1.0 Introduction

Washington State's Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Law was adopted by the 1991 Legislature (*Chapter 202, Sections 10 to 19*) and incorporated into the Washington Clean Air Act as RCW 70.94.521-551. Its intent is to improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion, and reduce the consumption of petroleum fuels through employer-based programs that encourage the use of alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle (SOV) for the commute trip. These strategies are also known as transportation demand management (TDM). These acronyms, as well as others referred to in this document, are included in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Abbreviations

SEPA	(Washington) State Environmental Policy Act
CTR	Commute trip reduction
DOE	(Washington State) Department of Ecology
DOR	(Washington State) Department of Revenue
ETC	Employee transportation coordinator
GMA	(Washington State) Growth Management Act
HOV	High-occupancy vehicle
ISTEA	(United States) Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
MPO	Municipal planning organization
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RTPO	Regional transportation planning organization
SOV	Single-occupant vehicle
TAT	(Washington State Department of Transportation) Technical Assistance Team
TAZ	Traffic analysis zone
TDM	Transportation demand management
TMA	Transportation management association
TMO	Transportation management organization
VMT	Vehicle miles traveled
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation

The law applies to employers with 100 or more full-time employees at a single worksite who are scheduled to begin their workdays between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. weekdays and that are located in counties with populations of over 150,000 (Clark, King, Kitsap, Pierce, Snohomish, Spokane, Thurston, Whatcom, and Yakima counties). The law establishes goals for reducing commute trip vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by the employees of affected employers. These goals were established in 1991 as a 15 percent reduction by 1995, a 25 percent reduction by 1997, and a 35 percent reduction by 1999, measured against the 1992 average in the area where the site is located. The law, including 1997 amendments, is reproduced in Appendix A.

An initial CTR Task Force (hereinafter referred to as “Task Force”) was appointed by then-Governor Booth Gardner pursuant to the requirements of RCW 70.94.537. The primary responsibility of the Task Force was to establish guidelines for the development of CTR plans by affected local jurisdictions. Current members of the Task Force are listed in Appendix B.

In 1997, the Legislature passed amendments to the law which changed the SOV and VMT reduction goals from 25 percent to 20 percent in 1997, 35 percent to 25 percent in 1999, and extended the program and established a 35 percent reduction goal in 2005. Additionally, the amendments:

- Specify that employers are required to make a good faith effort to implement CTR at their worksites;

- Clarify that failure to achieve the SOV and VMT reduction goals is not a violation;

- Expand the size of the Task Force to 28 members, adding an additional six employer representatives, and broadens the employer nomination process; and

- Direct the Task Force to develop a statewide public awareness campaign.

This edition of the guidelines reflects changes resulting from these amendments.

1.1 Guiding Principles

In developing these guidelines, the Task Force examined the experience of others around the country with similar laws and arrived at a set of "guiding principles" it believed would help ensure the success of CTR plans and programs in Washington. The key elements of these guiding principles are:

- The law must be implemented cooperatively in a process that involves state and local governments, employers, transit agencies and citizens. That is the primary reason for the broad public-private composition of the Task Force. That same cooperative approach is essential as local jurisdictions develop and implement their plans.

- There must be sufficient flexibility in the local government plans to allow employers to design programs that work for their employees and situation, while at the same time ensuring consistency and fairness. One program will not fit all.

- In order to be fair and effective, many state and local government agencies are also subject to the requirements of the law.

- Because of the strong link between this law and other land use and growth management laws, coordination with regional transportation planning organizations (RTPOs) is essential in developing and implementing commute trip reduction plans. The link with the Growth Management Act (GMA) is a prime example. The GMA (*RCW 36.70A.070 [6][e]*) requires

coordination of land use and transportation plans and calls for a TDM element in local comprehensive plans.

- CTR plans and programs must be developed in such a way that the benefits to the community, employers, and employees are clear. Efforts under this law will succeed to the extent they are seen as providing benefits. The advantages to the community will be evident in terms of reduced air pollution, traffic congestion, and energy consumption. Benefits to employers and employees, however, may initially be less apparent; and care must be taken to make those benefits both real and obvious.

- The success of programs like The Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County's "Commuter Challenge," under which employers have voluntarily undertaken efforts to reduce commute trips, is an indication that CTR efforts work. Programs that offer employees real options can have benefits for both employer and employee.

