

Washington State

**Report on the
Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Program
Stakeholder Interviews**

Prepared for the
Washington State Department of Transportation
by

**Cocker
Fennessy**



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

September 2004

Prepared by Cocker Fennessy for the Commute Trip Reduction Task Force and the Washington State Department of Transportation, September 2004.

To comment or request more information:

- Phone the Public Transportation and Commute Options Office at (360) 705-7846
- Email davisb@wsdot.wa.gov
- Write to the Washington State Department of Transportation, Public Transportation and Commute Options Office, PO Box 47387, Olympia WA 98504-7387

After September 24, 2004, this report will be available online at <http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/tdm>

This information is available in other formats

If you would like copies of this document in an alternative format—large print, Braille, cassette tape, or on computer disk—please call Washington State Telecommunications Relay Service TTY 1-800-833-6388, Tele-Braille 1-800-833-6385, Voice 1-800-833-6384, and ask to be connected to (360) 705-7097.

Contents

Introduction & Methodology.....3

Findings with Representative Statements4

Themes18

Interviewee list.....19

Appendix A: The Interview Responses20

Appendix B: Comments on the Research Findings60

Introduction

Cocker Fennessy, Inc., a Seattle-based public affairs firm, was retained by Washington DOT's Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Program to assist with a stakeholder involvement process intended to identify opportunities and challenges for the future of the CTR Program. One part of this process was research on the views of people who are familiar with the program and represent a variety of perspectives.

The purpose of this research was to assist the Commute Trip Reduction Task Force in answering questions such as:

- Is there a future for the CTR Program?
- Is there a need for the CTR Task Force in the future? If so, what would it look like, and what role would it play?
- How could the impacts of CTR be extended or broadened?
- How does/should CTR relate to other policies and programs?

This paper reports on Cocker Fennessy's research and findings.

Also included in this paper, in Appendix B, are comments on the findings from people who attended Public Transportation Conference 2004: Exploring Transportation Connections, held in Yakima on August 23, 2004. Cocker Fennessy presented the research findings at a workshop called "Where do we go from here? Future directions for CTR and TDM." Approximately 35 people attended and discussed the findings.

Methodology

Cocker Fennessy conducted 34 phone interviews with stakeholders who were identified by CTR staff. Interviewees were selected from a variety of categories: private business, elected and non-elected public officials from all levels of government (local, regional, state and federal), transit authorities, and transit experts.

The telephone interviews were conducted in mid-July and early August of 2004 by Cocker Fennessy staff. Eight open-ended questions were asked during the interviews, which lasted approximately 30 minutes. The interviewers used prompts to elicit more in-depth responses as appropriate.

To promote candor, interviewers assured participants that, while their opinions would be reported to the CTR Task Force, their names would not be associated with any specific views or quotations included in the report.

Cocker Fennessy also informed those who were interviewed that the results of the survey would be considered by the CTR Task Force as it prepares recommendations to the Legislature on whether the program and the Task Force should continue, be modified or be eliminated.

Findings

The findings are conclusions and interpretations based on what was heard in the interviews. The findings are organized according to the questions asked in the interviews. Following each finding are representative statements that were given by those who were interviewed.

The interviews were intended to be qualitative, rather than quantitative, research. The purpose was to gather a variety of ideas and perspectives, not to measure opinion as a poll would do. Because the research is qualitative, the reported findings do not quantify the number of people who expressed ideas. The only exceptions are cases in which a majority of interviewees made similar comments. These commonly held themes also are called out in the “Themes” section below.

Initial thoughts about the Commute Trip Reduction Program

1. Most people perceive the CTR Program as being successful. People often used words like “fairly successful,” “good track record” to describe the program. A few used more positive words (“has worked wonderfully”) and a few were less positive.
 - *It’s a great idea and concept and program. Execution has been a solid B or B+, very good.*
 - *It has been somewhat successful in the past. Recently it has had problems. Hopefully it can turn around in the future to see some of the success of the past.*
2. Commute trip reduction is a valuable tool for helping to manage traffic congestion.
 - *I have been a strong supporter of that program because we have to recognize that it isn’t possible to build our way out of congestion. We have to deal with the demand side of the issue somehow, and CTR is one, because we have 10 years of under-funding transportation issues, and CTR is a good way to get private participation on the issue, which is important.*
 - *CTR is one tool in the toolbox for transportation demand management. Like any resource, you can manage supply side or demand side to find the balance. This is just one tool to reduce demand on the system, which is funded by tax dollars, and this is one way to reduce the amount spent on the system.*
3. The program is a national model program.
 - *I think it’s been an innovative and effective way to reduce SOVs. When I’ve been to other places nationally, no one else took this approach. Washington is unique in that we still have a functioning program here. But it’s probably time to take it apart now to see if there’s a way to do things better*

- *It's been doing well—has been innovative and has hung in there as other states have dropped their programs. It's been pretty cost-effective.*
4. Many interviewees said that funding of the CTR Program should be increased.
- *Overall funding for everyone should be increased. The program is so important and successful. When you consider the alternatives—more congestion or building capacity—it's clear that the program overall needs more funding. I'd like to see a more-aggressive approach by the CTR Task Force to pursuing federal funding.*
 - *I think we should increase the investment level and expand the program.*
 - *Additional money. There already is a small pot of money for experimental, innovative programs like Flex cars and station cars.*
 - *There should be more money for CTR.*
5. Administrative or bureaucratic issues concerning implementation of the program, especially the relationship between the state and local jurisdictions, should be addressed.
- *The overall administration is somewhat convoluted. The way some resources and responsibility are disbursed to the county jurisdictions and some held by the state causes some confusion and some tension for businesses that are in multiple jurisdictions.*
 - *I draw a delineation between the state program and what happens at the local level. Locals are doing good job with what they have to work with. The state spends too much time and money on surveys and baseline data.*
6. Business and private sector involvement is a positive and needed aspect of the program. This is a strength of Washington's program compared to other states.
- *I think it has been a successful program in that it has kept trip-reduction awareness high in the business community without being overly punitive.*
 - *I think it's a good approach to dealing with the congestion problem. The program's involvement of business is what keeps it a national model.*
7. Aspects of the CTR law, including its goals and enforcement authority, need refinement.
- *I think it was a good attempt when it first started, but in hindsight, it didn't go far enough in some areas and it is somewhat limited in what it could be. The goals*

are limited and need some refinement to be more effective; they were not well thought out from the beginning—they seemed to be pulled from thin air. As a result, the results are compared against the goals as a justification that the program is not working. I am not sure we had the right measures to begin with.

8. CTR needs to be better integrated into other TDM strategies, and better integrated into the rest of DOT.
 - *I think probably the most important thing about it is that it is one of the few programs that DOT runs as a way to provide capacity on the transportation system apart from building and adding lanes. It is one of the few programs that have the potential to increase capacity on the transportation system in a sustainable manner. It is the kind of program DOT should be doing more of, especially since it is specifically dealing with the transportation system's capacity in peak hours, high density areas and choke points in main areas.*
9. Lack of enforcement powers is a problem.
 - *I think for the most part it works. The law has very limited teeth. A lot of employees don't take it as seriously as they should.*

Proposed suggested changes

10. People mentioned the following possible program changes:
 - a. expand to include employers of less than 100;
 - b. consider targeting non-commuter travel times and being more flexible to changing target times based on a county's traffic patterns; and
 - c. expand program to include seasonal employers with large workforces that have predictable traffic patterns.
 - *I think maybe their focus needs to be revisited. They focus on the commute. It is my understanding that the commute trips are only 25 percent of the problem. Nowadays there are so many trips throughout the day. There used to be a very traditional peak period and people were driving consistently to the same place at the same time. That isn't the case anymore. It is a very changed environment. There are events—in the city we have so many baseball and basketball games, opera events, etc. You have to take all those into consideration. I don't know what the answers are but I know that the environment is changed.*
 - *The program ought to be more broad-based. It should expand from nine counties and attempt to teach its value system to the entire populace of state. In addition to geographically, it should include a focus on schools to teach the value system to young children.*

- *I think the program should be expanded to encompass smaller employers, meaning down to the 50-employee level or 25-employee level.*
- *One thing we've experienced is that the program applies to entities that are in operation 12 months of the year. We have aircraft carriers here for nine months, so they escape the program, but they have a big impact. The law could probably be written in a way to capture organizations like this.*

11. A common theme was that program funding needs to be more predictable and at a higher level.

- *I think we should increase the investment level and expand the program.*
- *Expand the program, ensure ongoing revenue and that it is consistently applied. The program has been funded, defunded, funded and defunded so many times and that hurts its ability to live up to its potential. Expand it to more employers and counties. The program has had relatively flat income as population increased. Population growth and income have outpaced the program's funding.*
- *They have added new cities (I think Yakima) but they have not added any new funding. These new cities come in and no additional dollars are added. It is not adequately funded and it needs to be.*
- *CTR is always funded on the margin and institutionalized on the margin, then accused of being marginal. We need to de-marginalize it.*

12. Funding tied to performance is a possible way to better motivate jurisdictions and businesses.

- *I like that the program has started to move further toward a performance basis. There was some talk about having funding based on who improved by the greatest percentage. But if we do this there needs to be a baseline for those who have already achieved a lot. Then beyond that baseline, funding should be based on how many people you have moved out of SOVs. And I would prefer that we look at multi-year effort.*
- *I've always thought that if you're going to spend \$10 billion on a transportation corridor, why would you do that unless the corridor has an effective demand-management program. If they don't have one, I wouldn't give them the \$10 billion. There should be some linkage between demand management and grants of huge amounts of money that people get huge benefits from. Corridors should have to compete for funds on the basis of their demand management programs, just as they compete on the basis of the cost-effectiveness of their highway programs. And I wouldn't give money for mass-transit projects, either, unless the recipient had an effective demand-management program.*

13. Administrative improvements suggested were:

- a. streamlining of the relationship between the state and local programs;
- b. more flexibility in how the state interpreted the program;
- c. consideration of changes in the program's application to rural counties; and
- d. redistribution of resources and oversight authority between the central state office and local jurisdictions.

- *Streamlining the administration of the program, taking on more of a central role at the state level, finding a way to make relationships with counties a little different. Some people who administer the program at the county level are also representing the program in compliance. How can a representative also be an enforcer? There is a conflict. The program could be better managed at the state level; that would require more resources.*
- *Well, put honestly, some of the language in the contract is onerous for an organization as large as ours. When I tried to negotiate this with them they refused.*
- *The definition of what counties and jurisdictions are included needs to be thought through. The premise that every county gets \$80,000 to start with is ridiculous. To distribute funds on the basis of politics rather than effectiveness is ridiculous.*
- *I'm aware that some of the more rural counties that happen to meet the threshold because they have a major employer are struggling to meet the performance goals. That's one reason we need to look at the program mandates, what does the state expect and does it meet the expectations. It is important for DOT and the Task Force and Legislature to look at the proper level of funding. I have a personal belief that rural counties don't benefit much—I'm not sure the dollars are well-spent there. They don't have congestion and air-pollution problems. Is there enough money now if we readjust the distribution? I think the money should go where there is the greatest need.*
- *...there is too much state administrative oversight—it is excessive. This work could be handed over to the counties, the way it was done when it was first was administered. This would eliminate some of the administrative duplication and reduce costs. It would also be easier for cities to dedicate resources to administration if it was closer to home. The state asks for too much administration; it sucks up a lot of resources. For smaller cities or counties this makes some sense, but across the board it doesn't make sense.*

14. CTR needs to be better integrated into other TDM strategies, and better integrated into the rest of DOT.

- *It could embrace intelligent transportation systems and advanced technology as a tool for the future—to get employers to utilize information and get that information to the public so they can make choices on their commute. Tying it into other intelligent transportation systems that the Washington State DOT has. And look at the same principals for special events—use the program for major events in the city and elsewhere.*
- *The goals need to be revised and made more realistic. The program needs to be better integrated with broader TDM strategies underway instead of being thought of something separate, and the funding should provide support to do this. The CTR laws don't have any teeth and it operates in a vacuum. How effective trip reduction can be is a direct function of land use. The local cities are not carrying out land-use laws and the employers get penalized as a result. There needs to be better integration with land-use processes, otherwise CTR is just a feel-good thing which can't deliver results.*
- *The focus on employers is good for reducing trips by large employers, but it is not an entire Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. A full program has many components and strategies to meet the goals outlined in the act. There is a need for a coordinated state-wide TDM program of which CTR is one part of it.*

15. Concerns were expressed about the quality of data and evaluation of the program goals.

- *We've used some of their data. They should pay more attention to quality control of employers' data. Sometimes there are typos, like one employer will write \$50,000 where another will write 30 cents. The data is a potential resource that could help improve performance, and they should continue to use and get more out of the data.*
- *I would like to see more quantifiable results and interpretations of them. We got rid of 10,000 tons of carbon in the atmosphere—but what does that mean? We reduced 8,000 single occupancy vehicle trips—but where and is this saving us any time? What effects are CTR programs having along main corridors?*

Perceived goals of CTR Program

16. Most people believed that the most important goal for the CTR Program was to help reduce congestion. Other goals commonly mentioned were reducing single occupancy vehicles (SOV) and reducing air pollution.

