



1995 ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 30

April 3, 1995 – Introduced by Representatives LAZICH, HOVEN, DUFF, BRANDEMUEHL, ZIEGELBAUER, SERATTI, OLSEN, TURNER, GROTHMAN, PORTER, PLACHE, OTTE, LADWIG, OWENS, URBAN, SCHNEIDERS, LEHMAN, WIRCH, GUNDERSON, DOBYNS and NASS, cosponsored by Senators PETAK, FARROW, PANZER, SCHULTZ, ANDREA, DARLING and ZIEN. Referred to Committee on Environment and Utilities.

1 **Relating to:** requesting Congress to eliminate the requirement for an employe
2 commute option and trip reduction program.

3 Whereas, through the federal Clean Air Act and its amendments, the federal
4 government has undertaken the necessary task of cleaning up our nation’s air; and

5 Whereas, a balance must be struck between the steps to be taken to reduce air
6 pollution and the adverse impact that those steps may have upon the economy, the
7 business climate and the cost of government; and

8 Whereas, under the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, the states with areas
9 classified as extreme or severe nonattainment areas are forced to adopt employe
10 commute options and trip reduction laws; and

11 Whereas, efforts to clean the nation’s air are being conducted through the
12 imposition of onerous and burdensome travel restrictions on the employes of
13 companies having 100 or more employes; and

14 Whereas, the federal government has launched this ill-conceived initiative
15 through the Clean Air Act and its amendments, modeled after California legislation;
16 and

1 Whereas, the effectiveness and cost of California's program are not coming to
2 the surface; and

3 Whereas, trip reduction efforts have cost California between \$136 million and
4 \$197 million per year; and

5 Whereas, the costs experienced by California amount to approximately \$3,000
6 per car taken off the road and \$232 per employe; and

7 Whereas, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that
8 conducting employe commute options and trip reduction programs will cost the
9 economies of just the 10 nonattainment areas a staggering \$1.5 billion per year or
10 \$337 per employe; and

11 Whereas, the General Accounting Office estimates that trip reduction
12 programs will only yield a 1% to 3% reduction in vehicle traffic, which will be quickly
13 reversed by expected urban growth; and

14 Whereas, trip reductions and any resulting benefits will be short-lived at best
15 and will never meet the goals of the Clean Air Act as the California experience, the
16 General Accounting Office studies and urban growth have demonstrated; and

17 Whereas, the General Accounting Office believes that virtually none of the trip
18 reduction measures called for in the Clean Air Act will significantly reduce
19 emissions; and

20 Whereas, the General Accounting Office believes that market-based trip
21 reduction measures will be required if traffic and emissions are to be successfully
22 reduced; and

23 Whereas, recent studies cited by *Transportation Quarterly* indicate that not
24 more than 9% of all cars are responsible for as much as 50% of automotive emissions;
25 and

1 Whereas, the General Accounting Office has concluded that the existing models
2 used to predict emission reductions for trip reduction measures cannot be used with
3 confidence to estimate reductions; and

4 Whereas, there is no data or analysis to demonstrate that the Clean Air Act
5 mandates will accomplish the trip and emissions reductions mandated in the Clean
6 Air Act; and

7 Whereas, it is obvious to every employer, employe, governmental entity and the
8 General Accounting Office that the costs and results of the mandated trip reduction
9 measures do not justify the economic and social hardships which will occur in
10 nonattainment areas if employe trip reduction mandates continue as part of the
11 Clean Air Act; and

12 Whereas, despite the fact that other avenues may be available which would
13 result in, among other things, the elimination of the federal mandate for a vehicle
14 reduction program, it is imperative that the path chosen not result in the disruption
15 of many critical and environmentally desirable programs along with the desired
16 elimination of such program; and

17 Whereas, it is in the best interests of the employes and the employers of this
18 state, as well as other states, to choose the course of action that is directed towards
19 accomplishing one thing — the elimination of the federally mandated employe
20 commute option and trip reduction program; now, therefore, be it

21 ***Resolved by the assembly, the Senate concurring, That*** the members of the
22 Wisconsin legislature strongly urge Governor Thompson and the members of this
23 state's congressional delegation to work with other states and their congressional
24 delegations to seek amendment to the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990 so as to
25 eliminate the provision that an employe commute option trip and reduction program

1 be required in extreme and severe nonattainment areas and, in lieu thereof, leave
2 such program as an option to be implemented by the states based on relative costs
3 and benefits of such program; and, be it further

4 ***Resolved, That*** the assembly chief clerk shall provide a copy of this joint
5 resolution to Governor Thompson and each member of this state's congressional
6 delegation.

7 (END)