- Eliminating motor vehicle trips is the most effective way to meet clean air, traffic congestion, and energy goals through CTR. Therefore, alternative modes such as teleworking, walking, bicycling and compressed work weeks should be given priority.

1.2 Authority and Consistency

The Task Force feels strongly about promoting consistent implementation of the law and believes that to ensure consistency, these guidelines should be accepted in their entirety. In 1992, inquiries were made about adopting the guidelines into the Washington Administrative Code (WACs). At that time, the assistant attorney general for the Washington State Energy Office determined that the Task Force did not have the authority to establish WACs. However, in 1997, Governor Locke (*Executive Order 97-02, Regulatory Improvement*) directed, in part, that "…each [state] agency shall review its existing policy and interpretive statements or similar documents to determine whether or not they must, by law, be adopted as rules." The Task Force will work with WSDOT to determine the impact of this order on these guidelines.

1.2.1 Authority

The law provides for the creation of the Task Force. The Task Force "shall establish guidelines for commute trip reduction plans." *RCW 70.94.537[2]* These guidelines are promulgated for the purpose of fostering consistency among the CTR plans of local jurisdictions. They are not "rules" in the legal sense of the word. The Task Force cannot require local jurisdictions' compliance with the terms of the Guidelines. However, because one of the primary purposes behind the CTR law and these guidelines is to promote consistency, the Task Force strongly recommends that local jurisdictions follow the guidelines and the model CTR ordinance (see Appendix C).

Local jurisdictions should recognize that, at this time, the only legally binding aspects of the guidelines are those that restate the requirements of the CTR law.

1.2.2 Consistency

The primary charge to the Task Force was to develop guidelines for the CTR plans of affected jurisdictions. "The guidelines are intended to ensure consistency in commute trip reduction plans and goals among jurisdictions while fairly taking into account differences in employment and housing density, employer size, existing and anticipated levels of transit service, special employer circumstances, and other factors the task force determines are relevant." *RCW 70.94.537[2]* Stated another way, the intent of the guidelines is to ensure that employers facing similar circumstances that might affect employee commuting behavior are treated the same in all important respects, regardless of the jurisdiction in which they are located.

These guidelines are the primary means for ensuring consistent treatment of employers. The specific mechanisms to ensure consistency include:

- A model ordinance on which local CTR ordinances should be based.
- Methods for establishing CTR zones. These are areas in which all affected employers are to have the same goals for vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per employee and proportion of SOV trips.
- Methods for determining the CTR zones' base year values for VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips, from which the goals are derived.
- Methods for determining employers' progress toward the goals and the reporting requirements with which affected employers must comply.
- Methods to ensure that employers receive credit for the results of TDM efforts undertaken prior to the time they became subject to local CTR ordinances.
- Training requirements for employees of jurisdictions that will be enforcing CTR ordinances.

1.3 Relation to Other TDM Requirements

The Task Force strongly recommends that local jurisdictions make existing TDM efforts compatible with the requirements of RCW 70.94.521-551 and these guidelines. Several jurisdictions have implemented, or are considering implementation of, TDM requirements for employers and/or developers through the permitting of new facilities under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Many of these efforts have been and continue to be quite successful. The Task Force recognizes that jurisdictions may use TDM to satisfy different goals than those in the CTR law because of other considerations. The Task Force encourages jurisdictions to review existing and

proposed TDM requirements that are based on SEPA and make them compatible with the CTR law where feasible. The Task Force recommends that property owners and employers be treated equitably and that, wherever possible, jurisdictions reduce the conflict, duplication and higher cost of
separate or conflicting TDM requirements at the same worksite. To this end, SEPA-based TDM requirements for employers and/or developers should, as with the CTR law, be based primarily on performance goals rather than specific program elements, with progress measured using the same instruments, methodologies, and reporting requirements used for employers subject to the jurisdiction's CTR ordinance as recommended by these guidelines.

