

Transportation Demand Management Technical Committee



Meeting Minutes

January 12, 2023
Teleconference
10:00 AM – 12:00 AM

TMD Technical Committee members present: Mary Anderson, Marshall Elizer, Olivia Holden, Carol Cooper, Jennifer Hass, Kristin Melcher, Karen Parkhurst, Staci Sahoo, Heidi Speight, Kim Stolz, Dustin Watson, Michael Villnave, Tiffany West

TMD Technical Committee member(s) excused: Alon Adolf, Zach Carstensen, Michelle Rasmussen, Bryce Yadon

WSDOT staff present: Sylvia Crum, Matthew Cramer, Alex Deans-Gravlee, Ricardo Gotla, Patrick Green, Rebecca Jabbar, Brian Lagerberg, Stan Suchan, Carol Thompson (consultant), Michael Wandler, Emily Watts

Meeting convened at 10:05 AM

1. Welcome and opening remarks – Marshall Elizer

- a. Wished everyone a happy new year and introduced new committee member Kristin Melcher from People for People who replaces Jan Ollivier as a citizen representative
- b. Reminded group that WSDOT will send all CTR Technical Committee-related communications through WSDOT's GovDelivery listserv. Partners should sign up to GovDelivery by following the steps:
 - i. Visit: <https://publicgovdelivery.com/accounts/WADOT/subscriber/new>
 - ii. Enter your email address and click "Go"
 - iii. Under "Subscription Topics", click "News"
 - iv. Check the box next to "Transportation Demand Management"
 - v. Scroll to the bottom of the page and click "Submit"
 - vi. Confirm subscription by responding to confirmation email
 - vii. Save wsdot@servicegovdelivery.com, to your address book
 - viii. Check your "Other" or spam folders for emails from this listserv

2. Public Comment

- a. None

3. Year in review and what's ahead – Ricardo Gotla

- a. Ricardo shared the [TDM Coordination Gantt Chart](#). Staff is focused on a large body of work. Many projects moving forward simultaneously.
- b. Projects are on track though some project timelines have been slightly modified.
- c. WSDOT will look to TDM Technical committee for feedback and priorities if tradeoffs are required.
- d. Jennifer and Carol asked that the Gantt Chart denote which projects need Committee attention. Will help focus committee members' attention.

4. 2023-2027 CTR State, Regional and Local Plans timeline (decision item) – Karen Parkhurst

Decision: Karen motioned to approve the [CTR Plan Writing Timeline](#). Jennifer Seconded. Motion unanimously approved.

- a. Reminder that at the December 1 meeting the committee approved a deferral of CTR Plan updates until June 2024.
- b. The decision today is to approve the recommended [timeline for CTR Plan updates](#).
- c. Twenty years ago, CTR plans were more isolated, but today CTR planning is integrated with other planning processes, such as Comprehensive Plans, GHG management, etc.
- d. Jurisdictions have different rules related to plans.
- e. The committee must make several key decisions prior to plan updates, e.g., determine State CTR performance targets, and potentially amend the CTR program funding formula.
- f. Sylvia reminded the group that the length of time for the CTR plan will be an engagement opportunity and that jurisdictions retain the option to submit local CTR Plans as early as July 2023 once plan guidance, funding formula, and statewide targets are established.
- g. Blair: would anything prevent a jurisdiction from providing more updates than every 6-years? Problem?
- h. Karen: likely not a problem, but there wouldn't be many updates to impact local planning processes.

5. State Performance Targets and State CTR Plan – Patrick Green

- a. Patrick stated that staff is organizing a series of workshop to understand how local jurisdictions use the current state CTR targets and what new performance targets implementers may prefer for the next plan to meet their local needs.
- b. Workshops are scheduled for Jan. 24, 25 and 26.
- c. Stan explained that state targets are not limited to greenhouse gas reductions, other options may include NDAT, DAR, VMT, Metric Tons of CO2 per employee, non-numeric measures, etc.

6. Funding Formula education session – Stan Suchan

- a. Stan shared the current [CTR funding formula](#)
- b. There were three factors in the formula for counties. In some jurisdictions, there has been a decentralization – King and Snohomish. The county total was determined at the county level, but they disaggregated for cities.
- c. Are there new requirements that come with Climate Commitment Act (current Move Ahead Washington transportation package funding source) that required investment in VPOC+T?

