

Transportation Demand Management Technical Committee

Meeting Minutes

May 2, 2022
Teleconference



Committee members present: Alan Adolf, Mary Anderson, Jennifer Campos, Carol Cooper, Zach Carstensen, Marshall Elizer, Jennifer Hass, Jan Ollivier, Karen Parkhurst, Heidi Speight, Staci Sahoo, Dustin Watson, Bryce Yadon

TDM Executive Board member(s) present: Anna Zivarts

Committee member(s) absent: Michelle Rasmussen Eric Hansen, Kim Stolz, Michael Villnave

WSDOT staff present: Tanna Avila, Ricardo Gotla, Rebecca Jabbar, Brian Lagerberg, Stan Suchan, Carol Thompson (consultant), Michael Wandler, Emily Watts

Meeting called to order at 10:03 AM

1. Welcome and opening remarks – Marshall Elizer

- a. Marshall announced two committee vacancies. Jan Ollivier will be retiring at the end of the month and today will be her final committee meeting. Staff is recruiting a citizen representative to fill her vacancy. Jennifer Campos is leaving the City of Vancouver for a position at Southwest Washington Regional Planning Council. Jennifer will continue to serve on the committee for a few months while the committee finalizes a recommendation to the legislature for CTR expansion.
- b. Emily Watts announce launch of new Statewide CTR website: www.tdmboard.com

2. Public Comment – Marshall Elizer

- a. None

3. CTR survey tool update – Rebecca Jabbar

- a. Rebecca reminded the group that at April’s meeting the committee approved staff recommendation to pursue survey as a service option and explore possible vendors.
- b. Since then, staff has narrowed search down to two new vendors. Staff continues to examine details.
- c. Rebecca thanked implementers who provided input on and helped defined mandatory list.
- d. Staff is working as quickly as possible to identify new vendor for survey as a service.

- e. Because new survey questions will be different from the previous survey questions, a new baseline will need to be established. Nonetheless, staff will examine options for how to do comparisons over time.

4. Commute trip reduction expansion: where we are, and where we are headed – Ricardo Gotla

- a. Reminded group that the committee is working toward developing a recommendation to the legislature for CTR expansion for 2023 legislative session.
- b. Shared [slides](#) that included summary of 2021 and 2022 project deliverables, summary of engagement workshops, and May 2 – December 2022 timeline and expected deliverables.
- c. Recent phase of work has focused on developing and refining concepts for CTR expansion recommendations, receiving input and refining through stakeholder engagement workshops.
- d. Workshops have provided valuable feedback and participation reflects diverse set of mobility stakeholders. In upcoming agenda items, Stan will summarize recent round of workshop outcomes.
- e. Next big deadline, end of August. Need to have a final recommendation for legislature.
- f. Has met with champions in legislature. Still excited and supportive.

5. Recommendation to not open CTR law – Carol Thompson and Ricardo Gotla

- a. Recommendation only applies to 2023 session. Analysis:
 - i. Risky:
 - 1. A bit of a Pandora’s Box.
 - 2. Risk of losing the law and the program.
 - 3. Would give detractors within and outside the legislature an opening to dilute and/or remove programs. Some see CTR as unnecessary and an unfunded state mandate.
 - ii. Technically complicated:
 - 1. May have unintended consequences for other laws/programs (e.g., GMA, Vanpool, Clean Air Act).
 - 2. May generate multiple time-consuming side conversations not directly related to expansion and new emphasis areas.
 - 3. Challenging to keep focus of change on emphasis areas
 - iii. Would be resource intensive for both WSDOT and partners:
 - 1. May require multiple legislative sessions to complete.
 - 2. May be difficult to build and sustain a supporting coalition.
 - 3. Prolonged effort would provide more opportunity to detractors to weaken/remove law or stall expansion effort.
 - 4. If successful, would require overhaul of guidance and rules. More streamlined and efficient to start fresh with developing new WACs and guidance for new program.
 - iv. Likely unappealing to elected officials, who may be more inclined to fund a new program that compliments existing CTR program and fills service gaps.