1.4 Interjurisdictional Cooperation

The Task Force strongly recommends that, to the extent possible, jurisdictions in the affected counties enter into cooperative arrangements for the implementation of their CTR plans. This is particularly critical for jurisdictions that contain relatively few affected employers. Such arrangements may be made with the county, other cities, transit agencies, regional councils or RTPOs, or other entities, as appropriate. The arrangements may be entered into through interlocal agreements or contracts. *RCW 70.94.527[6]*

This recommendation is made both to stretch the limited resources available for implementing the CTR law and to facilitate consistent treatment of employers across jurisdictional boundaries. Significant economies of scale can be achieved through cooperation. In addition, minimizing the number of entities administering and enforcing CTR plans will likely increase the consistent application of ordinance and plan requirements.

1.5 Cooperation Among Affected Employers

Affected employers are encouraged to enter into cooperative arrangements with other affected employers in their immediate vicinity for the development and implementation of CTR programs. These arrangements could be through the formation of transportation management organizations (TMOs), or they could be less formal. *RCW 70.94.531[3]* This would be particularly appropriate for smaller affected employers. The advantages of such cooperation include economies of scale, the potential for sharing resources, and the formation of a larger "critical mass" of employees, making ridesharing arrangements or special transit services easier.

1.6 Employer Size Threshold

Affected local jurisdictions may, as part of their CTR plans, "require commute trip reduction programs for employers with ten or more full-time employees at major worksites in federally designated non-attainment areas for [both] carbon monoxide and ozone." *RCW 70.94.527[5]* The Task Force, however, was charged with recommending to the Legislature by October 1, 1992, the "minimum size employer who shall be required to implement [commute] trip reduction programs..." *RCW 70.94.537[3]*

In 1992, the Task Force recommended that jurisdictions not consider applying their option of lowering the employee threshold below 100 employees until after the second review of employer programs has been completed and reported to the Task Force. After reviewing program data, they subsequently recommended in December 1995 that the Legislature and local jurisdictions not lower the employer size threshold at that time. Their reasoning was that the administrative costs of expanding the program were greater than the probable benefits. The Task Force also pledged to review the recommendation and offer guidance to the Legislature on this issue as part of their 1999 legislative report.

2.0 Administrative Guidelines

2.1 Preamble

This chapter contains administrative direction from the Task Force to help provide consistency in the adoption and administration of CTR ordinances by cities and counties.

2.2 Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest language for jurisdictions to use in their letters of transmittal attached to local ordinances; to state general goals and objectives; to define terms used throughout these guidelines; to outline jurisdiction CTR plan requirements; and to recommend administrative procedures for jurisdictions.

2.3 Findings

This section provides language that jurisdictions may find appropriate to use in letters of transmittal attached to local ordinances. Suggested language:

"Automotive traffic is a major source of emissions that pollute the air. Air pollution causes significant harm to public health and degrades the quality of the environment."

"Increasing automotive traffic aggravates traffic congestion in (*city/county*). Traffic congestion imposes significant costs on (c*ity/county*) business, government, and individuals in terms of lost working hours and delays in the delivery of goods and services. Traffic congestion worsens automobile-related air pollution and increases fuel consumption, making (c*ity/county*) a less desirable place to live, work, visit, and do business. Capital and environmental costs of fully accommodating the existing and projected automobile traffic on roads and highways are prohibitive. Decreasing the demand for vehicle trips is significantly less costly and is at least as effective in reducing traffic congestion and its impacts as constructing new transportation facilities."

“Increasing automotive transportation is a major factor in the increasing consumption of gasoline and reliance on imported sources of petroleum. Moderation in the growth of automotive travel is essential to stabilizing and reducing dependence on imported petroleum and improving the nation's energy security.”

“(*City/County*) finds that reducing the number of commute trips to work made in single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) is an effective way to reduce automobile-related air pollution, traffic congestion, and energy use. Employers have significant opportunities to encourage and facilitate the reduction of SOV commuting by employees.”

“State policy, as set forth in RCW 70.94.521-551 and the guidelines of the CTR Task Force, requires (c*ity/county*) developing and implementing a plan to reduce SOV commute trips. The plan must require affected employers to implement programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled per employee and the number of SOVs used for commuting purposes by their employees.”

“CTR efforts implemented under this ordinance may be incorporated in the State Implementation Plan for the attainment of federal standards for ozone and carbon monoxide. CTR efforts implemented under this ordinance meet, in part, the transportation demand management requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA -- *RCW 36.70A.070[6][e]*).”

