lot of information with regard to measurement so it will evolve as a tool. She added that she'd like to hear from the board if there is any other information that WSDOT should try to capture in the report. It will be sent out to the RTPO's for comment. Kathy then touched on several of the key points as laid out in the progress report. She added that the financial plan was a difficult piece of the CTR plan for just about everyone, so we're hoping to garner more information along those lines.

Page suggested a change to indicate that RTPO's work only on local comprehensive plans, as well as for clarification on the question of funding. Aurora asked for the first deadline for RTPO reporting, which is June 30. Charlie suggested changing the verbiage of question 5 under the general questions to, "Describe your efforts taken to align your regional transportation plan with your local or regional growth plans". He added that question 4 could be more specific and less open-ended. Peter suggested adding two questions: "What recommendations would you make to improve the GTEC process", and "What recommendations would you make to improve the performance of VMT and CTR".

Joyce would like to see us ask if the GTEC's or RTPO's are continuing to partner with the local transit agencies and, if so, how successful they've been, as she thinks that will be the biggest key to the success of the GTEC's. Matt Ransom suggested we ask what the current prioritization process is, and what follow up opportunities they are pursuing. Kim suggested adding a question that speaks to the climate change process. Aurora asked for clarification on the consultation questions. Keith replied that we've followed up on the consultation piece with the RTPO's already. Bill suggested that the grant funding question should be specific, not open-ended. Kathy stated that she'll bring this back to the next meeting. She'll need any other feedback no later than May 15.

Kathy's next topic of board business was the schedule for the rest of the year. She asked the board whether they thought touring the GTEC areas would be beneficial and, if so, which jurisdictions would be best to check out this year. Matt Ransom replied that Vancouver is a better candidate for the first quarter of 2009. Bill suggested holding a meeting over the next year or so in each of the GTEC's, beginning with Seattle. Matt Hansen offered to help with the Seattle meeting, and will get the right folks to participate. Brian suggested that we need to be clear about what we want to have come out of these visits. Aurora says that, since we've been to Spokane for a meeting before, they could go last. Casey Kanzler suggested prioritizing a visit to a voluntary GTEC.

Climate change update

Anne Criss began by saying that the next CAT meeting will be May 15, at which they will be looking at the scope of work to be done in response to the last legislative session. Anne noted some significant changes to the membership of the CAT. One-third of the CAT's membership will be new, including Secretary Hammond, Carol Moser from the Transportation Commission, and Lonn Wyrick from the RTPO/MPO coordinating committee. A transportation implementation working group is being composed, as well as three other implementation workgroups. The primary focus of this group's scope of work will be reducing VMT. The timeline will be very tight: the CAT is due to report back to the Legislature in December, so we're looking at September/October for getting legislation, recommendations, or fiscal requests together.

Matt Hansen asked if they are using the CAT's prior work as a starting point. Anne replied that the CAT had an interim report that was delivered to the Governor in February, 2007, and then House Bill 2815 (the framework bill), which was the Governor's request for legislation on climate change. She added that elements of that bill were gleaned from the CAT recommendations. Kim asked whether the CAT transportation workgroup will have a transit representative. Anne replied that they are still in the process of determining who that will be.

Matt Ransom asked whether the CAT will hire a consultant to deal with the Section 8 piece in the specific requirements. Anne replied that the most effective means to coordinate the CAT process is using consultants already hired by Ecology. Bill asked what the board's role will be. Anne replied that this setting is a good foundation, so we can get some dialogue out there as to how you can best be engaged in the process. Bill followed up by asking whether it might be a good idea to have a direct liaison between the board and the CAT. Anne replied that they're discussing this now, and that it's very likely. Brian added that the statutory requirement is that the CAT must work with a CTR-affected employer as well.

Peter asked about the land use piece in the CAT process. Anne replied that HB 6580 speaks to that, as it deals with climate change within the context of the GMA, and that CTED will be involved closely with that. Liz asked whether CTED has been tasked with assessing climate change as it reevaluates the GMA. Joyce replied that CTED is putting together a policy advisory committee, and one of the tasks they have to do by December 1 is look at the GMA and other statutes and what revisions might be needed to better enable local governments to address climate change.

Kim asked what the best mechanism is for keeping the board abreast of any CAT developments. Joyce replied that the Ecology listserv is the best way. Joyce is keeping a list of interested parties. Bill noted that he'd like the opportunity for the board to comment collectively. Brian suggests that Joyce be available to let us know strategically how best we can weigh in or contribute.

GTEC update

Casey Kanzler began by noting that we have all seven signed contracts in place, and WSDOT is now working each jurisdiction to develop its progress report. The GTEC's are developing relationships with the transit agencies in the jurisdictions. There has been some difficulty in getting benchmark data on transit and vanpool ridership. He added that WSDOT is about two weeks away from being able to roll out its baseline surveys. As soon as the draft survey is available, Casey will send a link to the board. He mentioned that two "walkability" audits will be conducted within the Tacoma GTEC. Mike asked about the struggle getting data from the transit agencies. Casey suggested that there are multiple data sources, which confuses the process a bit. Further, this process is simply so new to these jurisdictions- it's not intransigence, it's just newness.

Vanpool update

Chris Simmons began by pointing out a data correction that now more accurately portrays the trend line in the 10-year growth target. We are projecting out to 2013, and with this correction we're now going to be well above the trend line through the 2013 goal. The trend line reflects the 10-year, \$30 million capital plan adopted by the Legislature, but the Legislature has added to the capital plan in each of the last two biennia. There are two pieces not represented here: one is the trend line's relationship to

additional funds put into the program by the Legislature, and one is additional funds put in by the local transit agencies looking to expand beyond the funding they receive from the state. Chris then shared projections through 2020 before going back to look at percentage changes since 2003, and broke that data out by transit agency. There are also new PTPA's in several counties across the state looking at starting programs.

Bill suggested that this be put into terms the transit industry uses, such as annual passenger trips. Chris replied that this data could easily be extrapolated to reflect that. Peter asked about cost per rider or cost per VMT reduced metrics. Chris replied that the data isn't in place yet, because the state program is specifically for capital expansion of these programs, but those will soon be things WSDOT looks at.

Mike asked about the draft vanpool criteria. Chris replied that we're working in a limited funding environment, so we are circulating some draft criteria to agencies around the state to help WSDOT better determine how to allocate to the agencies asking for funding. He added that there are some certain WSDOT baselines in the criteria, such as this must tie into other programs that encourage vanpooling, and this also needs to connect with the Secretary's Moving Washington plan, particularly along certain corridors.

Brian offered that the last biennium was quite different, when demand matched available funding. Now that we don't have sufficient funds, we need to adjust in a way that reflects priorities and existing demand. Mike noted that most transit systems apply their TDP's quite differently, so WSDOT should be careful in the way it collects this feedback. Chris replied that WSDOT is trying to keep it proportionate and system-specific. Brian ended with a comment about the need to convey the importance of starting this program in outlying areas, and the need to tell that story.

Meeting adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m., after a workgroup session on the Legislative package.