1 - DRAFT concept
CTR at more worksites

Short description
Expand CTR to more worksites and more workers in affected areas (detailed below).

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers (worksites/employers and jurisdictions)

What could this look like?
Local CTR implementers choose expansion option(s) they feel will work best in their community. Options include:
- <u>all</u> worksites with 100 or more employees
- worksites with fewer (50 or more, etc.) employees
- clusters of worksites (buildings, industrial park, neighborhood, etc.)
- worksites with large numbers of commuters during shoulder hours

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Highly likely to succeed because it builds upon existing systems, people and organizations and their strengths. Takes a proven concept and expands upon it.
- We're turning people away who want to be part of the program. New partners want in!
- Provides flexibility for employers and local implementers.
- Potentially doesn't require a change in the existing law – just needs funding.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Needs increased funding and staff resources focused on worksites.
- Needs streamlined performance measurement approach, scalable data gathering and evaluation.
- It's difficult to identify worksites that meet 100 or more/50 or more standard.
- We would likely have to provide a method to expand opt in/opt out for work sites. Examples: voluntary sites, omit sites that aren't productive and interested, shift emphasis to new worksites vs. existing.

2 - DRAFT concept
focus CTR on fewer jurisdictions

Short description
Realign CTR resources to jurisdictions that are 1. most engaged and 2. best able to achieve high levels of trip reduction.

Who would be most affected?
CTR board, WSDOT, CTR implementers (worksites/employers and jurisdictions)

What could this look like?
Expands CTR to more worksites and more workers in a few, priority areas. Competitive process to select jurisdictions and communities who receive CTR funds. Criteria based largely on local interest/engagement and number of trips reduced.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Provides more resources to some communities and jurisdictions.
- Removes participation mandate for some communities, which might make them happy.
- Focuses resources on communities where new partners want in.
- Would achieve higher levels of trip reduction.
- Additional resources might fuel innovation.
- Targets demand management resources to places where they could make the biggest difference for overall transportation system performance.
- Focuses surveying and performance measurement on places that value the data; less complaining from worksites that have to survey but don't use the information.
- Reduced resources needed for surveying, could be reallocated to implementation.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Some current participants will lose resources and programs. There will be losers.
- Would likely trigger loss of local support for TDM in some communities.
- Will require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Risk that state legislators will determine who receives funds or otherwise control the selection process.
- Needs increased funding and staff resources focused on worksites.
- Competitive process would leave jurisdictions uncertain about ongoing funding; encourages short-term thinking

3 - DRAFT concept
community-driven TDM (GTEC)

Short description
Communities determine the best approach to achieve trip reduction and mode shift. For example, could be focused on centers, corridors, non-work, neighborhoods, all-trips, etc.

Who would be most affected?
CTR Board, WSDOT, existing CTR implementers, new CTR partners and communities

What could this look like?
Communities customize approaches to TDM; define the markets and methods to achieve trip reduction and/or mode shift. The state would provide competitive funding to support implementation and would continue to have a role in performance evaluation.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Provides more resources to some communities and jurisdictions, creates coalition of the willing.
- Removes participation mandate for some communities, which might make them happy.
- Focuses resources on markets and communities that offer the highest trip reduction/mode shift potential.
- Would achieve higher levels of trip reduction overall.
- Would fuel innovation.
- Targets demand management resources to places where they could make the biggest difference for overall transportation system performance.
- Would increase local engagement and support; could increase legislative support and/or business support.
- Better integration with land use planning, local transportation and environmental initiatives, Practical Solutions.
- Simplifies compliance.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Some current participants will lose resources and programs. There will be losers.
- Would likely trigger loss of local support for TDM in some communities.
- May require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Risk that state legislators will determine who receives funds or otherwise control the selection process.
- Competitive process would leave jurisdictions uncertain about ongoing funding; encourages short-term thinking.
- Risk that we would lose employer/business support and legislative support.
- Complicates performance measurement and reporting, shifts performance measurement burden to local implementers/consultants, hard to roll up data.