“RCW 70.94.527[6] calls for consistency with related plans including ‘local comprehensive plans’ required under the GMA.”

“Adoption of this ordinance will promote the public health, safety, and general welfare within (c*ity/county*) and the region.”

2.4 General Goals and Objectives

The Task Force recommends that jurisdictions' ordinances be consistent with the following general goals and objectives:

2.4.1 General Goals

1. Reduce automobile-generated air and water pollution, relieve traffic congestion, reduce energy consumption, and reduce air pollution-related health problems.

2. Reduce peak period motor vehicle trips and the amount of VMT associated with commute trips.

3. Make optimal use of existing and future transportation systems to minimize costs and preserve business opportunities in Washington State.

4. Treat affected employers in a fair and reasonable manner.

5. Establish a plan consistent with the guidelines set by the Task Force, as well as CTR plans of counties, cities, or towns sharing common borders or common regional transportation and growth issues.

6. Minimize the administrative burden of local jurisdictions and affected employers in achieving CTR goals.

7. Promote consistency among jurisdictions statewide with respect to implementing the CTR law.

2.4.2 Objectives

1. To require all affected employers to develop and implement CTR programs designed to:

   a. Reduce the VMT per employee from the 1992 base year value established for each CTR zone. These reductions shall be at least 15 percent by January 1, 1995; 20 percent by January 1, 1997; 25 percent by January 1, 1999; and 35 percent by January 1, 2005.

      RCW 70.94.527[4g] requires that goals for reductions in VMT per employee be "not less than" 15, 20, 25, and 35 percent in the stated years.

   b. Reduce the proportion of SOV trips from the base year value established for each CTR zone. These reductions shall be at least 15 percent by January 1, 1995; 25 percent by January 1, 1997; 25 percent by January 1, 1999; and 35 percent by January 1, 2005.

      RCW 70.94.527[4a] requires local governments to adopt specific goals for reductions in SOV trips. The Task Force determined that these goals should be the same percentage reductions as set in RCW 70.94.527 for VMT. Also see Measurements and Evaluations Guidelines, Chapter 3.0.

c. Inform and educate employees about commute alternatives.

2. To establish, consistent with the guidelines, the following:

   a. CTR zones.

   b. Base year values for the proportion of SOV commute trips and the commute trip VMT per employee for each CTR zone.

   c. A means for measuring progress toward meeting CTR goals.

   d. Methods for assuring consistent treatment of employers that have worksites subject to the requirements of CTR ordinances in more than one jurisdiction.

   e. An appeals process by which affected employers may obtain an exemption from, or a modification of, CTR ordinance requirements.

   f. Methods to ensure that employers receive credit for the results of TDM efforts and CTR programs implemented prior to the base year.

   g. A method to set alternative CTR goals for affected employers that cannot meet the goals because of the unique nature of their business.
   h. A method to set alternative CTR goals for affected employers that undergo worksite changes that contribute substantially to traffic congestion in a CTR zone.

2.5 Definitions

2.5.1 Affected Employee

A full-time employee who begins his or her regular work day at a single worksite between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. (inclusive) on two or more weekdays for at least 12 continuous months, who is not an independent contractor, and who is scheduled to be employed on a continuous basis for 52 weeks for an average of at least 35 hours per week. *Based on RCW 70.94.524[1]*.

The employee will only be counted at his or her primary worksite.

Seasonal agricultural employees, including seasonal employees of processors of agricultural products, are excluded from the count of affected employees. *RCW 70.94.527[11]*

2.5.2 Affected Employer

An employer is a sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, unincorporated association, cooperative, joint venture, agency, department, district or other individual or entity, whether public, non-profit, or private, that employs (100) or more full-time employees at a single worksite who are scheduled to begin their regular work day between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. (inclusive) on two or more weekdays for at least 12 continuous months.

This term is based on the law's definition of "major employer" (RCW 70.94.524[11]) but accommodates the possibility that the employer size threshold may be lowered locally or by the state in the future. If a qualified local jurisdiction decides to lower the employee threshold as permitted under RCW 70.94.527[5], it should change the number of employees in parentheses to the appropriate number.

