

# Transportation Demand Management Technical Committee

## Meeting Minutes

June 6, 2022  
Teleconference



---

**Board members present:** Alon Adolf, Carol Cooper, Karen Parkhurst, Michelle Rasmussen, Heidi Speight, Kim Stolz, Michael Villnave, Dustin Watson, Bryce Yadon

**Board member(s) excused:** Marshall Elizer, Mary Anderson, Staci Sahoo

**WSDOT staff present:** Tanna Avila, Steven Breaux, Thomas Craig, Ricardo Gotla, Brian Lagerberg, Christie Stelzig, Stan Suchan, Emily Watts

Meeting convened at 10:04 AM

**1. Welcome and opening remarks** – Brian Lagerberg

- a. Brian is stepping in for Marshall today since both he and Mary Anderson, Committee Vice Chair, are out
- b. Overview of meeting purpose: will talk about the new CTR survey update and an overview of CTR expansion draft legislative proposal
- c. PTD is hiring two TPS4 positions and with passage of Move Ahead WA, there is lots of CTR work in the forecast
- d. Rebecca Jabbar is out on parental leave. Contact Michael Wander with any CTR survey related questions
- e. Icebreaker: If you weren't in this career, what could you see yourself doing?

**2. Public Comment** – Brian Lagerberg

- a. None

**3. CTR survey tool update** – Thomas Craig, Stan Suchan

- a. Stan shared Gantt chart
- b. Where we've been:
  - i. Assessment of 2021 custom build of survey replacement tool
  - ii. Decision to stop the custom build and restart the effort
  - iii. Engagement workshops results were to pursue survey as a service approach to replace the custom in house build
  - iv. Updated the tool requirements
  - v. vendor review is complete
- c. Currently selecting the vendor and negotiating the scope of work

- d. Contract negotiation is through DES and sometimes getting a contract complete varies
- e. Schedule has us using new survey system in September 2023 which is when new baseline data will be gathered
- f. There's been a lot of change in the commute world and comparing pre-pandemic situation to current time is not particularly productive
- g. Negotiations with vendor begin this week
- h. If negotiations fail, we have another vendor as an alternative option
- i. High level of confidence in survey as a service

#### Discussion

Karen: With implementers in the meeting, can we ask them if they have questions about this process?

Olivia Holden: Can you share between the two vendors as to how they compare?

Stan: We cannot share the name of the vendors at this time since we are going into negotiations. Both vendors were quite strongly able to meet requirements. There were some differentiating factors. One vendor is from the TDM world and knows this kind of work quite well whereas the other vendor would be new to the TDM and CTR world. There were some slight differences in how they achieve requirements but they are able to achieve them and provide solutions in different ways. There will be new capabilities as compared to the old system. There may be one or two capabilities that people wanted that may not be available but we are still working with the potential options offered with the vendors and they update their services regularly based on need. One vendor offered online dashboards that ETCs and others can get into whereas the other did not. One vendor offered more intense automation of email reminders whereas the other did not.

Alison Crosier: Is it possible to expound upon the existing WSU survey tool and create the new capabilities that are necessary?

Stan: No, it is high risk, long timeline option and through engagement, it was not an option to be pursued.

Veronica Jarvis: Will funding for vendor result in reduction to any CTR budgets?

Stan: No. WSDOT will not change agreements with implementers this biennium.

Sarah Spicer: I very much appreciate the new tool but think over a full year to develop it once the vendor is on board is a really long timeline. What is likelihood of earlier user testing? Or more certainty for spring use?

Stan: Range on Gantt chart is based in uncertainty in contracting. But the likelihood of early user testing is high. We should know in July how quickly or slowly contract finalization will be and that will inform pilot user testing. We don't anticipate needing workshops for this next phase and we greatly appreciate your participation and input.

Kate Johnson: Bellevue would need to retain something like the aggregate report - per-site results in a format that would allow us to do our own follow-up analysis.

Stan: This is a requirement to be provided and both vendors meet that.

Olivia Holden: Are you able to share if the Plan A vendor is the one with TDM experience or not?

Stan: The vendor with TDM experience is the one we are negotiating with.