4 - DRAFT concept
keep CTR, expand TDM

Short description
Increase funding for foundational CTR, allow interested jurisdictions to opt in and receive funding for foundational CTR. Expand competitive TDM grants that provide funding for all-trips, small businesses, corridors and centers-based TDM programs.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, new CTR partners and communities

What could this look like?
Expand existing CTR programs in existing affected areas and introduce CTR in new jurisdictions. Supplement with grants that allow communities to customize approaches to TDM; define the markets and methods to achieve trip reduction and/or mode shift. Combination of formula funds and competitive funding.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Provides more resources for TDM. Expands TDM to more communities and more markets. Fuels local engagement, enthusiasm, innovation and investment.
- Would increase trip reduction and mode shift.
- Could attract more private investment and public/private/non-profit partnerships.
- Supports baseline program on statewide basis while also focusing resources on markets and communities that offer the highest trip reduction/mode shift potential.
- Would achieve higher levels of trip reduction overall.
- Would fuel innovation.
- Would increase local engagement and support.
- Better integration with land use planning, local transportation and environmental initiatives, Practical Solutions.
- Formula funding stabilizes funding stream, supports ongoing investments in TDM at all levels.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Higher-profile and scrutiny. Requires higher levels of accountability.
- Innovation and/or expansion could invite controversy and headlines.
- We would need more money (perhaps lots of it) for local jurisdictions, the state and others to support the expanded program. Increased administrative burden at all levels.
- Would change the role of the CTR Board.
- State expectation that we prioritize investments that align with state initiatives like Practical Solutions, sustainable transportation, energy, etc. that might not align with local interests.
- May require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Risk that state legislators will determine who receives funds or otherwise control the selection process.
- Complicates performance measurement and reporting, shifts performance measurement burden to local implementers/consultants, hard to roll up data.

5 - DRAFT concept
focus on active transportation

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize walking and bicycling.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, other grantees

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize trip reduction via walking and bicycling. CTR implementers would be required or encouraged to invest in behavior change and infrastructure related to active transportation.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Expands the CTR coalition to new partners; health, education/safe routes to schools, public works, equity/inclusion, climate change/sustainability, neighborhoods/communities, bicycle and pedestrian advocates, etc.
- Fuels local innovation.
- Would increase mode shift. In addition to bicycling and walking, would support first and last mile to transit.
- Could attract more local government and private infrastructure investment. Could attract community support and enthusiasm.
- Improves transportation equity by targeting resources to low-cost modes and the most vulnerable people who have no other option than to walk.
- Could incentivize changes in land use and zoning to compliment multimodal transportation and community livability. Better integration with land use planning, local transportation and environmental initiatives, Practical Solutions.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
- Could incite mode wars. Would enrage bicycle-haters. Could invite controversy and headlines.
- Would change the role of the CTR Board.
- State expectation that we prioritize investments to active transportation might not align with local interests.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Complicates performance measurement and reporting, shifts performance measurement burden to local implementers/consultants, hard to roll up data.
- May reduce trip reduction performance, particularly in the short term.

6 - DRAFT concept
reorient to automated vehicles

Short description

Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize automated vehicles.

Who would be most affected?

Existing CTR implementers, other grantees, CTR Board, WSDOT, organizations that regulate use of automated vehicles (city, county, state), state legislators

What could this look like?

Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize support for automated vehicles.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?

- Expands the CTR coalition to new partners; vehicle manufacturers, WWU, vanpool/transit, safety, technology companies, early adopters, etc.
- Fuels local innovation.
- Could attract some media and early adopter support and enthusiasm.
- Could result in faster clarity about automated vehicles from federal, state and local regulators.
- Might get governor engaged.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?

- Would increase vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
- Shift in funding could incite conflict among transportation providers and conflict among government organizations. Could invite controversy and headlines.
- Would change the role of the CTR Board.
- State expectation that we prioritize investments to automation might not align with local interests.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Employers might not be on-board with shifting the focus away from them.
- Would reduce trip reduction performance, particularly in the short term.