Construction worksites, when the expected duration of the construction project is less than two years, are excluded from this definition. *RCW 70.94.527[12]*

2.5.3 Alternative Mode

Any means of commute transportation other than that in which the single-occupant motor vehicle is the dominant mode, including teleworking and compressed work weeks, which results in fewer commute trips.

2.5.4 Alternative Work Schedules

Programs such as compressed work weeks that eliminate work trips for affected employees.

2.5.5 Base Year

The period from January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992, on which goals for VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips shall be based. *RCW 70.94.524[7]*

2.5.6 Carpool

A motor vehicle occupied by two to six people traveling together for their commute trip that results in the reduction of a minimum of one motor vehicle commute trip.

2.5.7 Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

Is the highest-ranking official at an employer worksite, who may or may not be the company CEO. This term is understood to encompass other official designations or job titles.

2.5.8 Commute Trips

Trips made from a worker's home to a worksite with a regularly scheduled arrival time between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. (inclusive) on weekdays. *Based on 70.94.524[5], with clarification that "scheduled arrival time" conforms to other definitions that refer to the time employees "begin their regular work day."*

2.5.9 CTR Plan

A local jurisdiction's plan and ordinance to regulate and administer the CTR programs of affected employers within its jurisdiction.

2.5.10 CTR Program

Is an employer's strategies to reduce affected employees' SOV use and VMT per employee.

2.5.11 CTR Zone

An area, such as a census tract or combination of census tracts, within a local jurisdiction, characterized by similar employment density, population density, level of transit service, parking availability, access to high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities, and other factors that are determined to affect the level of SOV commuting. *RCW 70.94.524[3]*

2.5.12 Commuter Matching Service or Ride matching

A system that assists in matching commuters for the purpose of commuting together.

2.5.13 Compressed Work Week

An alternative work schedule, in accordance with employer policy, that regularly allows a full-time employee to eliminate at least one work day every two weeks by working longer hours during the remaining days, resulting in fewer commute trips by the employee. This definition is primarily intended to include weekly and bi-weekly arrangements, the most typical being four ten-hour days or 80 hours in nine days, but may also include other arrangements. *Defined in response to RCW 70.94.527[10], which requires a special method of measuring eliminated commute trips.*

2.5.14 Custom Bus/Bus Pool

A commuter bus service arranged specifically to transport employees to work.

2.5.15 Dominant Mode

The mode of travel used for the greatest distance of a commute trip. *Defined to conform to the measurement and survey requirements contained in the Measurements and Evaluation Guidelines, Chapter 3.0.*

2.5.16 Employer

A sole proprietorship, partnership, corporation, unincorporated association, cooperative, joint venture, agency, department, district or other individual or entity, whether public, non-profit, or private, that employs workers.

2.5.17 Employer Exemption

A waiver from CTR program requirements granted to an employer by a local jurisdiction, based on unique conditions that apply to the employer or employment site.

2.5.18 Flextime

An employer policy allowing individual employees some flexibility in choosing the time, but not the number, of their working hours to facilitate the use of alternative modes.

2.5.19 Full-Time Employee

A person other than an independent contractor, scheduled to be employed on a continuous basis for 52 weeks for an average of at least 35 hours per week.

2.5.20 Good Faith Effort

An employer's act of meeting the minimum requirements identified in RCW 70.94.531 and working collaboratively with the local jurisdiction to continue their existing program or to develop and implement program modifications likely to result in improvements to the program over an agreed-upon length of time. *RCW 70.94.534[2]*

2.5.21 Implementation

Active pursuit by an employer of the CTR goals of RCW 70.94.521-551 and the guidelines, as evidenced by appointment of an employee transportation coordinator (ETC), distribution of information to employees regarding alternatives to SOV

commuting, and commencement of other measures according to their CTR program and schedule. *RCW 70.94.534[5] permits civil penalties for "failure by an employer to implement a commute trip reduction program..." The Task Force interpreted "implementation" in conformance with employer requirements in RCW 70.94.531.*

2.5.22 Measurement Week

The period of time about which employees are asked to report when being surveyed about their travel habits.

2.5.23 Mode

The means of transportation used by employees, such as single-occupant motor vehicle, rideshare vehicle (carpool, vanpool), transit, ferry, bicycle, and walking.