**4. Commute trip reduction expansion update – Ricardo Gotla, Stan Suchan**

**a. Shared presentation**

- b. Where we've been: overview of 2021 and 2022 including project brief, development of emphasis areas, initial report, presentation to house transportation committee and workshops
- c. Summary of engagement workshops (110 small group workshops, 350+ participants)
- d. Key takeaways shared including stakeholder enthusiasm, gaps in local resources to do work, value of base CTR program, limitations of current program to achieve emphasis areas, recent legislative funding package, prospective champions have competing priorities
- e. Where we were last week: Draft legislative recommendation with existing CTR with more funding with priority on vulnerable populations, overburdened communities and tribes and new mobility partnership grant program; decision not to open CTR law to revision
- f. Review of **Gantt chart timeline**
  - i. Justin D. Leighton: Is this a use of Move Ahead WA funds or ask for new money?  
Ricardo: this would be a new ask for money; where that money comes from is to be determined. Will not seek funding already committed to public transportation or transit.
  - ii. Jennifer: When we last discussed this with the committee, there were thoughts and concerns around number of coalitions and some of those feel unresolved. Concerned and want to feel as a committee we feel good about that where it is shared out further.  
Ricardo: Staff heard this concern and amended recommendation based on that feedback. There is a greater sense of comfort and support for the update recommendation.
- g. \$3M/biennium for CTR/TDM recommendation:
  - i. Staff is recommending remaining silent on the \$3M TDM/CTR funding in Move Ahead WA package because it is the legislature's intent to fund CTR with that money. It will not be in a budget until legislature crafts each biennial budget.
  - ii. The additional \$3M comes from carbon emission account which has a lot of uncertainty with how much money will be available and when.
  - iii. We have strategic questions to answer that come with that potential future funding like how to meet VPOC-T requirements, are new jurisdictions welcome to opt in, updates to funding formula, etc. and be ready to pivot if for some reason we don't get the money  
Comment: Veronica Jarvis re-emphasized the uncertainty with the amount of money that we'll get from the carbon emission account
- h. Mobility Partnership Grant recommendation:
  - i. Funding would be provided for organizations to conduct planning and grant writing activities to obtain funding for projects as well as funding for project delivery.
  - ii. Operations would be an eligible expense, but capital would not be an eligible expense under this grant. However, grant could be used to leverage other grants that have capital expenditure eligibility, e.g., RMG.
  - iii. Technical assistance will be provided.
  - iv. We may need a menu of talking points for who are you communicating with such as an urban or rural representative and the examples you use to illustrate this will be different

- v. Round robin: do you support this recommendation and are there fatal flaws?

Alan: Yes, I can support the recommendation and don't see any fatal flaws

Karen: Yes, I can support it. We'll have different language for different audiences but yes, I support it

Heidi: Yes, it looks good

Dustin: Yes, I can support this, I think Ecology would support this; don't see any fatal flaws besides issues that have already been discussed

Kim: Yes, and agree with points brought up earlier

Bryce: Yes, already provided lots of feedback. There's still long-term gaps in the transportation funding field. The work is not done now that the last package was passed. From a legislative perspective and my perspective, this is well timed and the work can take a number of years so we should put together policies now so when the time does come and there's a shift in priorities, then we have the information ready. In all the circles I'm talking to, the core groups that are highlighted in this document, are the core groups who have always had the majority of gaps in the transportation system and leaders are trying to address these gaps.

Justin D. Leighton: concern is this consumes other prioritized money that is already been hard work on last session to get to. Board is focused on ensuring what transit was given in Move Ahead WA and that that is fully funded before other priorities. This seems like new money beyond what is already allocated by Move Ahead WA. Fought hard for \$3B dollars and that's what the general managers expect.

Karen Parkhurst: important to talk to each other about this issue. There's areas where our programs support each other so moving forward to place where there isn't confusion about money. Let's band together to get more money than fight over what's been offered.

- vi. Next steps:

- Decision to focus on this proposal
- Feedback from governor's office and legislative champions
- Finalize recommendation, prepare one pager and talking points
- Bring to board for August meeting

5. **Good of the order items** – Brian Lagerberg

- a. Great meeting with CTR implementers last week with many good ideas brought up. Intent of that was to ensure we maintain a voice of current implementers of the program at this forum and how we do that effectively.
- b. Thank you for your engagement and input in this process. The product is a lot better because of it.
- c. TPS4 positions are recruiting!

Meeting adjourned at 11:27am