- v. Unnecessary:
 - 1. Can accomplish objectives and emphasis areas through other methods such as budget provisos, funding directives or new grant program.
- b. Brian – Historical perspective. Gov. Locke zeroed out CTR budget. Commission asked PTD to survey employers. Result, would do less if state did less, and more if state did more. So, statute guarantees current levels of effort.
- c. Where is opposition coming from?
 - i. Each session there is an effort to undermine CTR program, e.g., defund, pause, study, etc. Some business groups view CTR as an unfunded mandate and would support its removing core program requirements.
 - ii. Politics. Staff has seen a program worked on traded away because another member wanted something else. Not worth risk. Mason Co. delegation spoke against Transportation package because wanted more roads.
- d. Might be good to look at opposition and work to build support.
- e. Regarding level of risk of opening up law: Is there one chamber that could stall efforts to kill changes? Seeing lots of changes next year. Lots of adjustments. Is this an opportunity? Would be willing to open if strong pluses. Telling clients to go big next year. If someone we can rely on to kill efforts to kill then may be worth it. Lots of potential next year.
- f. Committee supported staff recommendation, with the caveat that staff and committee remain flexible to opening law if opportunity presents itself.

6. Review Mobility Coalitions Grant concept – Stan Suchan

- a. Reviewed the evolution of input through workshops from stakeholders.
- b. Evaluating two paths: program outside CTR and expanding existing CTR.
- c. Last two weeks of engagement – 44 people participated in discussions on a new grant program through local coalitions.
- d. New grant concept is a mashup of CTR and Human services. Start-up funding provided to get new coalitions off the ground and established. A small pot of funding for pilot projects.
- e. Technical assistance is critically important.
- f. Example of existing gap: North Snohomish Mobility Coalition and CT have shift workers they would like to provide TDM and mobility services to. But existing mobility grants are not designed to serve this trip market and they fall through the cracks.
- g. New grant concept accomplished to outcomes: promote use of existing multi-modal services and serves disadvantaged and rural communities. RMGs and GTECs used as model for concept.
- h. Significant gap identified – No capacity for existing partners to apply for grants.
- i. Staff evaluated existing state and federal grants and findings conform funding gap assessment.
- j. Response in workshops are positive; confirm that funding and program gaps exist and are experienced by partners; agreed that technical assistance is really important to get new partners and coalition off the ground and running.

- k. Suggestions for improvements: Some coalitions might want to shut down after achieve project, others would want to continue; change name from Mobility Coalitions, confusing; allocations good idea to encourage participation; state provide tech assistance may not be ideal. Alternatively, peer to peer support might be more successful.
- l. Mary – Saw as a replication of CLs. But not opposed to state staff doing. WSDOT will require some funding for program support, admin, compliance, etc.
- m. Staci – Caveat. Loves Mobility Coalitions. Likes a lot about this proposal. Want on record: mobility coalitions very hard to run and sustain. Concerned that too much resource will be required to running and sustaining coalition rather than providing services. Big opportunity for duplication with existing Mobility Coalitions.
- n. Staff will keep that in mind and won't force new programming where programming currently exist. Existing Mobility Coalition may be eligible for to apply for new concept.

7. Upcoming workshops – Carol Thompson

- a. Expect an invitation from staff for small group workshop that will focus on receiving ideas for improvement on an CTR expansion concept focused within constraints of existing CTR law.

8. Move Ahead Washington CTR/TDM funding requirements – Ricardo Gotla

- a. [Shared slide](#)
- b. New CTR/TDM funding comes from Climate Commitment Act.
- c. Climate Commitment Act funding comes with specific spending goals to support **vulnerable populations and overburdened communities**.
- d. It also requires increased outreach and meaningful engagement with tribes.
- e. Potential effects on CTR implementers is currently unknow as budget language does not offer many details.
- f. Staff will work with partners, legislative staff and others to figure it out how to comply with CCA requirements.
- g. Upcoming workshops scheduled for next week will influence how to comply with CCA and staff recommendations to the legislature.
- h. The legislature will likely provide guidance in their 23-25 budget.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50am