- *Congestion, cleaner air. Another goal is to stave off the need for other fixes—building infrastructure. Offer alternatives to SOVs. The intended consequence is*

cleaner air.

- *They are implicit in the idea. Reduce congestion, especially evening and morning congestion, and convert people from their reliance on single occupancy vehicles.*
- *There are a number[of goals]—an environmental set and a congestion relief/mitigation set. Good strategies will support both.*

17. Reducing fuel consumption and improving air quality were also mentioned as goals.

- *To reduce energy consumption. To improve air quality. To get people out of cars to lessen the impact on the transportation system.*
- *The program is under the Clean Air Act and therefore a policy goal must be clean air. But this is a problem because _____ County doesn't have a clean-air problem and therefore naysayers of the program use that to criticize the program. Others include congestion relief and fuel consumption. But I don't think that the goals are prioritized or defined well. If they were, communities might be better able to say "this is a good program for us because we have this problem and we need the program to address them."*

Policy goals of the CTR Program (after being informed that the goals are to reduce congestion, pollution, and fuel consumption)

18. Most interviewees said the state's current policy goals are good. Several people also raised concerns about whether the goals are achievable.

- *I think the order is right. Number one is congestion. Air quality is not near the problem that is used to be because of technology advances. Our major problem is congestion.*
- *I agree with the goals. In large urban areas we need to pay special attention to these to prevent gridlock that would reduce the quality of life. In doing so, we can keep the state competitive with other states/regions in an economic sense.*
- *These are all laudable goals. But from a political viewpoint, congestion reduction is how policy makers and legislators view the purpose of the program. When they talk about CTR they are not really addressing pollution and fuel consumption goals. Some environmental legislators are interested in those goals but the bulk of them sell it on congestion benefits.*
- *These are worthy objectives, but I'm not sure CTR is the best way to get at them. CTR is not a silver bullet. It's not going to "solve" congestion. Currently we have*

pricing structures for fuels and congestion that are out of whack. CTR won't make a dent in these. It has to be part of a bigger more integrated approach.

19. Possible additional goals are economic development, public education, and access to other transportation choices.

- *They are on target. I would add to it broader education of the general public.*
- *Those are important. We spend all day working on those, plus the social-service goal of providing access.*
- *Those cover the public interest, and to a certain degree the private interest. But they should go back to figuring out the bottom-line impact. The program could benefit employers by helping retain employees—employee turnover is expensive for employers. When you evaluate the program from the public-interest point of view, you could miss this other side of the picture—the benefits to the private sector.*

Future of the program

20. There was strong support for the program to continue.

- *Yes, of course it should continue. They shouldn't go away just because the problems are hard and there are not easy solutions. Keep working. Keep improving.*
- *I really believe it needs to continue. I don't think a matter such as the three goals can be left to voluntary participation by the community. There is so much incentive not to do it, people need a push to get on board to do it. Other cities have tried but have not had such comprehensive success as Washington state. With the economy the way it is, with Boeing and Microsoft out there, it seems to me that [the program] hasn't pushed too much of a burden on the economy. The change is coming from other factors.*
- *It should [continue]. It has been a successful program. The business community has generally embraced the ideals of the program and their responsibilities. There has not been a widespread cry that we should step away. The program allows businesses to support a state policy goal, and they get something out of it. The program gets results.*

21. The program and its goals could be modified and updated to reflect current and future traffic demand and needs.

- *I would continue the program, but modify it. They need to make it more broad and integrate it with existing TDM programs. It needs to be more effectively linked to*

transportation and land-use planning. This is easy to say, but hard to do. Until we can do this more effectively, CTR will be challenged. Because land use and transportation are not integrated, we wonder why CTR is not working as well it should. The effectiveness of the CTR Program is so tied to land use it's hard to make it effective if we don't look at land use also.

- *It should continue. The state is growing at 1.5 percent a year and congestion is growing at twice that rate. We have not kept up with infrastructure improvements. This [CTR Program] is low-hanging fruit that we have to have in place. The CTR isn't just van pooling and car pooling. We should also look at non-motorized vehicles like bicycling, which would address both our congestion problem and our health problem.*
 - *If the program continues, it needs to refocus the market. It should go to neighborhood or activity centers, where a lot of people go the same place at the same time. Not necessarily where people work together—it doesn't matter who you work for.*
22. Those who were skeptical or opposed to continuation of the program cited concerns about the program's accomplishments compared to what was intended, and thought that government did not need to be involved—that private industry should provide transportation alternatives to employees.
- *[Continuation] would depend on an analysis of what it has been able to achieve compared to what it was intended to achieved. The program should be compared to alternatives that could be pursued with the same resources.*
 - *I don't think state CTR should continue. Private industry should be encouraged to provide employees with alternatives.*

Perception of the CTR Task Force

23. There was mixed level of knowledge of the Task Force. Many respondents were unfamiliar or did not have an opinion of the Task Force.
- *I don't know anything about the Task Force.*
24. Those supportive of the Task Force thought the following were important functions:
- a. oversight and guidance of program and implementation;
 - b. formalized exchange of information among program participants;
 - c. bringing together the public and private sectors; and
 - d. giving the program a focus and credibility.

- *It is group of very dedicated people that provide good oversight and guidance for the CTR Program.*
- *It seems like a good vehicle to spread cooperation and information. I'm not too involved so don't have much of an opinion.*
- *I used to go to meetings. I think it is important and allows the public to interact with the private to make sure the program is fulfilling its goals. The Task Force requires a limited public investment in dollars but gets a huge return on its investment from it.*
- *I was a member, but a poor attender over the past year because I had another priority. I think it is important. It tries to balance public and private interest, and that's probably why the program has worked better here than it has in other states. It's really important to keep a focus on the program. It's also important for the program to be integrated with other DOT activities, but it should have more importance and impact. CTR doesn't have enough influence now.*

25. Those who did not think the Task Force should continue thought it was unnecessary and not effective.

- *I don't think it is necessary.*
- *I am not sure that it's very effective today. It may have outlived its function or its structure is outdated. It could be more effective; part of this could be because the program is relegated to the basement at WSDOT.*
- *The question for the Task Force is: what role do they see themselves filling? In some ways their role feels duplicative with other transportation bodies, another layer. Their oversight role and their relationship with the Legislature are important pieces. They should clarify their role to be those things.*
- *I don't think they know what they are doing or where to go...a little lost in the woods. They are in a preservationist mode. They see the end of their term and want to preserve their organization, so they have gone into preservationist mode, meaning they think they must change in order to continue to exist. This change may not be necessary. I'm a populist in governmental perspective—the legislature will respond to voters who should decide the future and path.*

26. Some perceived the Task Force as not being broadly representative. It was seen variously as being weighted towards Puget Sound, and as not involving enough private businesses.

- *I have only been to a couple meetings. It seems somewhat Central Puget Sound-centric. Evidence of that is what's happened with smaller counties' funding. When*

you look at the 33 percent reduction in funding for smaller counties, that's not right. We [smaller counties] can do a lot more with \$40,000 than King County can—that's just a drop in the bucket for them. The overall program should have increased funding. The Task Force tends to look inward.

- *They try to do an effective job, but they are spread fairly thin throughout the state. Certain parties perhaps represent their own interest more than the overall goals of the CTR Program.*

27. It was suggested that CTR Task Force membership should be smaller and members' terms should be limited.

- *I would like to see the Task Force membership be smaller and more balanced. Five or six years ago the business community wanted six more members on the Task Force, but they have a difficult time finding folks to fill those positions.*

28. It was suggested that the Task Force should be more forceful.

- *From what I understand of task forces, it has kept pretty serious about doing its business. Some stop doing business or leave everything to staff. They're engaged and pretty earnest. They also have some timidity, a hard time getting into new things. They talk about doing new things, but when it's time to put something down on paper, they chicken out. They need to be more innovative. They need to have more coffee at their meetings.*

Policy direction

29. Respondents said that some combination of entities should be involved in setting policy. Overwhelmingly policy was seen as the purview of the State.

- *It should be done at the statewide level. The executive branch and the Legislature*
- *Ultimately the Legislature. Details should be worked out with Task Force and recommendations of participants like the State, private citizens, public agencies, private interests, etc. We should have the coming together of public and private with the legislative oversight.*

30. There was no agreement on who in the state should be directing policy. The Legislature, Governor, Washington Transportation Commission and DOT were all named as being potential policy directors.

- *Since it is state law, policy has to be set at the state level. It should be DOT. Not to say that other units of government shouldn't have demand management policy, but since it is a state law, DOT is the most logical.*

- *Policy will be set by the Legislature. Recommendations should come from the Task Force as well as from staff and participating counties.*
- *The state Transportation Commission should make recommendations to the State Legislature for actions.*
- *State government—the Governor, who probably would defer to Washington DOT. It would be nice if they reached out to business leaders so they [business] are involved and have a vested interest and want to see the program succeed.*

31. There were also respondents who thought the Task Force or local jurisdictions should be responsible for setting policy.

- *I think the Task Force should set policy and communicate that policy with DOT and the Legislature. The Legislature should not be too involved because they will come up with a political answer. The Legislature should pull back and leave it to the professionals to come up with innovations and new policy. By nature they don't look to come up with cutting-edge ideas.*
- *The Task Force is the right mechanism because it brings lots of voices to the table and is not just Wash DOT.*
- *I think localities need to set their own policy. There are planning organizations that do that. Setting policy for the CTR Program should be to guide the development of local policies so they are consistent and conform to help achieve the overall objective. Washington state is like other states that have a lot of cities that do things fairly autonomously. To set [local] policy to be consistent with the state policy is what's important, and the Task Force should make sure policy is consistent across the state.*

32. It was suggested that private business should be involved with public bodies in setting policy.

- *It needs to have public and private involvement. The private sector needs to be comfortable with the process to support the program. If the policy gets established just by agency people it won't meet the needs of companies. Local companies will need to feel comfortable with it to make it work – bureaucrats are not sensitive to their needs.*

Evaluation

33. DOT was strongly supported as the agency that should evaluate the program.

- *DOT should continue to evaluate the success of the program. The CTR Task Force plays a pivotal role in making recommendations, but should not be the policy-setting group and not the evaluation group because its members are recipients of grant funding. A state agency is better poised to evaluate the achievement of goals.*
 - *I think the DOT should do that; it would have the professional capability, and is an actor in the program. I think it should be independent of the management process.*
34. Independent evaluators such as university researchers were also mentioned as credible entities for conducting evaluations.
- *Someone independent of the program—an objective party, but one who is familiar with the issues. Perhaps UW, independent research firm, state OFM.*
35. The Legislature and the CTR Task Force were also mentioned as possible entities to evaluate the program.
- *For some other part of DOT that is not supportive of the program to do evaluation would be dreadful. The CTR Task Force or someone who supports the program should do it. It should stay with the people who do it now—the Task Force.*
 - *I would think that the Task Force is probably the best place for it. Give it greater authority to be able to do that.*
36. It is important that any evaluation include input or involvement of local jurisdictions, the Task Force, businesses and the CTR staff.
- *There should be a survey of affected local jurisdictions, employers (both major and smaller) and stakeholders. They should survey both the private and public sector. And they should also use data analysis. Do an independent technical analysis of user data, etc. Take the survey information and the data and bring it to the Task Force, DOT and the Legislature. That way they are forced to look at both feedback and independent analysis.*

Additional Findings

37. When asked if they wanted to share additional thoughts about the CTR Program, most interviewees reiterated comments made earlier. Themes heard: the program needs more funding; administration should be more flexible; the program's application to rural counties should be different; the program should exercise more rigorous standards and monitoring; program administration, especially between the state office and local jurisdictions, could be improved; allocation of resources between central

administration and local jurisdictions should be adjusted; performance-based funding should be explored; there is a need for better program data.