7 - DRAFT concept
reorient to broadband access

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize expanding access to broadband to underserved communities, including rural areas, people with low incomes, etc.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, other grantees, CTR Board, WSDOT, local jurisdictions, broadband providers

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize telework and support for expanded broadband access.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- People and communities who are currently left out of the tech revolution would have improved access to information, goods and services
- Expands the CTR coalition to new partners; broadband providers, technology companies, universities, rural communities, social justice groups, etc.
- Fuels local innovation, economic growth in rural and low-income communities, and public-private partnerships
- Could attract some media and community enthusiasm, Eastern Washington legislators, tribes, legislators who want to support social justice
- Might get governor engaged
- Might reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Shift in funding could incite conflict among transportation providers and conflict among government organizations. Could invite controversy and headlines.
- Would change the role of the CTR Board.
- State expectation that we prioritize investments to broadband and telework not align with local interests.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Employers might not be on-board with shifting the focus away from them.

8 - DRAFT concept
expand partnerships with non-profits

Short description
Expand the capacity of non-profit community groups engaged in transportation (e.g. transportation management associations (TMAs), chambers of commerce, human services transportation providers, Feet First, Cascade Bicycle, Transportation Choices Coalition, etc.) by shifting the focus of CTR/TDM resources.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, non-profit community groups, CTR Board

What could this look like?
Develop stronger partnerships with these organizations. Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize community groups. Invest resources to establish new groups in communities that don't have them. Establish streamlined mechanisms for government to hire community groups to conduct TDM activities (e.g. statewide on-call TDM agreement).

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
• Builds on proven model.
• Strengthens existing community groups.
• Expands presence of these groups into more communities.
• They know the interests and language of their markets (employers, low-income workers, bicyclers, etc.)
• Fuels local innovation, investment and engagement.
• Might get more community and business support for CTR and TDM.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
• Could undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
• Would change the focus of the CTR Board.
• Are communities, businesses and non-profits interested in more involvement in TDM?
• May require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
• Must keep non-profit organizations in alignment with government objectives.

9 - DRAFT concept
emphasize modal connectivity

Short description
Shift the focus of CTR and TDM resources to emphasize modal connectivity.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, other grantees, transit agencies, local jurisdictions, transportation network companies (TNCs), active transportation community, WSDOT

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize improved modal connections.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Expands the CTR coalition to new partners; public works, transit facilities/service/operations, active transportation, TNCs, etc.
- Fuels local innovation.
- Could attract support and enthusiasm from local officials.
- Leverages existing infrastructure and services by filling gaps and completing networks.
- May encourage more local and private investment in capital construction, service and technology.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Expensive.
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
- Could require more emphasis on capital construction, technology development, service funding
- Shift in funding could incite conflict among transportation providers and conflict among government organizations.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.

10 - DRAFT concept
attract more private investment in TDM

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize private sector investment in transportation solutions, e.g. transportation network companies (TNCs), employer shuttles, for-profit ridesharing innovation, for-profit transportation and parking management.

Who would be most affected?
Private transportation providers, existing CTR implementers, other grantees, CTR Board, WSDOT staff

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize private investment in non-drive-alone transportation. Reward public-private partnerships. Open grant eligibility to private sector.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Fuels private sector interest and investment.
- Fuels innovation by shifting resources to organizations who are willing and able to take more risks than government.
- Might decrease government spending.
- Might decrease government regulation.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Might increase transportation costs for employers, workers and others.
- Might increase government spending.
- Might increase the need for government regulation.
- The private sector would cherry pick the most profitable markets and leave the most expensive services to the public sector.
- Patchwork of local regulations.
- Might create chaos for local jurisdictions and travelers.
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
- Would change the role of the CTR Board.
- Private sector profit motives might not align with state and local interests.
- Would make equity issues worse.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Complicates performance measurement and reporting; private companies resist data sharing and public reporting.
- Is the private sector really interested in non-drive-alone solutions? To the extent that they'd make it their business?

11 - DRAFT concept
emphasize TDM in places with tolls and parking fees

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to places with tolls and parking fees.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, other grantees, local communities

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to focus resources on places with tolls, parking fees and other financial incentives for people to shift their behavior to non-drive-alone modes.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Puts TDM in a better competitive position; tolls and fees push people to look for more affordable solutions
- Boosts transit and vanpool ridership, use of active transportation
- Builds on proven practices.
- Could boost community support for tolls and parking fees
- Might provide a way to provide better transportation equity
- Might provide a funding stream to support TDM

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Everybody hates tolls and parking fees
- May shift resources from areas without tolls and parking fees to areas that have them
- Concerns from legislators and Transportation Commission
- Would change the role of the CTR Board.
- State interest in fees and tolls might not align with local interests.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Toll and parking revenues aren't used to improve transit and other non-drive-alone modes

