

2019-2023 Statewide CTR Strategic Plan

The strategic plan will identify:

1. Transportation partners' most promising opportunities to enhance trip reduction
2. The approaches partners will take to pursue those opportunities

The strategic planning process will generate:

1. Our most promising opportunities to expand trip reduction
2. Clear, mutually-agreeable approaches to pursue those opportunities
3. Enthused partners who will invest organizational, financial and political resources needed to pursue our most promising opportunities

Seven Concepts

1. Community driven TDM (GTEC)
2. Practical Solutions (Emphasize corridors with multimodal, multiagency investment plans)
3. Focus on education
4. Focus CTR on fewer jurisdictions
5. Keep CTR – expand TDM
6. Reorient to a regional approach
7. Retain traditional CTR while allowing flexibility for alternative programs where justified

Themes

Does this list capture the main themes you see? If not, what themes emerge for you?

- Emphasize innovation and local flexibility
- Emphasize locations that offer greatest trip reduction and mode shift potential
- Reach different people (employees at worksites with fewer than 100 people, people attending special events, students and their parents, residential areas, etc.)
- Support existing base by focusing resources on areas of the greatest demand and potential impact
- Sub-regional partnerships; capture efficiency gains of centralizing programs/resource
- Emphasize community-TDM, beyond CTR sites
- Educate non-CTR affected communities on their role in this process.
- Bolster the reach of the program by using a grant program that encourages innovation and adaptability
- Increase the value and visibility of the program to state legislators
- Education, outreach to the traveling public
- Increase amount, consistency and sustainability of TDM funding resources
- Accelerate adoption of new technologies
- Improve performance feedback loop and provide transparent, legible program assessment
- Continuing and strengthening performance gains
- Efficiency

Critical Success Factors

Does this list capture the main critical success factors you see? If not, what should change?

- Support and encourage local implementers
- Improve measureable performance results
- Ensure viability and relevance
- Gain support from key groups:
 - local government
 - state government
 - employers
 - business associations
 - people and organizations who serve as champions
- More emphasis on relationship with legislators
- Improve measureable performance results and effectively communicate success to stakeholders, data and stories
- Improve measurement of key success factors
- Community recognition
- Fair targets for longstanding worksites and new worksites
- Increased community buy-in
- Expand to reach underserved communities (off-peak/shift manufacturing)
- Reduce bureaucratic barriers for local implementers
- Maintain viability and relevance (replace the word ensure with maintain)

organizing structure for strategic plan

introduction

goals

plan purpose

program vision

goals, strategies, actions

goal 1:

strategy 1:

suggested tactics:

-
-
-

strategy 2:

suggested tactics:

-
-
-
-

1 - 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.
- 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.

2 - 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.
- It may reorient the program from employers to corridors.

3 - 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.

4 - 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.
- 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

5 - 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.

6 - 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.

7 - 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