

# CTR Performance Grant Program

## Program Results

**Robinson Hartsell**

Public Transportation and Rail Division

**Douglas B. MacDonald**

Secretary of Transportation

**Paula Hammond**

Chief of Staff

Public Transportation Conference

August 22 - 24, 2005



**Washington State  
Department of Transportation**

# 2003 Legislative direction (RCW 70.94.996)

In 2003, the Washington State Legislature directed WSDOT to develop an entrepreneurial grant program by ...

- Creating a system that facilitates buying and selling avoided vehicle trips.
- Establishing a value for avoided vehicle trips.
- Bringing sellers together with the buyer

# Legislative direction

To develop an entrepreneurial grant program by ...

- Purchasing \$1,500,000 worth of avoided trips
- Granting an amount based on the value to the transportation system
- Giving priority to applications projecting the greatest reduction in trips and commute miles per public dollar requested

and ...

## **... to consider the following criteria**

- Local price on cost of providing new highway capacity
- Congestion levels
- Geographic distribution

# Who Will Buy / Sell Avoided Trips?

## Sellers

Entrepreneurs

Employers

Public agencies

Organizations / groups

Others?

## Buyer

Washington State (DOT)

## **Sellers offered...**

- 50 proposals
- for a total of \$3.1 million

## **Buyer accepted...**

- 33 projects for \$1.5 million
- that projected 5,022 avoided trips
- and 137,000 daily VMT reduction

**LEAST** expensive trip offered:

\$48 per  
annualized trip

**MOST** expensive trip offered:

\$460 per  
annualized trip

# 2003 – 2005 Program results

Thirty-three projects received grants. Four were unable to implement their projects. Of the 29 projects that were implemented and completed....

- 14 exceeded their goal
- 7 projects made at least 50% of their goal
- 4 projects did not meet 50% of their goal
- 4 showed an increase in SOV trips

# 2003 – 2005 Program results

- Total number of projected trips reduced was 3,645
- Total number of actual trips reduced was 5,141
- The overall program goal was exceeded by 41 percent

# 2003 – 2005 Program results

- The total award amount paid was \$1,084,217.10
- The total bonus amount paid was \$161,508.20
- The average price per trip was \$242.31

# A look at both ends of the spectrum

Top 2 projects based on performance

## 1) Spokane County CTR Office

Projected number of trips reduced – 254

Actual trips reduced – 985 or 388%

Cost per trip – \$120

## 2) City of Redmond

Projected number of trips reduced – 300

Actual trips reduced – 1,032 or 344%

Cost per trip – \$143

# A look at both ends of the spectrum

Two projects that showed an increase in trips

## 1) City of Seattle

Award amount - \$10,000

Projected number of trips reduced – 100

Number of increased trips – 80

Startup costs received – \$2,850

## 2) Community Health Association of Spokane

Award amount - \$5,000

Projected number of trips reduced – 11

Number of increased trips – 1

Startup costs received – \$2,494

# Lessons Learned

**A program like this can be successful!**

- 50% of the projects exceeded their goal
- 75% of the projects received performance funds
- Overall goal was exceeded by 41%
- Over 5,100 trips were removed from the highway system
- At approximately half the cost of providing new highway capacity\*

\*Based on the optimal tolling rate for efficient use of the highway system in the Puget Sound region

# Lessons Learned

## Identifying ways to improve the program

### WSDOT Staff needs to provide ...

- Help developing project structure and goals
- More training and resource materials
- Better technical assistance and guidance
- Greater emphasis on measurement methodology

# Lessons Learned

## Identifying ways to improve the program

### The programs purpose was unclear

- Is it a traditional grant program or an “entrepreneurial” program to create new trip reduction services?
- If it’s a grant, why do funds depend on performance?
- If it’s intended to attract entrepreneurs and encourage innovation, why is the risk so high? [shared risk - 50% WSDOT / 50% grantee].

# Lessons Learned

## Identifying ways to improve the program

### **Instructions on measurements / surveys and calculations were confusing**

- Instructions on how to calculate the number of trips the project would reduce were confusing.
- Instructions on when and how to survey were difficult to follow – not enough information was provided.
- Nearly half of the recipients indicated having problems with the measurement methodology as outlined by WSDOT in the contract language.

# Lessons Learned

## Identifying ways to improve the program

### Eliminate program inconsistencies

- The timelines in the WAC, application and contract differed
- Due dates in the WAC, and contract were different
- Payment calculations in the contract did not coincide with the program's intent

# How do we make it better?

## Steps toward improving the program....

- Have a research team at the UW analyzed the program and identify areas for improvement

# How do we make it better?

## Steps toward improving the program....

- Form a committee consisting of grant recipients, county representatives, private organizations and Task Force members
- Have committee review suggested improvements and make recommendations

# How do we make it better?

## Steps toward improving the program....

- Revise the language in WAC 468-60
- Change contract language
- Enhance web pages
- Increase communication