2.5.24 Peak Period

The hours from 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. (inclusive), Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

2.5.25 Peak Period Trip

Any employee trip that delivers an employee to his or her worksite to begin his or her regular workday between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. (inclusive), Monday through Friday, except legal holidays. *From the definition of commute trip in RCW 70.94.524[4]*

2.5.26 Proportion of Single-Occupant Vehicle Trips (SOV Rate)

The number of commute trips over a set period made by affected employees in SOVs divided by the number of affected employees working during that period. *RCW 70.94.524[5]*

2.5.27 SOV

A motor vehicle occupied by one employee for commute purposes, including a motorcycle.

2.5.28 SOV Trips

Trips made by affected employees in SOVs.

2.5.29 Single Worksite

A building or group of buildings on physically contiguous parcels of land, or on parcels separated solely by private or public roadways or rights-of-way, occupied by one or more affected employers. *Defined to distinguish "single worksite," referred to in RCW 70.94.524[1], from "major worksite," defined in RCW 70.94.524[2].*

2.5.30 Telecommuting/Teleporting

The use of telephones, computers, or other similar technology to permit an employee to work from home, eliminating a commute trip, or to work from a work place closer to home, reducing the distance traveled in a commute trip by at least half. *Defined in response to RCW 70.94.527[10], which requires a special method of measuring eliminated commute trips.*

2.5.31 Transit

A multiple-occupant vehicle operated on a for-hire, shared-ride basis, including bus, ferry, rail, shared-ride taxi, shuttle bus, or vanpool. A transit trip counts as zero vehicle trips.

2.5.32 Transportation Management Organization/Association (TMO/TMA)

A group of employers, or a group representing employers, located in a defined geographic area. A TMO or TMA may represent employers within specific city limits, or may have a sphere of influence that extends beyond city limits.

2.5.33 Vanpool

A vehicle occupied by seven to 15 people traveling together for their commute trip that results in the reduction of a minimum of one motor vehicle trip. A vanpool trip counts as zero vehicle trips.

2.5.34 VMT Per Employee

The sum of the individual motor vehicle commute trip lengths in miles made by affected employees over a set period divided by the number of affected employees during that period.

2.5.35 Week

A seven-day calendar period, starting on Monday and continuing through Sunday.

2.5.36 Weekday

Any day of the week except Saturday or Sunday.

2.5.37 Writing (Written/In Writing)

Original signed and dated documents. Facsimile (fax) transmissions are a temporary notice of action that must be followed by the original signed and dated document via mail or delivery.

2.6 Local Jurisdiction CTR Plan

2.6.1 Local Jurisdiction Plan to Task Force

Not more than 30 days after adoption of a CTR plan and ordinance, the local jurisdiction shall submit its CTR plan or summary and certification of its adoption to the Task Force. The CTR plan or summary will include:

1. Goals for reduction in SOV rates and VMT per employee;

2. Designation of CTR zones;

3. Requirements for affected employers;

4. A commitment to develop a CTR program for its own employees;

5. A commitment to review local parking policies and ordinances as they relate to affected employers and affected worksites and to make any revisions necessary to comply with CTR goals and guidelines in a period consistent with the time lines of the GMA review process;

6. An appeals process for affected employers; and

7. A means to determine base year values for the SOV rate, VMT per employee, and progress toward meeting CTR goals.

Based on RCW 70.94.527[7], local jurisdictions must submit a plan to the Task Force 30 days after passing their CTR ordinances. RCW 70.94.527[4] lists all the elements of the plan.

2.6.2 CTR Program for Local Jurisdiction Employees

Any jurisdiction adopting a CTR ordinance with at least one affected employer must implement a program at each of its own employee worksites that meet the definition of affected employer. If the jurisdiction has no such worksite(s), a program must be implemented at the worksite with the largest affected employee population. The jurisdiction will submit the program to the jurisdiction(s) in which its affected worksites are located within six months after the adoption of the applicable CTR ordinance(s). The local jurisdiction will implement a CTR program within six months after submittal. *RCW 70.94.527[4][d]*

2.6.3 Annual Report to the Task Force

Each year on July 1, beginning in 1994 through 2005, affected local jurisdictions shall report to the Task Force on the progress towards plan goals in each CTR zone. *RCW 70.94.527[8]. Costs incurred by all government agencies, including but not limited to cities, counties, transit agencies, RTPOs, municipal planning organizations (MPOs), and the state, shall also be*

reported to the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and will be released as part of the CTR program evaluation.