12 - DRAFT concept
existing CTR

Short description
Continue the traditional CTR program.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers (worksites/employers and jurisdictions)

What could this look like?
Local CTR implementers would continue their current programs focused on major employers in affected areas as defined in the law. New communities would not enter the state program unless additional resources were available.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Continuing the current approach has the least legislative risk.
- The program is well recognized in the TDM community.
- Communities and employers know what to do.
- It doesn't require a change in the existing law.
- Some communities are happy with the current program.
- Locals are highly invested already; don't toss out the baby with the bath water.
- Lower cost to state and other implementers; change requires resources.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Will not allow new jurisdictions to participate.
- Doesn't provide requested flexibility for jurisdictions; they have great ideas but don't have resources or flexibility to pursue them. For example, they can't focus on employers/areas where they could achieve greater performance.
- Keeps the program "stuck" where it is.
- Hard to keep people enthused.
- Does not address threat posed by static funding from the state. How long can we stretch these dollars?
- Performance measurement is too burdensome for some jurisdictions, employers and the state. We need to find ways to make performance measurement work better, both in terms of level of effort and meaningful, actionable information.

13 - DRAFT concept
Emphasize corridors with multimodal, multiagency investment plans (Practical Solutions)

Short description
Shift program resources to corridors with that have planned and scoped TDM as a part of a multimodal, multi-agency corridor investment package.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers (worksites/employers and jurisdictions), WSDOT regions, partners in affected corridors

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to be directed to identified needs in the Practical Solutions planning and scoping process and included in funding packages.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- This will direct TDM investments with the greatest areas of need in the transportation system.
- TDM performance in some corridors may bring greater state and local investment.
- Recognition of CTR and TDM as viable strategies for the transportation system will increase.
- Some communities will embrace the changes.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- This could take resources away from some parts of the state.
- Performance may decrease in some areas.
- Some communities may be upset about the changes.
- It will require a change in the existing law.
- We don't have the local capacity to deliver more TDM programs and projects in some areas.
- Public and policymaker skepticism about TDM. Lack of understanding. Social engineering.
- It may reorient the program from employers to corridors.

14 - DRAFT concept
Focus on smart growth (land use, transit oriented development, etc.)

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasis transit oriented development, density and multimodal land use plans and policies in local communities.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers (worksites/employers and jurisdictions), community and regional planners, transit agencies

What could this look like?
Grant programs would require local implementers to focus their programs on influencing community planners to develop land use plans and investments to be more supportive of transit-oriented development and demand management programs.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Land use is a key part of effective TDM and transit uses. This would develop new and closer partnerships with other parts of local and regional governments.
- Would begin a movement to help communities plan and develop more TDM friendly communities.
- Some employers will be supportive of a more efficient transportation system.
- Will increase mode shift in the longer term. Would create lasting change.
- Might get new people engaged in TDM, e.g. developers, city land use officials.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- This will decrease program performance in the short term.
- Doesn't address any of the issues identified in the current program.
- It will require a change in the law.
- Enforcing transportation management plans is challenging for local jurisdictions.
- Local jurisdictions will not welcome the state pressuring them on local land use decisions.
- Political hot potato in many parts of the state, could rile state legislators.
- Doesn't show immediate results, longer-term.
- Changes may not translate to visible changes in the transportation landscape.
- They positive impact on the transportation is limited, as this strategy focuses only on development, not the current built environment and people's habits.

15 - DRAFT concept
focus on shortening commute distances

Short description
Focus the program on helping employees shorten commute distances.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers (worksites/employers and jurisdictions) and local policymakers

What could this look like?
Local CTR implementers would work with employers and commuters to find options for shorter commute distances, including incentives for moving to areas with better multimodal options (e.g. Live Downtown Tacoma), shifting to work locations that are closer to home (e.g. proximate commuting), and increasing support for telework and telework centers.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- This will decrease VMT.
- There are successful examples of this approach.
- These strategies could increase use of biking, walking, and transit as well as telework.
- It doesn't require a change in the existing law.
- Many people would LOVE to have a shorter commute.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Strong partnerships with employers are needed to shift work locations for their employees.
- Incentives for moving to a new home need to be substantial for people who may not want to move.
- This must be supported by home purchasing partners.
- Some jurisdictions may not have the local support to implement this approach.
- Housing costs near job centers are extraordinarily high in many urban areas.
- We'd need to see a significant shift to see the effects on the transportation system.
- Would take a long time to deliver results and the results would be difficult to measure and attribute.
- The reasons people live where they live and work where they work are complex, e.g. I have a great boss, we live in a great school district, and my spouse works close to our home but my workplace is far away.