38. Some new ideas were shared about adding new program incentives, expanding the program scope, and looking to other states as models.
- *I have one thought that relates to the program being set up to benefit businesses. The program needs some incentive beyond tax breaks for local, state and federal agencies.*
 - *Another problem we face is that a fair number of government agencies are affected by the law. The challenge we face is to get people interested in car pools or van pools. The problem is that people need access to a vehicle during the day, to go to lunch or errands. We need a relaxation of restrictions on use of public vehicles to allow this. Right now it is prohibited as a gift of public funds. We assume that somehow people would pay for mileage. We're addressing the problem by using Flex cars that let people get around during the day. So either relax restrictions on use of staff cars, or give us the flexibility to set up a program with Flex cars.*
 - *Ensure that someone is looking at what other states are doing (kind of like a best practices review). I think it helps to keep generating new, innovative ideas.*

Themes

Although the purpose of the interviews was to gather a variety of ideas and perspectives, all to be considered by the CTR Task Force, it might be useful for the Task Force to be aware that some views were held by a majority of those interviewed. The following are themes that were expressed by a majority of interview participants.

1. The CTR Program should be continued.
2. The CTR Program should be adequately and consistently funded.
3. The existing policy goals for the program are good; the goal of reducing congestion is particularly important.
4. The work of the CTR Task Force is not well understood.
5. CTR Program policy should be set at the state level (but interviewees identified a variety of entities or combinations of entities that should have responsibility).
6. The Washington State Department of Transportation should have a leading role in evaluating the program.

Interviewees

Interviews were completed with the following individuals:

- Andrew Johnsen, Governor's Office
- Ashley Probart, Association of Washington Counties
- Aubrey Davis, Washington State Transportation Commission
- Charlie Howard, Washington State Department of Transportation
- Dave Anderson, Washington Department of Community, Trade & Economic Development
- Dean Lookingbill, Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
- Dick Hayes, Kitsap Transit
- Don Skone, Yakima Valley Council of Governments
- Doug Ericksen, Washington State Representative
- Doug Hurley, CH2M Hill
- Eli Cooper, Puget Sound Regional Council
- Gene Baxstrom, Washington State Legislature staff
- Gordon Price, planner
- Grace Crunican, City of Seattle Department of Transportation
- Ian McGowan
- Jim Horn, Washington State Senator
- Jim Miller, Whatcom Council of Governments
- John Miller, Unico Properties
- John Powers, King County EDC
- John Resha, Greater Redmond Transportation Management Association
- Joyce Olson, Community Transit
- Kim VanEckstrom, City of Redmond
- Leo Bowman, Benton County
- Matt Hansen, King County Metro
- Megan Roberts, City of Tacoma
- Paula Hammond, Washington State Department of Transportation
- Phillip Winters, Center for Urban Transportation Research
- Rob Fukai, Washington State Department of General Administration
- Ross Kelley, Spokane County
- Ruth Fisher, Transportation Commission
- Scott Merriman, Washington Association of Counties/CTR Task Force
- Scott Rutherford, University of Washington Dept. of Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Thera Black, Thurston Regional Planning Council
- Wayne Berman, Federal Highway Administration

Appendix A: The Interview Responses

The following are all the recorded responses to questions that were posed to interviewees.

Question No. 1

What do you think of the state's Commute Trip Reduction Program?

- *It's a great idea and concept and program. Execution has been a solid B or B+, very good.*
- *I think it has been very helpful getting businesses involved in trip reduction and it has had a measurable outcome in reducing trips. It has been fairly successful. It is important to know that it has provided measurable results.*
- *It's been doing well—has been innovative and has hung in there as other states have dropped their programs. It's been pretty cost-effective.*
- *I think it is a necessary effort; it is successful. The program has a purpose in the future as well.*
- *Very valuable but need to focus more attention on it to beef it up.*
- *In relation to me it is very beneficial. I am not far enough along in the process to make an accurate assessment. The fact that they grant money is a huge benefit to us.*
- *I think it is very necessary. Good program. The program itself was a really good idea when conceived of, and it has made a lot of headway. The CTR bodies in counties are doing a good job in their communities. But it's time for a fresh look, to see if the program needs to be tweaked after ten years. I'm glad they're taking this opportunity.*
- *I think it is a good idea, in the context of looking across the transportation system and the need to work on more modes than just the highway mode.*
- *We think it has worked wonderfully. With their help, we have made tremendous strides here. _____ County now has the lowest SOV rate. In terms of cost-effectiveness, it's a real bargain.*
- *I think that we have some issues and things that we feel could be improved. But overall we are happy that it exists and happy to be a part of the program.*

- *This is a value system that ought to be taught and promoted statewide, similar to litter and pollution- prevention campaigns. Overall it is a good program.*
- *My perspective is that the program is very innovative and forward thinking. I believe it is a positive step toward not only reducing air pollution but also managing traffic demands, which is critical. The program gives people choices, and that's what's important from this end.*
- *I think it was a good attempt when it first started, but in hindsight, it didn't go far enough in some areas and it is somewhat limited in what it could be. The goals are limited and need some refinement to be more effective; they were not well thought out from the beginning—they seemed to be pulled from thin air. As a result, the results are compared against the goals as a justification that the program is not working. I am not sure we had the right measures to begin with.*
- *I think it has a good track record. It now has the tools it needs to generate greater results—restoration of the CTR tax credit. In addition, as market conditions affect the costs of driving alone, CTR performance should also continue to increase. So it is a good program, generating results. I think at some point it will plateau and we will have to find another means of enabling the program to reach that next level of success or dimension of success.*
- *It's a good program and from my understanding it has been fairly successful. My role has been political representation for the _____ industry, and while they had some problems expanding the program, by and large they have been happy with the program. Generally the _____ industry has been supportive of the program.*
- *In a nutshell it is valid and needs to continue. It provides alternative choices to single-occupancy vehicles, and helps relieve congestion in urban areas. I would add that it is an appropriate alternative transportation strategy vs. building our way out of congestion. One consequence of CTR at a state level is that it fosters large-scale employers to think about alternatives to the automobile, which is very important. Some big companies already do it, but it is a good consequence of the legislation.*
- *I think it is a valuable one. I think probably the most important thing about it is that it is one of the few programs that DOT runs as a way to provide capacity on the transportation system apart from building and adding lanes. It is one of the few programs that has the potential to increase capacity on the transportation system in a sustainable manner. It is the kind of program DOT should be doing more of, especially since it is specifically dealing with the transportation system's capacity in peak hours, high density areas and choke points in main areas. There is lots of evidence that CTR isn't effective in some areas of the state—in the more rural areas—but those aren't really areas where added capacity is necessary. It wouldn't cost much to add capacity in the rural areas. CTR works because the*

areas where the need is the greatest are the areas where it is most effective. It will not solve the congestion problem, but it helps. It is not the only tool, but it is an important one.

- *They have been successful in accomplishing what the program was intended to do, but it didn't meet the goals. They didn't come close to reaching goals as outlined in the act, but it did set up infrastructure to make progress toward the goals. The goals were too high to begin with; it would have been very difficult to have reached them.*
- *It has been somewhat successful in the past. Recently it has had problems. Hopefully it can turn around in the future to see some of the success of the past.*
- *I think it has been a successful program in that it has kept trip-reduction awareness high in the business community without being overly punitive.*
- *The overall administration is somewhat convoluted. The way some resources and responsibility are disbursed to the county jurisdictions and some held by the state causes some confusion and some tension for businesses that are in multiple jurisdictions.*
- *I have been a strong supporter of that program because we have to recognize that it isn't possible to build our way out of congestion. We have to deal with the demand side of the issue somehow, and CTR is one, because we have 10 years of under-funding transportation issues, and CTR is a good way to get private participation on the issue, which is important.*
- *CTR is one tool in the toolbox for transportation demand management. Like any resource, you can manage supply side or demand side to find the balance. This is just one tool to reduce demand on the system, which is funded by tax dollars, and this is one way to reduce the amount spent on the system.*
- *I find it difficult to distinguish between the state program and various local programs. Overall they tend to be treated as sidebar issues. We know we are never going to spend enough money to achieve commuter or transit nirvana. We need to keep the program strong and strengthen its incentives. Safeco gets fifty percent of people in Redmond by other methods than single occupancy vehicles. We need to learn from their method and teach it to other businesses.*
- *First and foremost, the state should be commended for maintaining a focus on the travel demand strategy. Given the pressure on transit systems, having a program that enables employers to work with public sector as partners, managing single occupant travel during peak hours should be congratulated. The program saves millions if not billions in avoiding costs that would be incurred without CTR. It also holds advantages beyond traffic. Environmental, natural-resource-based, air*

pollution reduction. Lower demand on system, less impervious surfaces need to be built. It seems that the types of benefits accrue throughout the system—on highways, city streets, direct access roads, and driveways, reducing traffic all over.

- *Overall funding for everyone should be increased. The program is so important and successful. When you consider the alternatives—more congestion or building capacity—it's clear that the program overall needs more funding. I'd like to see a more-aggressive approach by the CTR Task Force to pursuing federal funding.*
- *I think it's been an innovative and effective way to reduce SOVs. When I've been to other places nationally, no one else took this approach. Washington is unique in that we still have a functioning program here. But it's probably time to take it apart now to see if there's a way to do things better.*
- *I think it's a good approach to dealing with the congestion problem. The program's involvement of business is what keeps it a national model.*
- *I think for the most part it works. The law has very limited teeth. A lot of employees don't take it as seriously as they should.*
- *I think it is an essential part of how the state does its business. What I mean by that is that there is a public service culture/climate. CTR's goals fit well with that culture. There is the business of what we do and there is how we do business. I think that public service employees have a certain kind of culture. And that culture is very different than private sector employees. Some aspects of CTR lend itself well to both. The two fit together.*
- *It has worked out fairly well. I wrote the original bill so I have watched it fairly closely. It has not been funded adequately, and never will be, but that's just how it goes.*
- *I draw a delineation between the state program and what happens at the local level. Locals are doing good job with what they have to work with. The state spends too much time and money on surveys and baseline data.*
- *Not sure.*
- *Not essential.*

Question No. 2

Are there any changes you would like to see?

