

Commute Trip Reduction Board
Meeting Summary
May 30, 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 (via conference call), Bill Roach, Aurora Crooks, Matt Ransom, Mike Harbour, Peter Hurley, Matt Hansen, Robin Rettew, Ted Horobiowski, and Page Scott.

Board Members Not Present: none.

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

Audience: Joan Cullen, Washington State Department of General Administration (GA); Joe Olson, CTED; Karen Parkhurst, Thurston Regional Planning Council; Amber Carter, Association of Washington Business; Monica Whitman, City of Kent; and Daniel Carlson, University of Washington.

Introduction and Board Business

Kathy Johnston began by stating we need direction on the legislative package, because we need to get the draft done by June and have it adopted by July. Another big piece of today's meeting is to get the funding policy discussion moving, because the draft is due in August. The third big item is coming to an understanding of how WSDOT is moving demand management forward, which we will discuss later in the corridor plan and GMAP discussions.

Brian noted that the agenda has been reformatted to incorporate items carried over and items to discuss at the next meeting. He said that one of the issues we must keep moving forward is funding and the distribution of funds to the counties, adding that a lot of work must be done between today and August. Aurora, Matt Ransom, Matt Hansen, Page, and Cathy Silins comprise the funding team right now. Aurora said that the group will set aside a full day away from the board to work on funding issues, and that she wants to schedule something for between now and July. She suggested that we ask the TAG members to email us with suggestions for how to do the distribution piece. Kathy replied that she'll work with Cathy Silins, and asked if the group would like to add another member to the committee. The tentative date for the funding committee meeting is July 24.

Brian then mentioned that the Regional Mobility Grant Program has a meeting today to talk about criteria for moving it forward. He added that there are clear understandings of the importance of GTEC's in the process. Bill noted that it'd be helpful if they'd schedule their meetings opposite the board meetings.

Brian then added that the climate process is moving forward very quickly. One CAT meeting has been held, and the implementation group has held one meeting and has another scheduled for Monday. Keith and his team have put together several briefing papers on CTR, vanpools, park and rides, and TRPP. Liz is representing the board in the

process. Bill offered to lend additional support from the board. Peter suggested we get a short briefing at these meetings.

The Governor's office is working on an executive order on sustainability. Brian lent some comments and insights to that process, which should be finalized by the end of June. It's an eight-page order right now, covering a lot of material pertinent to the board. Brian suggested that the board look at it in terms of whether it makes sense within the context of CTR and the CTR statute. Bill, Joyce, Robin, and Mike will work as a group to look at it.

Kathy began the RTPO progress report by mentioning that the draft has been sent out to all of the regional governments. We've only gotten one response so far. Everything is due by the end of June. Kathy added that the board needs to adopt this today. Page noted that her CTR coordinator completed the draft as an exercise, and there was nothing in it that he was unable to address.

Motion: A motion was entertained to approve the RTPO progress report. The motion carried.

April Meeting Summary

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

Public Comment

Joe Olson from CTED spoke about business-related commute trip reduction. He looked at the statute as it was written, and couldn't find language which speaks to CTR within the context of the trips taken during the workday. CTED would like to emphasize the potential of this aspect of ridesharing.

Bill thinks it's a great topic that needs further discussion. Aurora agreed, but added that CTR, as it's defined, is the trip from home to work. Mike added that it stretches the current statute, but keep in mind that we are beginning to move toward overall demand management with this board. Bill suggested that CTED put forth a formal request to the board to review this, as it is a broader policy question and it would be very helpful if this was submitted formally. Joyce noted that CTED looked at this within the boundaries of the GTEC, and that CTED also discussed incorporating an incentive program to encourage employees to rideshare on work-related trips.

Joan Cullen said that, from GA's perspective, it's up to each agency to define what constitutes trip reduction, as far as subsidies are concerned. Liz mentioned that teleconferencing should be included in this discussion. Mike suggested this be addressed in the Governor's executive order on sustainability. Brian mentioned that petroleum consumption reduction is in the order, which would include work-related trips, and that the order be viewed and related from the climate change perspective.

Robin asked if there was a WAC relating to this. Joan replied that she'd look for it and get it for her. Aurora commented that she encourages employers to reduce these types of trips, but that it still falls outside the law as it's written. Brian mentioned that the level of complexity to adding this dimension of trip reduction is a big reason why this board hasn't already done so. He added that we try to keep this relatively streamlined, so that

we can efficiently produce data and demonstrate results. Bill replied that it's still important that we get at this, and determine an accountability measure as we go about broadening our approach.

