

Tell us about your CTR/TDM program and your role in it.

Jan is the CTR Coordinator for 56 worksites which are located in the cities of Camas, Vancouver, Washougal and Unincorporated Clark County. There is an inter-local agreement for the program to be administered by the City of Vancouver.

Jennifer Campos who is also on this call is the City of Vancouver's jurisdiction representative.

What are the key barriers you need to overcome to make your program even better?

Our key barriers are the demographics in the region.

- Congestion on the I-5 and I- 205 corridors is from commuters traveling to Oregon to work. Consequently, the program target audience is not the commuter causing the congestion.
- At an average VMT of 11 miles, distance traveled to work is typically not a big factor for the CTR affected commuter.
- 96% of CTR worksites have an abundance of free parking.
- With the low VMT and with most commuters having to have at least one transfer for a bus route to their workplace, transit typically isn't a viable option.
- The CTR program runs completely on DOT funding only. The bulk of it is used to fund the CTR Coordinator's salary and benefits, resulting in her hours being reduced to a .75 FTE.
- We were able to secure an STP grant for marketing/campaigns but as it was awarded the direction came down from DOT that we couldn't use the money for reward subsidies, incentives etc., as it would be considered "gifting of public funds". Rewards have been the primary reason drive alone commuters would try an alternative commute. Consequently, plans that were in place to encourage carpooling were stopped. If the severe restriction on how we can use the funding isn't lifted, we're not sure what else we'll be able to do.

If you had additional resources, what would you do with them to make your program better?

While it wouldn't help the traditional CTR target market, in order to target the commuter that is actually creating the congestion on the state highway system, we would like to target the southbound commuter traveling to Oregon. It would take a substantial amount of resources to do social marketing/campaign to try and reach them. The focus would be on large residential areas that are feeding onto the freeways. The anticipated costs would be \$100,000+.

In terms of traditional worksites we reach out to, employees have a one-way 11-mile or 15 min drive. It's hard to convince them to take transit with one transfer and it takes 90 minutes as an alternative. To carpool, they'd have to go out of their way to meet with a coworker to share a ride with. It is almost impossible to get them to look at any options without some sort of viable incentive to do so. Historically the only thing that made a huge difference was when gas prices were almost \$4 per gallon and clearly gas prices are not controllable.

What is the single most important thing the state provides to your CTR/TDM program?

Funding.

How do you and your customers use the information from the CTR Employer Survey Reports?

The CTR Administrator meets one-on-one with ETC's and go over the report with the ETC . We review and discuss the following highlights on the survey results:

- The drive alone rate – did it increase or decrease from the base line as well as from the survey before.
- The mode split employees reported for the current survey results compared to the previous survey results and discuss what might have changed to impact the results.
- We the employees' response of the top three reasons employees leave car at home. We talk about how they can take advantage of that knowledge – i.e., incorporate it into their marketing message. For example, for “health reasons” is typically a reason why employees choose an alternate commute. I will encourage the ETC to take advantage of that and incorporate it into the company's wellness program and messaging so people can make connections about how alternative commute behaviors can benefit their health. We focus on the market message from there.
- We review the zip code data and I highlight the zip codes that have larger responses in them and the zip codes with the greatest distance from the worksite. I discuss how this information can be used to help form carpools. We work with HR and target message to reach out to employees by means of a party for the “xxx” zip codes and provide information around that.

How do you and your customers use the information from the Employer Annual Report and Program Description?

Mostly, I use it as a tool to review if they are in compliance with law, based on how they respond. I also can see if they have carpool parking and/or made any significant changes to parking; easy implementation measures that could make a difference. Just a check to make sure they're in compliance -

All jurisdiction reps are given an option of reviewing the reports to whatever degree they want and sign off for final approval.

What other methods do you use to measure the effectiveness of the program?

Anecdotal based on ETC responses. We survey ETC's so they can give feedback to me as the administrator. To help increase effectiveness of programs I get involved in ETC carpool matching/GIS map events, ETC training and participate in benefit wellness fairs year round.

Which subsidies and incentives that you have used are the most effective at helping people change their behavior?

- About nine years ago, we had extra money so we created a grant matching campaign for the worksites. Small grants were available if worksites would match them. For example, one of the employers decided to start an incentive program for their employee. They found it effective and decided to completely fund a CTR incentive program a year later they saw it made a difference in employee participation. We also did this with bike-lockers and bike racks. It was good because the employer had to match the funding and this small grant program help nudge them to do that.
- We had a carpool matching pilot program where we did carpool matching using the non-identifying employee addresses. A carpool matching campaign was initiated with a geocoded map enabling employees to get an idea of how many possible carpool partners lived near enough to carpool together. Employees who were driving alone and started to carpool (or use an another mode) were rewarded. They and their carpool partners who carpooled (or other

alternative commute mode) 60% of the time and logged on in a diary to keep track of their trips would get \$50 gift card to retail store of their choice (Target, Fred Meyer) for three months. If they were already carpooling and added a person to carpool they were also eligible for the rewards. What we found from a post survey is while there were those who did it just for the gift card and stopped after the subsidy ended, the majority of participants found it was more convenient than they anticipated and indicated they would continue to do it even without subsidy.

- We have a TDM program that we run downtown. We had it structured so that if someone signed up they received a \$5 coffee card. After first 5 days of logging non drive alone trips they received a \$25 Fred Meyer gift card and weekly drawings kept people interested. When we couldn't do that anymore, participation really dropped off. It's hard to find other things to replace it. I can't emphasize strongly enough the loss of ability to use funds in that way. It gave people that nudge to try it out and realize it's not as hard/inconvenient as they thought it would be.

Is it important to have the state CTR law?

I think that the benefit of continuing to have state CTR law. It provides a way to assure employer support and engagement. The law keeps it in the forefront of decision-makers minds. The problem with the law in regions like ours (which is very unique) is the congestion on the state corridors that makes our region CTR affected is not our target audience consequently trying to implement a program that isn't the source of the congestion. As a result, we are constantly trying to encourage behavioral changes to an audience that isn't typically impacted by that congestion. We need to take a hard look at is the CTR law statewide determine if it make sense to continue to be statewide as it is in its current form. While we all know this question may have an adverse impact on some of our jobs – is time to ask the question if the CTR law is still relevant the way it's written or do we need to be willing to make changes that may exclude some regions that are currently affected but whose congestion patterns, audience, etc. really isn't well served by CTR anymore. For example, in order for our region to target the commuter making the congestion, we'd need considerably more funding to provide the outreach to those commuters.

Additionally, we have to be willing to exclude some jurisdictions (in our case rural Washougal that happens to be adjacent to the UGB and has one CTR affected worksite) from being CTR affected. It doesn't make any sense that they are affected, but if they withdraw from the CTR Program it will have a negative impact on the transportation funding they receive from DOT.

Currently, there isn't a mandatory requirement for jurisdictions to contribute financially to the CTR program. Maybe we need to look at the jurisdictions that are CTR affected and ask the question, "Do they need to contribute financially?"