16 - DRAFT concept
reorient to electric vehicles

Short description
Use CTR and TDM resources to emphasize use of electric vehicles

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, CTR Board, WSDOT, organizations that create electric vehicle infrastructure/charging stations, companies refining and providing fossil fuels used for transportation, state legislators

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize use of electric vehicles. CTR implementers would be required or encouraged to invest in behavior change and infrastructure related to electric vehicles.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Could attract more local government and private infrastructure investment. Could attract community support and enthusiasm.
- Could attract support from groups concerned with greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.
- Supports Governor Inslee's Results Washington goal: Sustainable Energy and a Clean Environment.
- Would expedite shift to electric vehicle fleet and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- We're a hydro state – electricity is cheap! – so commuters would save money on fuel.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- No impact on vehicle miles traveled or vehicle trips.
- No impact on congestion.
- Would reduce gas tax revenues.
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
- Would enrage climate change deniers. Could invite controversy and headlines.
- State expectation that we prioritize investments to electric vehicles might not align with local interests.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Changes the focus of performance measurement and reporting.
- Equity issues in the short-term, as electric cars are not currently affordable.
- It's a radical shift in focus for CTR/TDM because it's about vehicles, not people.

17 - DRAFT concept
focus on transit

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize use of transit.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, CTR Board, WSDOT, transit agencies, state legislators

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs to emphasize transit as a commute option through subsidized transit passes for employers and low-income workers

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Transit passes are one of the most proven and effective ways to change travel behavior in locations where transit service is readily available.
- Could generate local support for transit expansion.
- Would increase equity.
- Would decrease vehicle trips.
- Builds on existing transit pass programs, not difficult to ramp up.
- Could make transit pass products more feasible for small businesses.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Transit supply might not meet new demand. Transits might not have capacity for additional riders, at least in the near future.
- Focus is less helpful where transit service is not already robust and successful (e.g. Yakima, Clark, Spokane); not all employers would benefit, as transit service might not be available to their worksites.
- Transit isn't always the best solution for some markets, e.g. suburb to suburb commutes
- It ain't cheap.
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM partnerships and support.
- Shift in funding/focus could incite conflict among transportation providers and conflict among government organizations.
- Many transit agencies don't subsidize fares for people with low incomes (ORCA Lift)

18 - DRAFT concept
focus on telework/flexible work options

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize telework and flexible work options

Who would be most affected
Existing CTR implementers

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs to emphasize telework and flexible work options, such as staggered shifts, compressed workweek (CWW) schedules, and job shares

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Telework and CWW completely remove trips from the transportation network
- Telework and CWW decrease time spent commuting, allowing those hours to be used in more productive ways
- Teleworking and CWW can decrease operating costs for businesses
- Could have a major impact on reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled
- Staggered shifts reduce congestion during peak travel periods
- Teleworking could also be allowed during the commute to and from work when utilizing shared mobility, increasing productivity and freeing up time

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Not all jobs are appropriate for telework or flexible work options.
- Not all employers are open to teleworking as a viable strategy.
- Requires investment in technology, e.g. access to broadband.
- Potentially decreases necessary in-person interactions, comradery. Face-time is important.
- Not all workers have the ability to telework (e.g. lack of reliable, high-speed Internet).
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM partnerships and support.
- Many managers and executives don't like telework.
- Workers find being at home too distracting; kids, pets, chores.

19 - DRAFT concept
focus on shared mobility

Short description

Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize shared mobility.

Who would be most affected?

Existing CTR implementers, other/vanpool grantees, CTR Board, WSDOT

What could this look like?

Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize support for shared mobility use, such as vanpools and carpools.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?