-Finance/Funding Issues

- *Yes. Before Wash DOT took over the program, the smaller counties were receiving \$120,000 a year. Wash DOT's core funding for counties has not decreased, but smaller counties have been reduced down to \$80,000. We built our program at \$120,000 and are now doing it at \$80,000. That's a hardship. I would like to see small counties' funding go back up. Smaller counties don't have the resources to supplement the smaller amount.*
- *We want to get CTR addressed in their ferry fare structure. If there was a better connection between CTR and other parts of DOT, we'd be better off. The main body of DOT doesn't listen to CTR much. The ferry system has sort of escaped our reach. We need better connections.*
- *There has been talk about funding at different levels to affect different populations. If we reduce the size of companies that have to comply, much larger resources will be required. If there is a readjustment, some people should be encouraged to comply voluntarily. But Atlanta has shown that an entirely voluntary program does not work.*
- *They have added new cities (I think Yakima) but they have not added any new funding. These new cities come in and no additional dollars are added. It is not adequately funded and it needs to be.*
- *I think we should increase the investment level and expand the program.*
- *Additional money. There already is a small pot of money for experimental, innovative programs like Flex cars and station cars.*
- *I think it is important. Transportation, all modes, including Commute Trip Reduction, will be vital in business job retention and creation. I want to see increased focus on the program. I want to see increased awareness of the program, and I want to see an increase in resources for the program.*
- *There should be more money for CTR.*
- *Yes. The primary one is providing employees with incentives—true incentives. If you are really trying to encourage employees to change their behaviors (and I'm not taking about the true believers), then you have to provide them with real incentive to do so. That is usually money. The funding for the CTR Program is generally not provided. So agencies have to include incentives as part of their*

overall budget. When dollars are tight, which is generally the case, the amounts of the incentives get reduced or eliminated. If you don't provide financial incentives, you have to rely on the employees' good will. In a minority of cases, the employee will still do it, but most often they need some incentive.

- *We need to examine the funding of the program itself and develop a better way of being responsive to the actual needs of the CTR Programs around the state.*
- *If we could get some tax refund money in there it would be great. The original bill called for it, and it was there for awhile, but it isn't there anymore. It now concerns companies that have 100 or more employees. Maybe we could reduce that to 75 employees to get more involvement. There may be problems with that but we may want to look into it.*
- *Expand the program, ensure ongoing revenue and that is it consistently applied. The program has been funded, defunded, funded and defunded so many times and that hurts its ability to live up to its potential. Expand it to more employers and counties. The program has had relatively flat income as population increased. Population growth and income have outpaced the program's funding.*
- *There are limitations on the amount of state investments for the program. Fully funding the program is important to increase the benefits we receive from it.*
- *The one I would like is to continue to strive for more transparency on where CTR funding goes. What I am getting at is how many pennies on the dollar go to credits vs. overhead costs.*

-Transportation Demand Management Issues

- *It could embrace intelligent transportation systems and advanced technology as a tool for the future—to get employers to utilize information and get that information to the public so they can make choices on their commute. Tying it into other intelligent transportation systems that the Washington State DOT has. And look at the same principals for special events—use the program for major events in the city and elsewhere.*
- *The goals need to be revised and made more realistic. The program needs to be better integrated with broader TDM strategies underway instead of being thought of something separate, and the funding should provide support to do this. The CTR laws don't have any teeth and it operates in a vacuum. How effective trip reduction can be is a direct function of land use. The local cities are not carrying out land-use laws and the employers get penalized as a result. There needs to be better integration with land-use processes, otherwise CTR is just a feel-good thing which can't deliver results.*

- *The focus on employers is good for reducing trips by large employers, but it is not an entire Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. A full program has many components and strategies to meet the goals outlined in the act. There is a need for a coordinated state-wide TDM program of which CTR is one part of it.*
- *I've always thought that if you're going to spend \$10 billion on a transportation corridor, why would you do that unless the corridor has an effective demand-management program. If they don't have one, I wouldn't give them the \$10 billion. There should be some linkage between demand management and grants of huge amounts of money that people get huge benefits from. Corridors should have to compete for funds on the basis of their demand management programs, just as they compete on the basis of the cost-effectiveness of their highway programs. And I wouldn't give money for mass transit projects, either, unless the recipient had an effective demand-management program.*

-Administrative Issues

- *Streamlining the administration of the program, taking on more of a central role at the state level, finding a way to make relationships with counties a little different. Some people who administer the program at the county level are also representing the program in compliance. How can a representative also be an enforcer? There is a conflict. The program could be better managed at the state level; that would require more resources.*
- *I think it should be moved to the side of the spectrum. It is not a core function of state government*
- *Administratively- a lot of revenue flows back to community – can be confused in service delivery between public and private service providers with Washington DOT, transit authorities, and private service providers. There are opportunities for the program to be streamlined and centralized in administrative and service delivery arenas.*
- *Well, put honestly, some of the language in the contract is onerous for an organization as large as ours. When I tried to negotiate this with them they refused.*
- *There are two areas: Management and changing the law. First, under management, there is too much state administrative oversight—it is excessive. This work could be handed over to the counties, the way it was done when it was first administered. This would eliminate some of the administrative duplication and reduce costs. It would also be easier for cities to dedicate resources to administration if it was closer to home. The state asks for too much*

administration; it sucks up a lot of resources. For smaller cities or counties this makes some sense, but across the board it doesn't make sense.

- *We've used some of their data. They should pay more attention to quality control of employers' data. Sometimes there are typos, like one employer will write \$50,000 where another will write 30 cents. The data is a potential resource that could help improve performance, and they should continue to use and get more out of the data.*

-Changing Commute Issues

- *I think maybe their focus needs to be revisited. They focus on the commute. It is my understanding that the commute trips are only 25 percent of the problem. Nowadays there are so many trips throughout the day. There used to be a very traditional peak period and people were driving consistently to the same place at the same time. That isn't the case anymore. It is a very changed environment. There are events—in the city we have so many baseball and basketball games, opera events, etc. You have to take all those into consideration. I don't know what the answers are but I know that the environment is changed.*

-Business Issues

- *I think the program should be expanded to encompass smaller employers, meaning down to the 50-employee level or 25-employee level.*
- *The law should be changed so that it is applied to additional employers. There are two ways to make changes: eliminate the 6-9 a.m. rule and have it affect all large employers. The rule should be based on numbers of employees and not time on their arrival at work. Many major employers have large numbers of employees that work different hours than 6–9 a.m.*
- *It would be good to look at lowering the threshold for less than 100 employees.*
- *I'd like to see the law changed to its original intent—to include smaller employers, those with 50 employees.*
- *From an industry standpoint, they are positive, and I have not heard of anyone calling for any changes at this time. The only change I have heard is expansion of the program to smaller companies.*
- *I know it tries to track performance, and has some good quantitative data that support its performance tracking. I think because that it so effective, more of it would probably be a good thing.*

- *I think the focus has been on SOVs. I think that is a little limiting. From a resource point of view, you might want to focus on a different measure. At some point you're going to reach a point where you're not going to penetrate any further, and will need to look at other ways to improve efficiency. A better performance measure might be the ratio of vehicles to 100 employees. If you set a goal of getting it down from 90 to 85 cars per employee, you have a clear goal that is easier to explain to an employer or politician.*
- *Modeled from late '80s Clean Air Act, many worksites (under 100) do not qualify. Given CTR's success, should be extended to worksites of employers with less than one hundred employees. Keep the tax credit carrot out there; just expand so more workers have access to credits. A Ninety-eight person site isn't eligible but should be.*

-Governance Issues

- *A political question is, is the mechanism of empowering counties, which in turn can empower other entities, workable? I'm not sure we have the optimum way.*
- *The definition of what counties and jurisdictions are included needs to be thought through. The premise that every county gets \$80,000 to start with is ridiculous. To distribute funds on the basis of politics rather than effectiveness is ridiculous.*
- *I think I would like to see probably more regulation placed into the law. When it comes to employers that are noncompliant, more help at state level for jurisdictions to deal with employers out of compliance.*
- *I'm aware that some of the more rural counties that happen to meet the threshold because they have a major employer are struggling to meet the performance goals. That's one reason we need to look at the program mandates, what does the state expect and does it meet the expectations. It is important for DOT and the Task Force and Legislature to look at the proper level of funding. I have a personal belief that rural counties don't benefit much—I'm not sure the dollars are well-spent there. They don't have congestion and air-pollution problems. Is there enough money now if we readjust the distribution? I think the money should go where there is the greatest need.*
- *One thing we've experienced is that the program applies to entities that are in operation 12 months of the year. We have aircraft carriers here for nine months, so they escape the program, but they have a big impact. The law could probably be written in a way to capture organizations like this.*
- *More flexibility under the law. Exemptions that make sense for the different jurisdictions. I'm not saying exemptions that allow for the purpose of the program to be minimized. I think that it would enhance the program and make it more*

usable. An example is here in _____ County. Under the law, we don't have to have a program, but I believe that there are areas of congestion. I would like to do a pilot project within those areas and I'd like to receive funding. I'm not saying that we won't get some funding but under the law it isn't explicitly allowed. Clearer defined goals of the program. If the goals are clear, the program would be easier to defend.

-Structure Issues

- *There is a gap between the potential effects of CTR and the actual effects, perpetuated by a lack of awareness of the program. Better communication to local leaders would help.*
- *I would like to see the Task Force membership be smaller and more balanced. Five or six years ago the business community wanted six more members on the Task Force, but they have a difficult time finding folks to fill those positions.*
- *The program ought to be more broad-based. It should expand from nine counties and attempt to teach its value system to the entire populace of state. In addition to geographically, it should include a focus on schools to teach the value system to young children.*
- *I like that the program has started to move further toward a performance basis. There was some talk about having funding based on who improved by the greatest percentage. But if we do this there needs to be a baseline for those who have already achieved a lot. Then beyond that baseline, funding should be based on how many people you have moved out of SOVs. And I would prefer that we look at multi-year effort.*
- *I would like to see more quantifiable results and interpretations of them. We got rid of 10,000 tons of carbon in the atmosphere—but what does that mean? We reduced 8,000 single occupancy vehicle trips—but where and is this saving us any time? What effects are CTR programs having along main corridors?*
- *The entire regulatory approach needs to be rethought. We could continue just because we've always done business this way, but there are some questions we should be open to asking. Who's the target population and on what basis do you determine who you're going after? Then there are some mechanical things, like is the survey of employers the right tool to use. Should we do this? Every two years?*

-Other Issues

- *We would like help purchasing vans—they are really important. We have an old bus fleet and remarkable Park & Ride needs.*

- *I think sometimes the program tries to concentrate too much on carpooling/vanpooling and not enough on conventional forms of transit. One thing that could strengthen the program a lot is to open discussions around what kinds of programs are the most effective and how strong we are on recommending them. We don't know much about parking supply and dealing with it. Looking at it is very important.*
- *Strengthening incentives. And second, institutionally, CTR needs to be put on equal footing as the construction side of the fence. Transportation now is in a situation similar to energy was in the '70s. The industry wanted to build nuclear power plants and dams, but knew they were expensive projects that we couldn't afford. They wrapped water heaters in insulation instead. We need to find soft solutions that maybe aren't as sexy, and institutionalize this system, rather than spending money on infrastructure that we can't afford and may be out of date by the time we build it.*

Question No. 3

What do you think are the policy goals of the Commute Trip Reduction Program?