- i. CTR meets the requirements currently, but we need to determine whether we meet the spirit of the law. MAW requires some things, and state agencies are trying to figure out with they mean. WSDOT has received funding more immediately. We are looking into how we'll meet/report on those requirements. We don't know yet. We applied this approach to the existing budget. If we used the current approach, we would meet the requirements. But we can explore changing the process, regardless, to exceed the requirements.

7. CTR Survey updates – Rebecca Jabbar

- a. Rebecca shared the [CTR-tool replacement presentation](#)
- b. Rebecca is most excited about the tool being an “all-in-one” system and that it will offer an interactive dashboard. Implementers will still be able to print out reports, but will also be able to refine/aggregate different levels of data
- c. Crosier: A baseline survey could be completed with a program report?
 - i. Rebecca: The program report may be used to introduce worksites to the CTR process.
- d. Veronica: Will ETC contact information be available? (Confirmed) What kind of export for contact information?
 - i. Rebecca: Will follow up regarding export format/fields with RideAmigos.
- e. Veronica: Program requirements process enabled?
 - i. Rebecca: This would be in the program report process.
- f. Olivia H: Can you send the program report core questions?
 - i. Rebecca: Will send what Olivia and Debbie put together.
- g. Crosier: Is there a clearinghouse of survey tool information?
 - i. Rebecca: Available – resource of survey tool training links.

8. Legislative updates – Ricardo Gotla

- a. Governor's proposed budget included funding for commute trip reduction – an additional \$3M a biennium for CTR stemming from CCA.
- b. Transit is fully funded, reflected in Governor's budget.
- c. Mobility Partnerships: Rep. Taylor continues to champion the proposal and has requested a sign-on letter showing there is a diverse constituency. Kristen M. and Jennifer H. volunteer to help draft the letter.
- d. Gratitude expressed for Rep Taylor's support.
- e. CCA funds from carbon credits are more than projected. Debate about whether revenue should be invested in transportation since MAW is supporting transportation.
- f. No identified opposition to proposal.
- g. Carol– is this a pilot project?
- h. Ricardo: No, this is a program funded through a budget proviso – not a bill. Defined as a program.
- i. Stan: Noted that stakeholders said pilot would be a flawed idea. Timelines would be too short. The mobility partnerships target areas that don't typically apply to mobility mgmt. They need technical assistance to stand up the work. If we want to move the needle – then those markets need organizational/relationship capacity building to accomplished prior to the projects operating.

- j. Ricardo: if it were a pilot, it would need to be a long pilot.
 - k. Stan: legislature asked WSDOT to study frequent transit service. Advocates are working with legislature and take data from the study and for the state to assign goals regarding access to frequent transit. This would expand access (geography, frequency, day of week). Advocates using the study to expand access. State role is to provide study + data analytics. Also expand other data – pedestrian + bike. But this is disaggregated data without standards. This data influences access to transit. But this isn't easy or cheap to get. There is a lot of data that we don't have on those facilities. This is complicated. If you want to use the data on widespread/automated data. Width of sidewalk, signposts? Slope, condition. In sum: there is a reason we have better data on highways than bike/ped access. Seattle has led the charge about increasing data access in particular areas. There is progress/examples.
 - l. Carol: how are you going about it? Advisory group?
 - m. Stan: Multiple people from King Co. Metro both in policy and technical group. This team can make a presentation at a technical committee, and we can plug people in.
9. **Top 5: [Commute Seattle presentation](#)**
- a. New survey process. New survey tool. Reduce admin barriers for ETCs. Understand employee travel behavior and dynamic report and analysis. Provide as much support as possible.
 - b. Ask more detailed questions about travel choices. Challenges too. How to survey remote workers and if so, which ones. Firewall and IT issues. Variety of employer/address input – difficult to tie responses to the site.
 - c. Remote work increases on Mondays and Fridays
 - d. 76% driving alone for personal trips.
 - e. Public transit mode split almost doubles for employees who earn over \$90K. More insights to come.
 - f. Question about changes in response rate after introducing a longer survey.
 - g. Shared Commuter Spotlight video. [See them here](#) and [here](#).
 - h. Sylvia noted that we'd like to highlight the work of implementers in these meetings. Invite people to share.
 - i. Any other comments?

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 PM