

CTR Performance Grant Program

Program Results

Robinson Hartsell

Public Transportation and Rail Division

Douglas B. MacDonald

Secretary of Transportation

Paula Hammond

Chief of Staff

Public Transportation Conference

August 22 - 24, 2005



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

2003 Legislative direction (RCW 70.94.996)

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

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

Legislative direction

To develop an entrepreneurial grant program by ...

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

and ...

... to consider the following criteria

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

Who Will Buy / Sell Avoided Trips?

Sellers

Entrepreneurs

Employers

Public agencies

Organizations / groups

Others?

Buyer

Washington State (DOT)

Sellers offered...

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

Buyer accepted...

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

LEAST expensive trip offered:

\$48 per
annualized trip

MOST expensive trip offered:

\$460 per
annualized trip

2003 – 2005 Program results

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

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

2003 – 2005 Program results

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

2003 – 2005 Program results

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

A look at both ends of the spectrum

Top 2 projects based on performance

1) Spokane County CTR Office

Projected number of trips reduced – 254

Actual trips reduced – 985 or 388%

Cost per trip – \$120

2) City of Redmond

Projected number of trips reduced – 300

Actual trips reduced – 1,032 or 344%

Cost per trip – \$143

A look at both ends of the spectrum

Two projects that showed an increase in trips

1) City of Seattle

Award amount - \$10,000

Projected number of trips reduced – 100

Number of increased trips – 80

Startup costs received – \$2,850

2) Community Health Association of Spokane

Award amount - \$5,000

Projected number of trips reduced – 11

Number of increased trips – 1

Startup costs received – \$2,494

Lessons Learned

A program like this can be successful!

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

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

Lessons Learned

Identifying ways to improve the program

WSDOT Staff needs to provide ...

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

Lessons Learned

Identifying ways to improve the program

The programs purpose was unclear

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

Lessons Learned

Identifying ways to improve the program

Instructions on measurements / surveys and calculations were confusing

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

Lessons Learned

Identifying ways to improve the program

Eliminate program inconsistencies

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

How do we make it better?

Steps toward improving the program....

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

How do we make it better?

Steps toward improving the program....

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

How do we make it better?

Steps toward improving the program....

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