- *Energy conservation, air quality, [reduce] congestion.*
- *Reducing emissions and traffic congestion are the key goals. Fuel consumption would benefit from this but I'm not sure this is a policy goal for the program.*
- *Reduce congestion, improve air quality, and reduce fuel consumption.*
- *Congestion, cleaner air. Another goal is to stave off the need for other fixes—building infrastructure. Offer alternatives to SOVs. The intended consequence is cleaner air.*
- *I think it is to encourage ride-sharing and transit usage of employees at major employment sites. The broader goal is to reduce air quality concerns and congestion on highways and freeways.*
- *Reduce traffic congestion, reduce air pollution, and enhance mobility.*
- *To improve the environment. The focus is to reduce the number of people who drive by themselves to work. Try and get them to use alternative means of transportation.*
- *To reduce energy consumption. To improve air quality. To get people out of cars to lessen the impact on the transportation system.*
- *To reduce the reliance on single occupancy vehicles to worksites and encourage alternative means of transportation, and also reducing congestion and improving air quality. All of these perceived goals are seen as noble and worthwhile.*
- *Providing affordable and good access to transportation as it relates to employment and commerce. Protection of the environment by pursuing transportation strategies that are sustainable. Also to reduce energy consumption.*
- *To identify opportunities to encourage drive-alone commuters to seek vanpool, carpool or transit options. To promote the program, introduce it to future potential employers, users, employees, and to educate the general public about role of CTR in improving air quality, and mitigating the effect of congestion. It represents one part of a broad based set of responses to address chronic traffic congestion in metro regions.*

- *There are a number—an environmental set and a congestion relief/mitigation set. Good strategies will support both.*
- *They are implicit in the idea. Reduce congestion, especially evening and morning congestion, and convert people from their reliance on single occupancy vehicles.*
- *The policy goals are for employers of over 100 employees to advocate alternatives to single occupancy vehicles, i.e. bicycles, buses, carpools, etc. Also congestion relief and to advocate alternative transportation.*
- *Certainly air quality and energy reduction. Environmental reasons are the main policy goals. Reduce air pollution, improve energy use. The program uses primarily environmental drivers as policy goals from what I know.*
- *The main goal is to reduce the number of single occupant vehicles arriving at large worksites or reduce vehicle miles of travel. The focus has been on the single occupant side rather than vehicle miles traveled side. And another minor goal is to increase the use travel alternatives.*
- *The program shares responsibility for managing transportation resources with the private sector in support of GMA.*
- *Encourage more people to share cars or take carpools or busses to reduce traffic load out on crowded traffic corridors*
- *I think that they should be looking at ways to cross through the barriers of jurisdictional thinking and look at ways to get people out of their single occupancy vehicles. A goal should be to get a better return on money. To provide the greater public with a better return. To me they are an efficiency tool.*
- *Goals are to reduce number of single occupancy vehicles.*
- *The goal is to reduce Single Occupant Vehicle trips to work sites by large employers.*
- *I think they are to offer transportation alternatives to remove as many single occupancy vehicles from highways at peak hours as we can. This is something we can do cooperatively with private employers.*
- *Lower peak-hour single-occupancy vehicle traffic.*
- *The goal is to get more cars off the highway.*

- *The major policy goal of the CTR Program is to provide more capacity. Making sure vehicles traveling during peak times and in main corridors carry more people. To provide a range of incentives and disincentives that will tend to discourage single occupancy vehicles and encourage multiple occupant vehicles—be that transit, carpool, or commuting by other means than motorized transportation.*
- *Reduce the reliance on single occupancy vehicles and help improve overall efficiency of the transportation system. I mean efficiency in the sense of moving more people and less vehicles on the transportation system.*
- *They were defined in statute. If they are to be changed, they must be changed by the Legislature and not the Task Force.*
- *To reduce demand for single occupancy vehicle commutes to work and, by achieving that, allowing for the transportation network to better meet demand to move people and goods through regions. They seem pretty straightforward although with an implied goal of having a public-private partnership with mutually reinforcing behavior to reach the stated policy goals.*
- *They seem kind of obvious. To reduce congestion and get people out of their cars and into alternative transportation.*
- *Hope they would be reduce single occupancy vehicle usage. To assist employers with the CTR Program. And to garner support for the CTR Program and better use of transportation facilities.*
- *The program is under the Clean Air Act and therefore a policy goal must be clean air. But this is a problem because _____ County doesn't have a clean-air problem and therefore naysayers of the program use that to criticize the program. Others include congestion relief and fuel consumption. But I don't think that the goals are prioritized or defined well. If they were, communities might be better able to say "this is a good program for us because we have this problem and we need the program to address them."*
- *Basically to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled, especially by single occupancy vehicles. Also, to reduce dependence on foreign oil and other nonrenewable energy. By reducing the amount of traffic we reduce the amount of alternatives that require construction and other expensive upgrades to our transportation system*
- *Part of the Clean Air Act, that's why it was put together originally. Back then it was called TDM.*

Question No. 4

Let me provide you with a bit of information. The state law that set up the program defines three policy goals for the program. They are reducing congestion, pollution, and fuel consumption. What do you think about these goals?

- *These are worthy objectives, but I'm not sure CTR is the best way to get at them. CTR is not a silver bullet. It's not going to "solve" congestion. Currently we have pricing structures for fuels and congestion that are out of whack. CTR won't make a dent in these. It has to be part of a bigger, more integrated approach.*
- *CTR at the work sites has picked the low-hanging fruit, but employers can only go so far. I am not sure they are making progress with the harder accomplishments. To meet the goals it will take a more holistic approach. But the spirit and intent of the program is good.*
- *I think the order is right. Number one is congestion. Air quality is not near the problem that is used to be because of technology advances. Our major problem is congestion.*
- *I agree with the goals. In large urban areas we need to pay special attention to these to prevent gridlock that would reduce the quality of life. In doing so, we can keep the state competitive with other states/regions in an economic sense.*
- *To me the number one goal is to relieve congestion. Fuel consumption and air pollution are secondary. The biggest goal is providing alternatives to single occupancy vehicles and reducing congestion. It should help us avoid big-ticket infrastructure investment. 50 people on a bus in the mornings means one less lane.*
- *These are all laudable goals. But from a political viewpoint, congestion reduction is how policy makers and legislators view the purpose of the program. When they talk about CTR they are not really addressing pollution and fuel consumption goals. Some environmental legislators are interested in those goals but the bulk of them sell it on congestion benefits.*
- *They are very good goals to have, especially traffic congestion. It has become the primary policy of the program.*
- *Reducing unnecessary use of capacity of highway system is a valuable policy on the highway system. Conserving fuel and improving air quality are admirable goals. The goal for reducing congestion is more subjective, indefinable. I have worked with businesses who generally like more cars on the roadway because they mean more business.*

- *Yeah! I didn't realize the congestion side. They are consistent with federal level and support our goals and what we are striving for.*
- *They are good goals. Reasonable goals. I forgot about congestion. Maybe that is because there doesn't seem to be less congestion.*
- *Those are great goals. They just need to keep current on how they achieve them. Stay fresh.*
- *They are all good goals.*
- *They are neat goals – like motherhood and apple pie. Who could be against these goals?*
- *They're admirable and basic and I wouldn't want to tinker with them.*
- *Laudable. All need to be achieved.*
- *These are valuable goals. We need to be even more accountable than ever on all of these.*
- *I think they are good [helped write them].*
- *Think the goals are ok. Are they achievable—I don't know.*
- *I think they are accurate. If we do reduce single occupancy vehicles by using alternatives, it would do the other two, that's fair. I think there is a positive primary goal that is reduction of use and efficient use, the other two are benefits.*
- *They are on target. I would add to it broader education of the general public.*
- *They're all the same thing. If you do one you do the others. They're all fine. Putting it this way is the right way to sell the program—if you talk about eliminating trips, people get uptight.*
- *I don't think the first one is achievable in the context of the program. Other two are valid*
- *Those are important. We spend all day working on those, plus the social-service goal of providing access.*
- *They are very sweet. The goals are relative, really. It is nice to add energy and pollution reduction in there and those things matter, but a CTR Program will barely scratch the surface for those issues. These issues are clearly mammoth.*

There are other programs that would do far more toward those ends than CTR. The fundamental reason for the program—the actual reduction—needs to be dominant.

- *They are great goals. I would say fuel consumption is a definite issue. Congestion is an issue. Technology has advanced the automobile vehicle fleet so that air quality is less of an issue than it was when the program was created, but no less important.*
- *Fuel reduction is something that should be addressed more on the national scale. It is a worthwhile goal, but difficult for state and local agencies to address. Air pollution and traffic congestion, on the other hand, can be addressed by smaller agencies, and will have immediate effects for the local area.*
- *Admirable. They probably are overwhelmed by growth and the sheer quantity of vehicles. The program probably makes the situation less worse than it otherwise would be. I doubt if anyone would say congestion has decreased. [Even though this won't stop congestion] it is still essential to offer alternatives.*
- *I think it all benefits the community as a whole. Seattle has needed it for a long time.*
- *I think they are great goals but we are not giving the program enough money to make a dent.*
- *I think they are good goals but they aren't clear in the legislation. And they have to fit the different communities' problems. If there is a good "purpose and need" for the program, then communities could defend a need for the program. Again, I think the goals of the program are good, but the structure is the problem. For instance, is 100 the right number? Maybe there is an employer that is very environmentally conscientious and wants to participate but only has 40 employees. The definition of the "commute trip" might also have to be redefined. It's 6:00–9:00 am. I understand that this the traditional commute time but maybe in some communities, congestion occurs at different times. For instance, maybe a community has a big mill or something and at the end of shifts is when they have their congestion. That might not be at 6-9. The program needs to be flexible for communities.*
- *I love 'em. They're about as politically neutral and relevant to what the CTR ought to be doing as they could be. If you say the goal is to reduce greenhouse gas, you lose support. The only thing we might add is promote economic development.*

- *All laudable goals. Reducing fuel consumption is more and more a necessity. These are good goals and you should stress the need to do that in areas that have a problem.*
- *Those cover the public interest, and to a certain degree the private interest. But they should go back to figuring out the bottom-line impact. The program could benefit employers by helping retain employees—employee turnover is expensive for employers. When you evaluate the program from the public-interest point of view, you could miss this other side of the picture—the benefits to the private sector.*
- *I look at Washington as a national leader. They're usually up front in creativity. Their partnership approach is effective. I wish others could build on their success.*

Question No. 5

With what you know about the program, do you think it should or should not continue in the future? Explain your thinking.

- *I really believe it needs to continue. I don't think a matter such as the three goals can be left to voluntary participation by the community. There is so much incentive not to do it, people need a push to get on board to do it. Other cities have tried but have not had such comprehensive success as Washington state. With the economy the way it is, with Boeing and Microsoft out there, it seems to me that [the program] hasn't pushed too much of a burden on the economy. The change is coming from other factors.*
- *I would continue the program, but modify it. They need to make it more broad and integrate it with existing TDM programs. It needs to be more effectively linked to transportation and land-use planning. This is easy to say, but hard to do. Until we can do this more effectively, CTR will be challenged. Because land use and transportation are not integrated, we wonder why CTR is not working as well it should. The effectiveness of the CTR Program is so tied to land use it's hard to make it effective if we don't look at land use also.*
- *It should. It has been a successful program. The business community has generally embraced the ideals of the program and their responsibilities. There has not been a widespread cry that we should step away. The program allows businesses to support a state policy goal, and they get something out of it. The program gets results.*
- *I think it is an important element—not the only solution to traffic problems but it is a key element and it should continue.*
- *Yes, of course it should continue. They shouldn't go away just because the problems are hard and there are not easy solutions. Keep working. Keep improving.*
- *I think something like the program needs to continue in the future, but it needs to be part of a broader TDM strategy. It should continue but not be viewed as the only solution to meet these goals.*
- *I think it should definitely continue in the future. It has been reasonably successful. Until we can change the way we pay for transportation by changing how we place and finance it, we have very few alternatives to try to enforce demand except CTR, so we need to continue and expand on it.*
- *It should continue in the future. It's a very important part of meeting our state's metro area traffic congestion and air quality challenges. It also provides a*

stimulus for added transit rider-ship and van and carpool use. And it is a smart fit within the cluster of alternatives that we provide to the general public for commuting. What I mean by that is that the CTR Program supports our HOV system, commuter rail, transit, van and carpools, light rail in the future, and vice versa. CTR wouldn't work without HOV system and transit etc. CTR enables the whole to be greater than the sum of its parts. It enables all components to work better in an integrated fashion than individually.