Moving Washington update

Brian began by updating the group on the strategic planning effort. Historically, there has not been a long-term strategy for managing demand such as there has been for adding capacity. He had a meeting yesterday in Seattle with Chris Pickard of the Urban Planning Office, who wants a spreadsheet that breaks out the 'manage demand' components across two-, six-, and ten-year tracks, measurements which will be integrated into the 'Moving Washington' plan. It's very much a draft right now, but as we move forward we'll share it with the board so that they can contribute in the process. Brian added that there's a great deal of support within WSDOT to move these ideas forward.

Peter asked what the metrics for the 'Moving Washington' measurements are. Brian replied that his conversations with Craig Stone have been largely focused on measurements and goals, and their implementation. Peter said that no matter the strategy for determining the measures, it'll go a long way toward building relationships between the programs.

Brian replied that several of us are participating with PSRC's development of its demand management programs, and we're facing the same challenge there. The challenge remains that there's not a clear definition of, overall, what we are trying to accomplish within a corridor. He added that we need to begin to prioritize, as it's a more rigorous standard than we've had to deal with before. It's more challenging to determine what we're trying to accomplish along specific corridors, as opposed to our overall goal. The general goals are clear; the specific goals are not.

Bill noted that, when you're budgeting, you have to be specific with your objectives, but we need to eschew that approach in favor of a broader perspective while keeping in mind that specifics will need to be addressed over time. Brian replied that we are pushing hard in order to ensure our measurements become clear. Kim said that she wants this to be a multimodal approach and that we need to be in the business of moving people. Liz added we must also consider the movement of freight.

Keith brought up the GMAP forum on April 22 with the Governor. WSDOT was directed to address two issues from the forum: setting a more aggressive CTR goal with incremental milestones, and working with GMAP to make the vanpool goal and measure more contextual. Keith's group put together a follow-up draft memo to be reviewed by WSDOT's Strategic Assessment Office, which in turn will submit it to the Governor's GMAP group.

As for the CTR goals, there is limited statutory authority at the state level to change the local CTR goals in the near term, but focusing on the GTEC's allows us to be more aggressive. A chart in the memo demonstrates our aggressiveness within the confines of the CTR law. The memo also mentions several white papers for the CTR programs. They asked us for an action plan for addressing the CTR goals, so that's been in the memo. The vanpool piece of the memo adds context by addressing not only VMT but also the projected supply shortfalls. Keith concluded by stating that WSDOT is proposing to work with GMAP to develop additional measures, to work with vanpool providers to better and more efficiently provide data, and to develop a quarterly report by

which we can explore our core measures— as well as hone new ones— as we go forward.

Peter commented that, in order to meet the local goals, some funding will be needed by the local governments to meet them, but that doesn't come through clearly enough here. Kim replied that it could be added under the third paragraph on page three, but Peter suggested that it stand alone, not under the GTEC section. He also suggested this be expanded to incorporate projections for vehicle miles reduced, and that this memo identify other programs we might seek funding for. Keith replied that, as for funding, we have four draft white papers ready to go should we need them if questions about funding come up. As for the VMT/VMR goal, it's just not quite ready, as that's a tough number to pin down. Keith added that we're looking at the GTEC's role in this as well.

Bill suggested adding near-term strategies for vanpool parking, noting that a lease-lot program is cost-effective and very near-term. Keith replied that it's in the legislative package under staff recommendations.

Matt Hansen asked about the incremental milestones, noting that the local goals have just been established. Keith replied that we have an aggressive number to reach by 2011, but that we can be more aggressive at reaching the goal through the GTEC program, which is a big touchstone in the memo.

Karen Parkhurst suggested that, within the vanpool piece, local governments should be included in the discussion, as they have a stake, too. Liz cautioned that, if we're not careful, we might fail to capture key VMT reductions that fall outside the CTR statute. Brian replied that vanpools are such an enormous part of the VMT piece, and we need to be sure we don't confuse people with the vanpool VMT numbers. Aurora mentioned that we need to be careful to be sure the numbers represent what's happening statewide, although the biggest vanpool programs are in the Puget Sound area.

Draft legislative package

Kim began by mentioning that she's gotten good feedback from Bill and Peter, and also thanked Mike for doing a great job of keeping this process well structured. Keith said that we're trying to accomplish very specific things today. We're looking to get direction from the board right now in terms of whether this list works, the way it's laid out. He added we need to finalize it in July, in time for the Governor's budget proposal process.

Peter put forth some general questions to the board: Should we be asking for explicit support for authority on the issue of demand management from the Governor and the Legislature? Can we contribute in a way that allows us to broaden our reach into other kinds of trips? Can we lend our expertise to things beyond CTR? Can we broaden our statutory authority? Should we change the name of our board to incorporate demand management?