- Shared mobility is proven effective.
- Benefits areas without robust transit systems.
- Can be implemented across the state.
- Will decrease vehicle trips.
- Market-driven, adaptable to what consumers want, e.g. Millennials, seniors, rural, urban, fancy, basic
- Could reduce car ownership.
- Could be a first-mile, last-mile solutions
- Could reduce need for parking

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?

- Limited applicability to some employees.
- Could undermine existing CTR and TDM partnerships and support.
- Less effective in removing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled that other options, such as transit, active transportation, and telework.
- Might not align with local interests.
- Would require change to existing law, we must open up the CTR law.
- Park and ride lots in many areas are already full.
- Grass roots carpool initiatives (RideshareOnline.com, slug lines) have not generated huge results; more profit-driven ridesharing (Car2Go, Lyft) have not yet figured out how to get people to carpool with strangers
- Stranger danger
- Performance tracking would be challenging
- HOV lanes are already clogged in some areas
- Perception that fam-pools shouldn't count.

20 - DRAFT concept
focus CTR resources on incentives

Short description
Shift emphasis to incentivizing behavior change, trip reduction, and mode shift through gift cards, reserved parking, subsidies, rewards, etc.

Who would be most affected?
Legislature, CTR Board, WSDOT, existing CTR implementers, new CTR partners

What could this look like?
Jurisdictions, employers customize incentives for employees making non-drive alone trips based on markets and local conditions.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Provides more tools for jurisdictions, employers to achieve greater trip reduction, mode shift.
- Incentives are a proven strategy to get people to try something, reward them for doing so, and research shows that many often stay with the behavior change. People like incentives. It works.
- Focuses resources on new markets and revitalizes program in affected areas.
- Would likely result in higher levels of trip reduction.
- Would fuel emphasis on outreach and marketing.
- Would increase local engagement and support.
- Would increase business support.
- Easy to administer, already well-established.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Political sensitivity for government funds being used on incentives. Risk that we lose legislative support.
- Can attract negative headlines.
- Some aspects perceived as benefitting the haves rather than the have-nots. Other aspects perceived as transportation welfare.
- People tend to prefer spending on things (road expansion, new buses) rather than behavior change; provides ammunition to attack TDM/CTR
- Must be carefully administered, audits, need to secure items of monetary value
- Would require increased staffing at the local level, labor intensive

21 - DRAFT concept
focus on education

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources on statewide education and outreach.

Who would be most affected?
WSDOT, existing CTR implementers, employers, consumers

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs and state grant programs (for example, Regional Mobility Grants, Transit Coordination Grant, new grant program) to emphasize trip reduction via education and outreach. WSDOT would work with CTR implementers to create a statewide marketing, education, and outreach campaign that could be customized for local communities.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Provides information and resources to effectively change behavior in the short-term and in the long-term (as in recycling).
- Dedicated state resources would free up local resources to be used on other program strategies and services.
- Would complement other modal campaigns by transit, etc.
- May increase mode shift.
- Would attract community support and enthusiasm.
- Could improve transportation equity by providing access to information on local services.
- Could leverage local resources.
- Would comply with existing mandate.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Could overwhelm local transit, park & rides, existing services and programs.
- Could invite controversy and headlines.
- Could require more resources.
- Could require a diversion of resources from local implementers.
- Could complicate performance measurement and reporting, invite scrutiny on results directly related to campaign.
- Strategically difficult to develop an effective campaign.
- Local implementers need to support their own brands, not a statewide brand. They like to control marketing.
- Marketing is perceived as a luxury by some members of the public and some elected officials.
- May require additional state staff to develop and administer.

22 - DRAFT concept
reorient to regional approach

Short description
Shift the focus of existing CTR and TDM resources to a regional approach.