- *It's had a lot of success and should continue. It should be expanded to include smaller employers, and should be more aggressively implemented in corridors.*
- *The program has gotten a lot less visible [in the past three years], and needs to get a higher profile. Decision-makers need to know that the program is doing its job.*
- *It should continue. It has been widely used, successfully. It has helped reduce congestion, although maybe more on the margins of large areas. Both cities and private employers see the benefits of program. I would add that there is a long list of people that would like to continue using the program or to start taking advantage of its benefits, so it stands up on its own merits. For public policy this is one area where private and public agencies advocate jointly and that is unique in the public policy arena.*
- *I think it should. The reason is that if it goes away there will be a greater demand for additional capacity on the transportation system and we have no solution for that. It will put more vehicles on the road at peak hours.*
- *It should be continued into the future. We need to look at our transportation system across all modes and look at ways to be more efficient, to carry more people on the system.*
- *Definitely should continue.*
- *Yes, it should continue in the future. Value system needs to be taught here and in every state. I don't think it should continue under the DOT, which is a "fox in the henhouse." DOT [staff] are road builders not conservationists.*
- *It should, with a significant increase in its incentives and institutional stature. We will never afford or buy the \$60-90 billion in investments it would take to build our way out of congestion. The most affordable thing to do is to take the empty seat in a car or bus and put a passenger in it. Carpool is an instant 50 percent cost-share reduction for both the driver and the passenger. It doesn't require public money to build infrastructure or pay a driver. We need some sort of avoided cost model to show how much we save with these soft tools. We obviously need some construction, but CTR has to be a bigger leg of the solution. It is*

always relegated to a subordinate position inside bureaucracy and government. CTR is always funded on the margin and institutionalized on the margin, then accused of being marginal. We need to de-marginalize it.

- *It absolutely should. The amount of trips are reduced—a measurable number of trips that are not on the transportation system. It should be fully funded, extended and expanded. If the saved trips were added back into the system, congestion would be much worse and we would see the value of the CTR Program. Fuel consumption and air emissions are reduced. Every trip reduced is benefit, but fully funding the program would do more to break traffic woes of the region.*
- *It should continue as it is a valuable program, but with changes. Washington state's CTR Program would benefit from alliances with other states to create similar programs.*
- *The program should definitely continue. The companies I work with would support it continuing. Most high-tech companies are in fast-growing, congested areas so they view it as a tool for their employees and a way to have the state get involved in helping solve their transportation problems. Because high-tech companies are in congested areas they will support tools that help get employees to work faster. And high-tech folks are pretty progressive on these issues, too.*
- *It should continue. The state is growing at 1.5 percent a year and congestion is growing at twice that rate. We have not kept up with infrastructure improvements. This [CTR Program] is low-hanging fruit that we have to have in place. The CTR isn't just van pooling and car pooling. We should also look at non-motorized vehicles like bicycling, which would address both our congestion problem and our health problem.*
- *Until they have an effective mass transportation system in Seattle it should continue. People are not going to do it willingly. They need this financial incentive to do so.*
- *It needs to continue in the future. It is important to both business and the environment. It is critical that we have the type of transportation patters that we can sustain for the long term.*
- *I think it definitely should. Again, the way we are going to get people out of cars is to have a program that employers have to sponsor and by giving them a system with which to do it.*
- *The program should continue! It has been a huge success. The goals are important and the program gives us measurable results; there is no reason to stop doing something that is working so well. This is the first time that something has*

made all of the cities work together, that goes beyond city boundaries. This is the first time everybody is able participate in a regional or collective manner.

- *It should absolutely continue!*
- *The goals are admirable. We need to conserve where we can and people need to be encouraged to get out of their cars.*
- *Hell yes, but it needs to adapt.*
- *The program is an important policy statement for the state to make: We're going to do something besides building infrastructure. We're going to get good value out of the infrastructure.*
- *We need to continue the trajectory of having impact. How are we going to get the next 20,000 reductions?*
- *If the program continues, it needs to refocus the market. It should go to neighborhood or activity centers, where a lot of people go the same place at the same time. Not necessarily where people work together—it doesn't matter who you work for.*
- *It should continue in the future. I think overall it is a national leader. It is a direction we need to go consistently to get out of traffic congestion and air quality. It has been very successful and we should continue to get more results out of it.*
- *It should continue at some level of encouragement for employers to support ride sharing, alternative work schedules, flex time. Whether it needs to continue in the same form, I don't know. It is the state's role to support ride-sharing.*
- *It definitely should. They continue to show progress. The program is succeeding. Some might look at it and say the rates aren't as high as they'd like. But things are going downhill in terms of using alternative modes of transportation, so the program is putting a foot on the brakes as we go downhill. It's a challenge considering growth and sprawl.*
- *They have an objective in mind. Some communities say "we want more" but don't specify their objective and are never satisfied.*
- *I think it needs to continue. The most difficult part is changing the way people feel about their cars. We seem to feel that cars give us freedom and without them we aren't free. If you drive on the roads at all, you know why we need the program and need it to continue. There are a core group of employees that are really*

dedicated to this program. They really step up and participate. And they don't need any real incentive. But for most employees, and I'm talking about 80 percent, it's kind of a ho-hum deal for them. For them we need the program, and we need financial incentives for them.

- *It should continue because we need to focus on more-efficient use of transportation systems. Replacements and supplements (more lanes and roads) are extremely expensive. Mass transit is cost-prohibitive and intrusive in urban areas. Using common sense and alternatives can do a better job of moving people and reducing congestion and dependency on foreign oil, as well as reducing pollution.*
- *I think it should continue. It is not going to solve the problems but there is no one answer to all the congestion and air pollution problems so we need every step we can get and this is one.*
- *The program should continue. It is making a difference.*
- *That would depend on an analysis of what it has been able to achieve compared to what it was intended to achieve. The program should be compared to alternatives that could be pursued with the same resources.*
- *I think it should not. I don't think state CTR should continue. Private industry should be encouraged to provide employees with alternatives.*

Question No. 6

What do you think about the state's Commute Trip Reduction Task Force?

- *I am not sure that it's very effective today. It may have outlived its function or its structure is outdated. It could be more effective; part of this could be because the program is relegated to the basement at WSDOT.*
- *The question for the Task Force is: what role do they see themselves filling? In some ways their role feels duplicative with other transportation bodies, another layer. Their oversight role and their relationship with the Legislature are important pieces. They should clarify their role to be those things.*
- *I hope it will turn up meaningful suggestions to get the program back on track.*
- *I don't think it is necessary.*
- *It is group of very dedicated people that provide good oversight and guidance for the CTR program.*
- *It seems like a good vehicle to spread cooperation and information. I'm not too involved so don't have much of an opinion.*
- *I used to go to meetings. I think it is important and allows the public to interact with the private to make sure the program is fulfilling its goals. The Task Force requires a limited public investment in dollars but gets a huge return on its investment from it.*
- *I used to sit on the CTR Task Force. Haven't gone in awhile, but I thought I was a good group of people and a good way to get advice and oversight for the program. It is a good way to connect the program, the people implementing it, and those public and private groups affected by it.*
- *I was a member, but a poor attender over the past year because I had another priority. I think it is important. It tries to balance public and private interest, and that's probably why the program has worked better here than it has in other states. It's really important to keep a focus on the program. It's also important for the program to be integrated with other DOT activities, but it should have more importance and impact. CTR doesn't have enough influence now.*
- *I don't think they know what they are doing or where to go...a little lost in the woods. They are in a preservationist mode. They see the end of their term and want to preserve their organization, so they have gone into preservationist mode, meaning they think they must change in order to continue to exist. This change*

- may not be necessary. I'm a populist in governmental perspective—the Legislature will respond to voters who should decide the future and path.*
- *They try to do an effective job, but they are spread fairly thin throughout the state. Certain parties perhaps represent their own interest more than the overall goals of the CTR Program.*
 - *I have only been to a couple meetings. It seems somewhat Central Puget Sound-centric. Evidence of that is what's happened with smaller counties' funding. When you look at the 33 percent reduction in funding for smaller counties, that's not right. We [smaller counties] can do a lot more with \$40,000 than King County can—that's just a drop in the bucket for them. The overall program should have increased funding. The Task Force tends to look inward.*
 - *It is fairly responsive, takes its work seriously, believes in what it's doing. It serves the public fairly well.*
 - *One change would be for the member's terms to expire. Right now they are appointed and serve until they decide to quit.*
 - *I applaud it. I'm not completely sure of the structure of it but I think it is a good thing. Our general manager of _____ Transit is on the Task Force. We don't have a program but I think it is good because someday we might. My one complaint is that they don't have any authority and I believe that they should have more authority. DOT should have to listen to them. If a committee/task force has good, upstanding individuals, you need to make sure that "bureaucracies" are hearing their recommendations etc. They have to have some authority. Otherwise good people will not want to serve and then the committee won't be useful (self-fulfilling prophecy).*
 - *From what I understand of task forces, it has kept pretty serious about doing its business. Some stop doing business or leave everything to staff. They're engaged and pretty earnest. They also have some timidity, a hard time getting into new things. They talk about doing new things, but when it's time to put something down on paper, they chicken out. They need to be more innovative. They need to have more coffee at their meetings.*
 - *They are a good group of knowledgeable individuals who advocate for the goals of CTR. They are the best group of stakeholders to suggest changes and I hope they are willing to do that. I have a concern that they've been working on this since 1991, and sometimes when you are so close to something, you don't take time to evaluate it. It is heartening that they're doing this survey. I hope they are willing to change.*

- *I think that they have been a positive contributor. They have been consistently there and have done a good job. They provide leadership, guidance and expertise, at a minimum cost. They essentially donate their time.*
- *I think they have authority to set up goals but they don't have authority to implement those goals. They aren't responsible for follow up or enforcement. And I think that is appropriate. I'm comfortable with that level of authority.*
- *The Task Force is important part of the program's success, but it lacks some of the power it needs to be more successful—it is more advisory. I would like to see them have more teeth, more control over funding, and administrative direction. The state should grant them some powers rather than ask them only to advise*
- *I haven't really evaluated it in detail. I think something like it is necessary to keep the statewide focus. It serves to unify the CTR effort across the state, and keeps the common goals under common oversight. We all need to work together to accomplish commute trip reduction, and it is better to have a statewide effort at that high level with representatives from the east side, west side, public agencies, and private interests.*
- *I remember when it was put into place when at the hearing; the chair of state employees came in. I believe it was Mark Brown at the time. He just ripped it up and down because employees had to pay for parking. He didn't even like the paper it was written on. The program has worked in groups that have 100 or more employees in one place though. There are a few throughout the state.*
- *I question its relevance. The hard part is, no one really knows what they do. It is insider's baseball.*
- *I don't know a whole lot about them. To guide a law like this you need a task force. A collaborative group to oversee it. You have to have it to sustain the law and make it real to the public, and guide the law and use of the [law's] applications. They play a vital role, and you have to have them for success*
- *I don't know that much about the Task Force but I think it is fine. You are dealing with human beings who aren't perfect. But you need to keep them and keep working.*
- *I know very little about it, but having a public body with participation by interested private employers adds credibility, so it is good to keep that mix.*
- *Don't know that much about them to make a judgment, though I suspect they are perceived as an oversight group that is very bureaucratic.*

- *I'm not very familiar with the Task Force, but hope they are advocating for programs and research in other jurisdictions. I hope they keep an open mind and compares the program in Washington with programs in other states in all aspects, regulatory and service delivery.*
- *To be honest I don't know a lot about it. I have attended a couple of meetings. They are kind of program policy guidance group. They helped guide what the program should do, so they are important.*
- *Don't know a lot about it. As a researcher I appreciate that they continue to track and evaluate and share information with others.*
- *I don't know anything about the Task Force. [5 more like this]*

Question No. 7

If the program continues statewide, who should perform the following functions?