Robin responded that we should want to provide advice, but to whom? What's influenced in the statutory mandate are state appropriations. She noted that this board has a unique potential to bring a broader perspective on reducing VMT regarding best-use, cost-effective strategies, adding that no other entity can provide that. Bill suggests we also talk to the CAT before we go to the Legislature, as they are the ones who will be taking a lot of this forward. He added that it would be presumptuous not to include them, as they are that broader audience we're trying to reach. Brian replied that there might be a

timing problem, as we need to have recommendations in to the Governor's office by the end of August, but we're already there, as there is a member in the working group.

Mike then touched on the expansion of the board's purview to include TDM, adding that it's a natural progression of what we do. He noted that such a move would expand our authority to work with employers, schools, and local jurisdictions to look at overall trip reduction. He added that we're already partnering with the locals and becoming advocates on such things as sustainability policy.

Keith brought up three goals coming out of this conversation: integrate the climate work and the VMT reduction goals, focusing on what's most successful right now, and having a broader role in TDM. Page mentioned that it's been nice to have been so focused on CTR with this board, but we're ready to broaden, because everything seems to be shifting and the board should shift with it. The legislation as it was drafted four years ago made sense at the time, but needs to be updated to keep up with the times. Brian replied that, in 2006, we didn't put climate change in the CTR Efficiency Act because there wasn't support for it. Things have changed, obviously, and now if we're going to manage demand, if that's our charge, then we need to shift. Bill says we still need to stay focused even as we broaden.

Charlie said that he's struggling a bit with broadening the board's role. He added that if we're to become the TDM board, then the concept of TDM needs to be mainstreamed. Kim replied that we're already dealing with more than the commute share of the market, and that it's more about how we describe this new role.

Peter suggested that we look at the existing statute and determine what may need changing. He added that we should look beyond commute trips, but that we should bring specific statutory changes back in June. Aurora suggested we reexamine the 6-9 peak timeframe, and perhaps reduce the employee threshold for affected worksites to 50.

Matt Hansen suggested we improve our communication with employers, as they represent a large base of knowledge, and added that we support Liz as she moves forward with employers. He also suggested that, as far as expanding our role goes, we should limit our role to what the state is doing.

Ted mentioned the topics of parking and fuel, adding that the national culture is changing and things are falling into place for us. When we appear before the legislature, we need to acknowledge and give context to how this new culture affects us. Liz cautioned that we don't want to put whole industries and small businesses in further jeopardy, that we need to be careful to incentivize, not mandate.

Brian then spoke about the concept of incentives, not just in terms of employer incentives, but in terms of how we change our approach to incentives as they relate to such things as parking and land use. He suggested we simply sit back and discuss what we mean by 'incentives' in other contexts. Aurora noted that without the incentives and the programs in place, we wouldn't be here today. She added that all the groundwork we've laid has prepared us for where we find ourselves now.

Charlie noted that, around the edges, the problem may be solving itself, but there's a planning role here as well. We need to update our land use plans, get our employer services stuff in sync, and we need to do this before we move forward. Joyce replied that

the study group forming under 6580 will help tie those things together. Robin then touched on the extreme revenue shortfalls facing the budget, noting that this board needs to have a very clear, articulate argument for the role of the program.

Keith then added a fourth goal to come out of the discussion: support planning for the future with policy and funding incentives. Kim suggested a fifth: we should be context-sensitive and very clear about what our role is, adding that we may or may not have huge funding asks, but we need to be clear about we can do. Mike noted that we also need to think about the supply side of things, not just the demand side.

TDM strategies for schools

Daniel (Dan) Carlson began by offering a brief summary of the study he's conducting. The Legislature asked his group to look at pilot programs that might prove successful at easing congestion around schools. In phase one, they performed a literature review, both statewide and nationally. About 12 pilot programs were identified for the study, to gauge whether they were effective. Phase two involved presenting the pilot programs to an oversight committee, and then launching at the beginning of 2008. Dan mentioned that TRPC has proposed how to involve schools in a GTEC. He added that they are compiling everything now, and want to have a draft of the study together this fall so that it can be presented to the Legislature and the board, if needed.

Kim asked whether Senator Haugen had been briefed, as she had done a lot of work on this in the past. Dan replied that he and Keith briefed her staff in December, and she's also been briefed by Martha Rose, the Executive Director for Island Transit. Kim suggested another briefing would be a good idea and that she'd be happy to sit in on it.