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, MPOs/RTPOs, other grantees, CTR Board, WSDOT, state legislators

What could this look like?
Consolidate into regional TDM programs, likely housed at a regional planning organization, county, transit agency or TMA. Shift existing funding to regional efforts, which pursue broader TDM initiatives that cross-jurisdictional boundaries, e.g. multi-city, multi-transit agency, multi-county.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Better align TDM programs with trips and markets, most of which travel across jurisdictional boundaries. Better aligns with real-world transportation patterns.
- Would attract some media and early adopter support and enthusiasm.
- Would result in more consistent approach.
- Would increase leveraging of resources, particularly marketing, public education, employer outreach.
- Could reduce confusion amongst consumers about providers/services/fares, frustration with fractured governance.
- Creates coalitions and more champions; would result in additional services, programs, projects to respond to demand.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Would require changes to local and state laws.
- Would change the roles of WSDOT, local/regional governments.
- Would undermine existing CTR and TDM infrastructure, partnerships and support.
- Shift in funding could incite conflict among transportation providers and conflict among government organizations. Could invite controversy and headlines.
- Lack of local control.
- Employers might not be on-board with shifting the focus away from them.
- Would require a lot of political will and time.

23 - DRAFT concept
focus on parking management strategies

Short description
Shift the focus of some existing CTR and TDM resources to emphasize parking management strategies that incentivize multimodal and active transportation (higher parking rates, no "free" parking, preferential parking for carpool/vanpool, parking cash-out to support TDM, etc.).

Who would be most affected?
Existing CTR implementers, CTR Board, WSDOT, local jurisdictions, employers

What could this look like?
Require CTR programs to emphasize parking management strategies.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?
- Free/cheap/uncontrolled plentiful parking encourages SOV travel
- Expands the CTR coalition to new partners; technology companies, universities, parking management companies, etc.
- Would change public perception that parking is cheap or "free".
- Would allow jurisdictions to make better, more efficient use of (or recapture) public space.
- Would allow for multi-use development and additional densification in some areas to support smart growth, economic revitalization, multimodal travel, and livable communities.
- Parking turnover would support customers and businesses.
- Some businesses would choose to move to areas that manage parking supply and demand, especially if they do not have to provide parking.
- Could increase public-private partnerships.
- Could attract some media and community enthusiasm, legislators from urban areas.

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?
- Might reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.
- It's un-American.
- Would require real change in zoning and land use standards.
- Shift in funding could incite conflict in suburban communities and with some businesses/employers.
- Could invite controversy and headlines.
- Some might consider this an overreach of the program.
- State expectation that we prioritize investments to parking management might not align with local interests.

24 - DRAFT concept
Retain traditional CTR while allowing flexibility for alternative programs where justified

Short description

Enhance and potentially reorient existing CTR funding to focus on traditional CTR for jurisdictions/areas where the program has made progress towards goals and demonstrates additional need for support. Restore CTR funding to effectively match 1991 levels, incorporating inflation and program growth. Allow for alternative programs in jurisdictions for whom the traditional CTR approach is not performing and/or not popular.

Who would be most affected?

All existing areas / worksites would be affected as funding is refocused strategically to maximize performance.

What could this look like?

For worksites in jurisdictions where traditional CTR is a fit, retain existing program framework while ensuring funding matches that of the original 1991 levels (generally speaking, based on inflation factor and worksite/employee growth considerations). For worksites in jurisdictions where traditional CTR is not effective or desired, but who meet the criteria for an affected jurisdiction, the program activities and measurement may be altered based on an application process.

Why is this a good idea? What's the objective? What are the pros?

- Traditional CTR has proven track record of success, and funding should be retained instead effectively diminishing over time, as is the status quo
- Provides resources to allow the program to keep up with growing communities and jurisdictions
- Keeps the regulatory framework that brings employers to the table where this is most beneficial
- Retains economy of scale due to established, centralized state program framework and assistance
- Retains certainty of existing, ongoing funding and process, keeping implementation streamlined for jurisdictions (doesn't require staff internal "shepherding" of new programs)
- Recognizes that for some affected jurisdictions/areas, traditional CTR is not the best method for bringing about trip reduction; allows for more successful methods for these areas (prior "pilots" could be a basis for this process)

What are the key challenges that would need to be overcome?

- Will require change to existing law to allow for alternative programs
- May require CTR Board to establish funding policy and jurisdictional process for requesting permission for alternative methods
- Requires state legislators to recognize that traditional CTR needs more funding
- May concentrate funds in certain areas that are a fit for traditional CTR and that have more growth; if additional funds are not awarded by legislature, could reduce funding for other areas
- Complicates performance measurement and reporting for jurisdictions using alternative trip reduction methods; hard to roll up data
- Keeps more funding in traditional CTR, and thus less funding available for new, innovative ideas