1. Who should set policy?

- *Policy should be set in coordination between state, regional and local agencies. It can't just happen at the state level; there needs to be feedback between all the levels.*
- *The base policy is defined at the state level, by the Legislature hopefully in concert with the governor. Interpretation of policy should be done at the Task Force level.*
- *It should be done at the statewide level. The executive branch and the Legislature.*
- *I think the Task Force should set policy and communicate that policy with DOT and the Legislature. The Legislature should not be too involved because they will come up with a political answer. The Legislature should pull back and leave it to the professionals to come up with innovative and new policy. By nature they don't look to come up with cutting-edge ideas.*
- *The Washington Transportation Commission and Washington State Legislature should set policy.*
- *Policy will be set by the Legislature. Recommendations should come from the Task Force as well as from staff and participating counties.*
- *Ultimately the Legislature. Details should be worked out with Task Force and recommendations of participants like the State, private citizens, public agencies, private interests, etc. We should have the coming together of public and private with the legislative oversight.*
- *The state Transportation Commission should make recommendations to the state Legislature for actions.*
- *Ultimately, the Legislature, which also funds the program. But the Task Force should make policy recommendations, maybe to the Transportation Commission and the Legislature. The Task Force has done fairly well at this, but their recommendations get sent up and disappear into all the noise.*
- *Quite a bit is set in law. Assuming that the Legislature didn't set policy in law, the Transportation Commissioner should set policy—that's their job.*

- *It should be combination of state Transportation Commission working with leadership of the NPO's and TRPO's*
- *State government—the governor, who probably would defer to Washington DOT. It would be nice if they reached out to business leaders so they [business] are involved and have a vested interest and want to see the program succeed.*
- *Policy should be articulated by the state Legislature, state Transportation Commission, and the state DOT should all have a role in creating broad parameters for the agency, and the agency in turn should follow up with good, quantifiable data back to the regulating agencies. Sees all these key players as important.*
- *The Legislature and the Task Force should be charged with the specifics of determining and implementing policy, but a large part of the implementation should also rest on local agencies. Hopefully the local agencies will oversee the implementation under their jurisdiction and not rely on the resources of the state to do so.*
- *Typically the Legislature sets the policy, but we have an awkward sharing of policy in the state with Legislature, Transportation Commission and Governor's office, though its role is statutorily separated. I'll say the Transportation Commission.*
- *Local government.*
- *The Legislature. [3 more like this]*
- *I think localities need to set their own policy. There are planning organizations that do that. Setting policy for the CTR Program should be to guide the development of local policies so they are consistent and conform to help achieve the overall objective. Washington State is like other states that have a lot of cities that do things fairly autonomously. To set [local] policy to be consistent with the state policy is what's important, and the Task Force should make sure policy is consistent across the state.*
- *The councils of government in different areas, because they are regional and recognized by their region to do planning and programming. And maybe a state body would be needed to coordinate among them.*
- *Since it is state law, policy has to be set at the state level. It should be DOT. Not to say that other units of government shouldn't have demand management policy, but since it is a state law, DOT is the most logical.*

- *That is a hard one. I think that policy should be initiated by DOT but also by the Legislature. There is a real disconnect in that policy is set by the CTR Task Force but not supported by Legislature. So there needs to be more state legislators involved in setting policy.*
 - *DOT. I think they have tons of data that relates to the goals of the project. To me it is logical that they be in the lead.*
 - *Policy should probably be set regionally [within the state].*
 - *It needs to have public and private involvement. The private sector needs to be comfortable with the process to support the program. If the policy gets established just by agency people it won't meet the needs of companies. Local companies will need to feel comfortable with it to make it work – bureaucrats are not sensitive to their needs.*
 - *Should be a state standard tailored to regional needs.*
 - *This should be a joint function between the Task Force and Legislature. The Legislature should establish overarching policy, but there are administrative directions that should be appointed to the Task Force to address.*
 - *The state.*
 - *Policy should be set at the state level.*
 - *The Task Force should make recommendations that the Legislature then authorizes. This also provides balance. Sometimes a task force comes up with a policy/idea that technically makes sense but doesn't necessarily make sense for the state. The Legislature would provide an eye in that regard. And vice versa – checks and balances.*
 - *The Task Force is the right mechanism because it brings lots of voices to the table and is not just Wash DOT.*
 - *The Task Force.*
- 2. Where should program evaluation be conducted?**
- *WSDOT should evaluate it.*

- *I think the DOT should do that; it would have the professional capability, and is an actor in the program. I think it should be independent of the management process.*
- *DOT. Because they are the overseer of the program.*
- *I think the DOT.*
- *Wash DOT. The only possible other program would be the UW or a skilled public opinion research firm like yourselves*
- *DOT should continue to evaluate the success of the program. The CTR Task Force plays a pivotal role in making recommendations, but should not be the policy-setting group and not the evaluation group because its members are recipients of grant funding. A state agency is better poised to evaluate the achievement of goals.*
- *Probably the Department of Transportation or similar agency at the state level with involvement from CTR Task Force staff.*
- *You can't evaluate yourself, so probably a state agency should do evaluation. Probably DOT.*
- *The state level is the appropriate place for evaluation. It also depends a bit on what the evaluation is.*
- *At the state level, not at the regional level where efforts would be duplicated. By the state DOT.*
- *At the state level— probably DOT, with an emphasis on analyzing the quantifiable figures hopefully coming out of the program.*
- *Should be the Department of Transportation, Public Transportation Division, by far. No other existing institutional body is in place to do it. Therefore this makes the most sense for this division to administer the program, now that the Department of Energy is gone.*
- *Probably at the state level, with DOT. They set policy, they manage the program, they should evaluate it as well.*
- *Interesting question. DOT should have some role. From my past experience in _____, the state hired an academic institution to do an independent evaluation. It was important that they were familiar with the transportation system and demand strategies, but then gave the state and objective third party evaluation.*

People close to the program should have a voice, but the objective evaluation is also important.

- *There should be a survey of affected local jurisdictions, employers (both major and smaller) and stakeholders. They should survey both the private and public sector. And they should also use data analysis. Do an independent technical analysis of user data etc. Take the survey information and the data and bring it to the Task Force, DOT and the Legislature. That way they are forced to look at both feedback and independent analysis.*
- *Someone independent of the program—an objective party, but one who is familiar with the issues. Perhaps UW, independent research firm, state OFM. [3 more like this]*
- *The Legislature. [3 more like this]*
- *For some other part of DOT that is not supportive of the program to do evaluation would be dreadful. The CTR Task Force or someone who supports the program should do it. It should stay with the people who do it now—the Task Force.*
- *State CTR staff should perform this function.*
- *I would think that the Task Force is probably the best place for it. Give it greater authority to be able to do that.*
- *We should also take a hard look at having self-examination from participants. They won't just pat themselves on the back—they have been critical of themselves and want to do a better job.*
- *Well I think the agency that is actually carrying out the program and operates it needs to do the evaluation, but the criteria for it can be set by the state.*
- *At a metropolitan transportation system level, and employer site specific level.*
- *Each of the different components of the program has separate requirements. Someone with CTR Program grants in Yakima has a different program than someone with CTR Program grants in Seattle, so the evaluation should be done locally in the area where the dollars are allocated.*
- *Actually the communities should do the evaluation but DOT is the coordinator, collector, instigator of the evaluation information and process.*

- *The state OMB or whatever it is called will be doing some evaluation of the program's financials.*
- *I don't give a damn. The point is not where—but by not having structured CTR's role, we don't give it its due, we don't pay it enough, and then we wonder why it hasn't changed the world. Evaluate it in the context of it being a way to avoid building. Depending on who you talk to, one highway lane carries 1800-2200 vehicles per hour. Safeco has x number of people going an average of 23 miles to Redmond. It is a stunning sum, how much they can save with their 50% CTR. 405 is about 30 miles - to fix or upgrade it would be \$4 billion. If one lane isn't needed because of the use of softer tools, the savings are immense. We need an economic model to show value of these soft solutions.*
- *Oh heavens I don't know. I suspect they should chose an employer with a lot of employees like Boeing or the Puget Sound Naval Ship Yard and look and that, and then look at someone with a medium sized employee base, and someone with a small base, and evaluate how it is working within the various sized businesses in the state.*
- *I would come back to even question why you evaluate it. How rigorous do the evaluations need to be? I question the annual or biennial surveys (I forget which it is) and doing endless data analyses to prove that two cars came off the road, five gallons of gas were saved and two pounds of carbon dioxide is out of air. I am being flip, but it is about comparing the level of effort it takes and what your return is on it. I just don't see the analysis as being worth it.*

Question No. 8

Are there any other thoughts you might want to share with me about the program or Task Force?

- *I think that the program is flawed but the purpose is admirable and applaudable. It is flawed because it is a one-size-fit- all and blankets over every county the same. I don't believe that the populations are spread well over the counties. Employers that have over 100 employees have to participate, even if the county has a very low population and there isn't any congestion. There should be a non-congestion exemption for rural counties and other exemptions that make the law more flexible and take the differences in jurisdictions around the state into consideration. There is no ability within the law for any flexibility. It is one-size-fits-all, which isn't good.*
- *The program has been a very good thing. We should be cautious about using this opportunity to expand the program. It's not the right time for that kind of a grab.*
- *It seems to me like we had a successful CTR Program and then we got somewhat limited with funding. We took away the incentives to business and the front-line organizations that have the responsibility to make these programs work. Companies have to provide parking, share addresses for carpools, provide flexible working hours, etc...these are all front line [business] functions. When funding was cut, we reduced those incentives and kept the funding to staff, who could look at the CTR Program but do nothing to actually implement the program. In addition, the program has suffered because of severe Boeing cutbacks. They were a key element in producing and coordinating carpools with the 100,000 employees, but now they are down to 50,000, and those workers have been absorbed by other employers. We have carpool vans that don't have drivers. We need incentives to other companies as well. Where we used to be able to work with one company, we now have to follow the workers to their new employers to get as many people participating in CTR programs. Also, think about including smaller employers.*
- *I think we need to evaluate all programs like the CTR Task Force to ensure they are core programs for state government or if they can be achieved by private industry or local governments.*
- *By and large the Legislature supports the program. Staff have taken some hits and they don't always see that [that the Legislature is supportive]. Staff get a little shy about standing up for themselves. Rather than go out and say we're doing a good job and could do better with more funding, they get protective of what they've got. They ask the Legislature to keep us at the same level.*

- *I'm a little disappointed that they haven't had tighter standards. If you try something and it doesn't work, there are no consequences. But then anything that has mandates doesn't work. But people can get a lot done if they think they have to comply. There have been some wildly successful programs, like _____—they're a great example.*
- *Make sure the types of credits provided do not inadvertently and adversely impact the CTR users. Some in the past have resulted in a tax hit. Some credits can be interpreted by the IRS as a tax benefit. Because of this, some private sector people have mentioned they wanted to do more but it didn't make sense because of the tax hit they would have taken by receiving some of the benefits. We need to make sure the program provides the right incentives without inadvertently being a disincentive to some extent. The example I heard was that an employer who got free parking as a benefit was fine, but if you received a free buss pass over a certain value it would be taxed. This just needs to be profiled as a limitation of the program.*
- *A lot of the large private companies who participated used to have CTR coordinators, a program that was partially subsidized by program funds. As money has been cut, those resources have been cut and that has hurt these private sector programs. This should be revisited, because I think this was a big asset of the program.*
- *I guess one thing is that right now our policy toward transportation demand management involves nibbling around the edges. I have been working with CTR for a long time. We have contained in law a duty to monitor the program and to provide incentives for following it, but we have ambitious targets to reach with these relatively soft program methods. If we are serious about these targets, we have to get serious about the program. We have to talk about congestion pricing and parking supply. We have gone as far as we can go with passing out t-shirts and cookies at our annual evaluations. We have to start getting serious about congestion pricing and look at parking supply. These will not be pleasant conversations but if we want it to work those are two areas where we can make a huge impact, and we haven't looked to them at all yet.*
- *I have one thought that relates to the program being set up to benefit businesses. The program needs some incentive beyond tax breaks for local, state and federal agencies.*
- *Another problem we face is that a fair number of government agencies are affected by the law. The challenge we face is to get people interested in car pools or van pools. The problem is that people need access to a vehicle during the day, to go to lunch or errands. We need a relaxation of restrictions on use of public vehicles to allow this. Right now it is prohibited as a gift of public funds. We assume that somehow people would pay for mileage. We're addressing the*

problem by using Flex cars that let people get around during the day. So either relax restrictions on use of staff cars, or give us the flexibility to set up a program with Flex cars.