Dan noted that this is a smaller topic, but that once you get into it, it touches on so many other issues. He added that it's difficult to approach these schools, because right now they don't view this as a high priority. Aurora commented that, as an implementer, she wants to be sure she markets to this angle. Bill asked whether they'll be able to identify dwindling yellow bus ridership as an issue. Dan replied that there are two places that information would fit into the report. Matt Ransom, who runs the Safe Routes to Schools program for the City of Vancouver, commented that he would like to see discussions of the subtleties of the program included in the study.

Draft legislative package

Keith began the second part of the legislative package review by stating that he'd like to start at the beginning of the package and go through the specific issues that come up one by one. He advised the group to start with the core programs, such as CTR, GTEC, and VIP, but that there are broader policy recommendations that would nice to address as well. He stressed that the group doesn't necessarily need to look for consensus, but just an overall understanding of where we're at.

The matrix begins with base funding policy recommendations. Our current funding is \$5.5 million per biennium. Based on staff projections for meeting the local trip reduction goals, local governments will need an additional \$6.8 million per biennium. The staff recommendation also includes nearly doubling the WSDOT CTR budget, which would bring our request to the Legislature to \$13.9 million. This amount should support us as we strive to reach the goals.

Page clarified that the funding source for the CTR program is the state multimodal account. She suggested we also include mention of the support that the implementers provide to affected employers. Matt Hansen suggests that we include a statement which defends our current funding, and added that this matrix does an excellent job of demonstrating the need for the funding we want. Bill commented that we need to convince people that this is an effective means of spending this money.

Keith moved on to the second section of the matrix, which touches on policy questions for which we don't yet have answers: do we add more explicit VMT focus, do we expand beyond the commute trip, etc. The third section relates to GTEC funding. The staff recommendation is to expand the program to \$5 million next biennium. Ted suggested displaying any proposed dollar figures prominently in the matrix. Peter suggested that the budget items be laid out as a subsequent item. Brian suggested adding a column to highlight which linkages the GTEC program supports. Peter suggested we include a small amount of funding to study a GTEC rating and best practices system.

The next program in the matrix is TRPP, which was funded at \$2.5 million last biennium. There are no staff recommendations right now, as the program is being reevaluated at this time. Ted expressed his thoughts that the TRPP grants that were the most effective were the ones that were very clear and direct, likening that process to the situation we now find ourselves in. Peter asked what our timing for the TRPP evaluation is. Keith replied that we're tying in data from other programs to help apply context.

The next program in the matrix is the tax credit funding policy and, again, there are no staff recommendations here. Keith noted that there is more demand for the tax credit than there is funding for it. Brian added that we need to determine the incremental benefit of the tax credit to this point, or its incremental loss if we don't get it. Peter said that if this program continues as performance-based, it ought to be on the table. Mike suggests that someone make a specific recommendation on this to the legislative committee.

The next program in the matrix is the vanpool program. The staff recommendation here is for \$13.8 million and an FTE. Matt Hansen suggested that the board have a direct connection with WSTA on this part of our budget ask. Mike noted that we need to build a case for where the state can be a better partner, and this is the mechanism to do it. Bill would like to see the board further discuss vanpool subsidies for state employees.

The last programs in the matrix are TDM strategies for schools and telework and, again, there are no staff recommendations here, as these are ongoing studies for which data has yet to be compiled.

Charlie commented that we need to keep an eye on the federal side of things too, and what type of funding we might get from fed sources. Peter noted that establishing a transportation options trust is something worth thinking about, adding that a cap and trade and options system could be used as a funding source. Peter also added that rules are being written now in terms of what types of funding distribution systems are being developed.

Kim came back to the broader policy piece by stating that she'd like to see a 10-15 year projection piece up front. She suggested that she and Mike could pick that up next week and figure out where our policy statements align.

Keith then talked over some of the next steps, which include adding current benefit and incremental pieces, looking at outcomes, and working with the legislative committee to refine the list. Ted noted that this is pretty impressive, considering how tight the budget is, that this presents a concise argument for why the Legislature should invest in this.

Board business

Kathy went over the schedule for the rest of the year. The next meeting is in Tacoma, with meetings to follow in Seattle in July or August, and we are shooting for a meeting in Tukwila in late fall. Reappointment letters for board members whose terms are expiring this summer have been submitted to the Governor's office, and we hope to hear back in 7-10 days. Kathy then reviewed the agenda for next meeting, which includes several items deferred from this meeting, including the state CTR plan, the VMT presentation, a TRPP update, and federal authorization. We'll also hear from the Tacoma GTEC group, further discuss the legislative package, and get updates on a few other programs and projects. Other takeaways from today's meeting include setting up the funding policy meeting, the Executive Order sustainability review, the Moving Washington list, the 6580 update from Joyce, sharing email from the Attorney General response, and set up a briefing with Senator Haugen and Kim.

Meeting adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.