- *Full funding of the program is a must. It must be a funded mandate—with flexibility!*
- *The program needs to be adequately funded. Funding has been reduced from previous years. Funding should be sincere with the designated goals of the program, how they plan to reach them, and what level of resources it will take to do so. It is one thing to say “go to the store 20 miles away and buy a week’s worth of groceries,” it’s another to hand the person five dollars and a bike and tell them to do it.” Setting goals that are unreachable because of under-funding is not good policy. Find out what needs to happen to “buy the groceries,” and fund it to that extent. Like many committees, the Task Force is all too often manipulated by inside staff that set agendas and make preparations. Issues are all dictated by the staff, which is a shame. They don’t meet often enough to talk and discuss matters in-depth to know what it takes to get the job done. It is too superficial of a method.*
- *There is not enough money and it is being spread around like peanut butter.*
- *The program is on life support for available funding. It needs more money.*
- *I think it could be a lot better, but it takes money and it takes the tax refund, and until we have adequate money it isn’t going to work as well as the design for it expected. It just isn’t, that’s how it is, but that isn’t different from anything else in government. That’s just how it works. A few employers have done excellent jobs. Simpson in Tacoma, Boeing, and the Puget Sound Naval Ship Yard especially. They are a standout in what they do.*
- *Put in significantly more resources—the rationale for which would be that CTR programs may be the most cost effective means of reducing congestion and adding capacity to our current transportation system. CTR is less expensive than building infrastructure, so the more CTR programs we have, the more we maximize the utilization capacity of our existing infrastructure.*
- *This is one of a number of state and Task Forces and surveys I have participated in over the last four years. They tend to be chatty and not change anything of much significance. For the state and their stake in the traffic congestion arena, the secretary needs to be charged with developing a robust model so the institution can be successful.*
- *It is sometimes confusing to have government doing things. We have a density problem compared to other, larger (European) cities which are dense to the point*

that they experience what I call Brownian motion—everyone is moving every direction at once en masse. Buses are always crowded there. Here, we need micro transit solutions. Other than places like Capitol Hill, people tend to spread out, and the only places they aggregate are at work sites. We do not always have enough people going the same direction to fill buses, so they may not be the solution, and may add to the problem, they are big for our area. CTR is a solution for both the individual and business. Both need to understand that a significant investment in CTR is worthwhile. Businesses don't normally think about this issue, and maybe that isn't their function. As a government, we impose costs on them sometimes, but with CTR, the savings can be huge—if we can structure this effectively, they will be willing to participate. We can't get in a situation where all the people in power are in favor of spending capital for construction, CTR needs to be a partner in the transportation solution.

- *There is a fair amount of turf-ism in the CTR transportation demand arena between cities, counties, DOT offices, etc...a look should be taken at the system to see if it clear and effective, or confusing and adds to inefficiencies. Example: Greater Redmond TMA, downtown organizations in Seattle, some private groups. "Too many cooks in the kitchen." There is also an uneven distribution of resources. Redmond doesn't share with Federal Way. There should be an even approach so any employer has the comfort of working with public agencies. Service delivery paradigms should be less confusing.*
- *There needs to be a greater partnership between private and public. An example is the greater Redmond TMA is incorporated as a business association. In New Jersey, TMAs are defined as public educational associations and not-for-profit, so they cannot lobby for their members in the legislative arena. This creates a forum where public and private officials can serve on a board of an agency to bridge the gap between public and private agencies. This is the NJ, and one county in Delaware paradigm for problem solving. Washington limits ability for public agencies to be comfortable. TMAs need to be like chambers of commerce. Trying to build foundation for regional transportation, but we need to make the pie bigger, not create winners and losers. Utilize a unified board for multiple interests...county, DOT, state, and private. This model exists and succeeds in New Jersey.*
- *There should be a change in where the resources are be deployed. Size and population of a county may not be as helpful of criteria compared to density of a county or urban area in determining where CTR programs will have the most impact. Site and region specific allocation of resources may have better effect than blanket policy for an entire region (it may be that a rural county has one dense center where program should focus).*
- *CTR can play a significant role in the direction of our changing transportation needs. Examples being: addressing peak hour travel with time adjusted tolling,*

- helping the transition if fossil fuel cannot sustain our future transportation needs. CTR can take a role, especially in the policy realm, of all of these future issues.*
- *I am more and more convinced that dealing with congestion as a transportation problem is futile. As long as road spaces are free, and people have unlimited access to automobiles, and people's way of life is dependent on automobiles, people will do the rational thing, which is drive. Unless there is a country-wide strategy [land use, e.g.] to get people off the road, there is no way to reduce congestion—just reduce the rate of increase. It is frustrating to have transit charged with the task of reducing congestion. People need to understand that you're going to have congestion; the question is where are you going to have it. Individuals may be able to make individual lifestyle, location choices to avoid congestion*
 - *It's a good program. But they need to be careful on expanding it to more companies or changing the policies until there is political support for this. It's a very conservative environment right now and changes might not be well received until there is political support for them.*
 - *It seems to me that the Wash DOT staff has a lot of people. I've heard 9 to 11 FTEs. There are 10 counties participating, so I should have about a full-time FTE if you look at it that way. Are there too many people there? Could we shift their responsibilities to do more field work or shift resources to the field? Look at DOT's freight office. Barbara E.[the director] has one assistant and one staff, a total of three or four, for the entire state. Freight is one of our problems—it adds lots of congestion. They do a good job with a lot less people. At the time funding at smaller counties has decreased, the state staff level has stayed the same. We've got to take care of field people first. How do we fix that? I'm not after anyone's job. We should make a strategic effort to get more state and federal funding. We should get Sen. Murray's help—and we're starting to work on that. We should tell her we'd like a modest federal supplement of \$2 million a year for five years. She could take care of that—it would be a dream ask for her. But we haven't asked her. As I said before, the program gets protective of what we've got instead of pointing out deficiencies and opportunities to do more. A lot of problems could be fixed with increased funding.*
 - *I guess the only thing I can say is that the way the program works now with individual transit agencies operating the CTR programs works well. I would hate to see it consolidated into one central program.*
 - *I want to compliment DOT for doing this. In my mind I have ideas about what needs to be changed etc. but it is a valuable process to reach out to others who may think differently. I hope that you are interviewing a broad base of individuals, both geographically and in terms of positions.*

- *The Task Force decided to do performance funding. They said, instead of being paid based on number of work sites in a county, 80 percent will be based on work sites but 20 percent will be based on rewarding success. This sounds like a good idea, but when it was time to pull the trigger the Task Force backed away. They've gotta be more aggressive with performance funding, more entrepreneurial. They'll get more support from the Legislature if they can tell them we're putting money where it's effective. What would get more support from the public than telling them we're putting money where it's effective? They [Task Force] need to keep themselves fresh and in front or the Legislature is going to cut them. If they make a decision, they should stick with it.*
- *I really think it's time to decide whether rural counties should be mandated to be included. If so, if that is in the state's benefit and interest, what is the right amount of money to be appropriated to support the program. Right now we're splitting pennies to be fair, and there's never enough. I'd much rather see dollars go where they will do the most good.*
- *I've always been impressed by their professionalism and creativity. They definitely are leaders in the country in terms of creativity and logically. They're not just saying we're government and we'll make you do this. And they try things—I applaud their effort.*
- *I would like to see a little more information about how the program is performing. Specific information about how the program is meeting its goals etc. I try to promote the program. With more information I could do a better job of framing messages and promoting the program. I get annual reports but could use more information more often. I know that DOT has tons of data and I don't want all of it. They must have information around the goals of CTR that they could succinctly share at a fairly regular basis that would help directors promote CTR.*
- *There should be a study into how well the tax credits are working with CTR participating employers. Who are the beneficiaries, what kinds of employers, what are the costs and benefits of these employers paying less taxes vs. reducing their commute trips.*
- *I appreciate they are taking a look at the CTR Program—it's a good time to do this. They also need to be careful how it is evaluated. The problem might have to do with the original performance measures as they were set up. It also might be a bigger issue of how we see transportation and our communities. We could be misapplying a symptom rather than addressing the real problem. In general they are on the right track, but it needs some tweaking.*
- *Also, the Association for Commuter Transportation has guidebooks that are excellent resources. They have numerous professionals that compile the best*

aspects of plans from jurisdictions across the nation. These resources should be studied. "We are not alone here."

- *Ensure that someone is looking at what other states are doing (kind of like a best practices review). I think it helps to keep generating new, innovative ideas.*
- *Overall the program is going well and it showing its success. It allows for varied forms of response as different locations require them. This is a good aspect because different regions throughout the state have different environment, circumstances, and business opportunities. Keeping a common level to oversee the whole process allows the unique ability to accommodate goals within each sector.*
- *Also, we are in a pretty enviable position compared to other people across the states. In talking with people around the nation, he has discovered that many are looking to Washington's CTR Program as a model. Imitation is the highest form of flattery. We have some good things going and we need to keep them up. I had talked to a number of people there in the Washington State DOT and King County and Seattle Metro about using the program as a model that we could promote to other states. We have not done it yet but are still going to try to do that. Other states need to be aware that this exists and see the benefits of it and its successes. We would like to hold it up as a model and put out some information on it. I believe the program is a good one and a lot of states can learn from it and benefit by it. They can see that to implement such a program is not as burdensome as it may appear.*

Appendix B: Comments on the Research Findings

The following comments on the CTR research findings were made by people who participated in a workshop at Public Transportation Conference 2004: Exploring Transportation Connections, held in Yakima on August 23, 2004. Approximately 35 people attended and discussed the findings, which were presented by Cocker Fennessy staff.

Concerning the CTR program goals:

- What is the goal? Congestion is different than air pollution.
- Spokane has air quality issues—maybe the program emphasis should be different based on the issue.
- The program needs a strong selling point, and it is easier to sell the goal of congestion relief.
- Using congestion as the program rationale might broaden its impacts.
- Keep more than one goal because of geographical differences.
- Should the program give local jurisdictions flexibility? Goals that align but different emphases?
- If goals are prioritized, put congestion first.

Concerning organization of the program by county:

- Possible flaw in the law: organized by county rather than metropolitan area.
- Consider the density—don't just throw the program at the whole county.
- Should we organize around congestion corridors?
- Focus on density/volume of commute trips.

Concerning land use:

- CTR program needs to be incorporated into land use—a community goal.

- On the planning side, CTR can be a development tool to get the biggest bang for the buck. How can we move the most people on the capacity we currently have?

Concerning idea of extending CTR program:

- Should CTR extend outside areas of worst congestion? Puget Sound needs are more intense. Should we focus just on Puget Sound?
- May get more impact with smaller \$ in smaller areas—need to look at return on investment.
- By making investments in smaller areas, we might avoid some issues experienced in larger population centers.

Concerning funding:

- Ferries is put in the position of competing with others in the transportation community. Would rather work with others in the community. How can it be structured so that CTR funds are granted without entities fighting for them?
- The program needs to continue to be funded statewide.
- If the Task Force needs to ask for outside help, do it; most agencies are more than willing.
- Maybe funding should be performance based. Do cost-benefit analysis. Need to get the information out about long-term cost reductions for employers: parking, employee retention, etc.
- Extend program to smaller employers only if money is there.
- Need to improve the marketing. Must market to achieve success.
- Connect with businesses that are not yet affected, but only if there is adequate funding to do it effectively.

Other comments:

- The law doesn't require transit to support worksites with service. Where doesn't transit fit in?

Hybrid vehicles do not support other demand management goals. How do we incorporate them? They take up the same lane space and cause the same wear on the roadway, but provide less revenue from gas tax. People are more willing to drive them because they are “doing their part.” Should not be allowed in HOV lanes as SOV; would eliminate the effectiveness of the lane. Task Force should look at its goals based on current [up-to-date] technology.