2.7 Recommended Administrative Procedures

Jurisdictions should be consistent with the following administrative processes:

2.7.1 Annual Progress Report Procedures

The format for employers' annual progress reports will be approved by the WSDOT Technical Assistance Team (hereinafter referred to as the TAT). The requirements for the annual progress report shall be consistent with information necessary for a rigorous assessment of the statewide costs and benefits of the CTR law. As part of the annual progress report, affected employers will be asked but not required to complete a survey on costs associated with the administration of the CTR program at their worksites (except as specified below in the Document Review and Program Modifications section). This cost survey will be sent directly to WSDOT for evaluation purposes and will be kept confidential to the extent possible but will be subject to public disclosure. Cost information on specific employers will not be released to local jurisdictions or any other party without prior notification of the employer. When evaluation results are released by WSDOT, cost information will be reported only in aggregate form, and no single employer or worksite will be identifiable. *RCW 70.94.537[5]*

2.7.2 Employers with Worksites in Multiple Jurisdictions

Employers and jurisdictions are to work collaboratively and in good faith so that the administrative burden on employers implementing CTR programs at worksites in multiple jurisdictions can be lessened.

Employers with worksites subject to CTR requirements in multiple jurisdictions may request that a consistent program reporting and/or survey date(s) be established for all or any of its worksites in all or any of the affected jurisdictions.

Employers may also request that the appropriate jurisdictions collaborate during the program review process and/or that jurisdictions accept a single CTR program for all of the employer’s worksites if it can be determined that the proposed CTR program is likely to achieve the applicable CTR goals at each of the worksites.

At least 60 days prior to the first scheduled program reporting date for the employer in a given calendar year, employers must make such requests in writing to the jurisdiction with the largest number of the employer's worksites or to the jurisdiction with the largest number of the employer's employees. The employer must send copies of the request to all other jurisdictions where the employer has a worksite subject to CTR requirements.

Requests from state agencies with worksites in multiple jurisdictions are to be made to and coordinated by the State Department of General Administration's State Agency CTR program staff, who will work collaboratively with the requesting agency and with all jurisdictions involved.

The jurisdiction receiving the original request shall be the coordinating jurisdiction and shall establish a process so that a solution acceptable to the employer and the affected jurisdictions can be reached. The process must convene within 30 days from the date the employer's request is received and shall be completed within 60 days of receiving the original request.

Jurisdictions shall notify the TAT when they receive a request. RCW 70.94.527[9] requires that any requests for modifications of the requirements of a CTR plan be submitted to the Task Force for review. The TAT, as staff to the Task Force, may act on behalf of the Task Force. Neither the Task Force nor the TAT may grant or deny employer requests. They shall, however, make comments and/or suggestions to promote statewide consistency in implementing the CTR law. Jurisdictions shall also notify the TAT as to the disposition of any requests. The TAT shall provide regular updates to the Task Force on the disposition of employer requests. A list of current TAT members is included in Appendix D.

2.7.3 Appeal of Administrative Decisions

Affected employers may appeal administrative decisions regarding exemptions, modification of goals, CTR program elements, and violations to the local jurisdiction's appeals body named in the ordinance.

Any affected employer may appeal the imposition of penalties to the local jurisdiction's designated appeal body. Such appeal may be granted if:

1. The employer can show the violations for which the penalties were imposed occurred for reasons beyond the control of the employer; and/or

2. The penalties were imposed for the failure of the employer to revise its CTR program as directed by the local jurisdiction, and the employer can demonstrate that the measures the local jurisdiction directed the employer to incorporate in its CTR program are unlikely to reduce the proportion of SOV trips and/or VMT per employee. It is anticipated that the information to support such an appeal will be developed as part of the CTR program evaluation.

2.7.4 Document Review and Program Modifications

The local jurisdiction shall review each employer's CTR program description and/or annual report within 90 days of submittal. If the local jurisdiction is unable to review the employer's CTR program description within 90 days, it shall notify the employer in writing of its intention to extend the review period for up to 90 days. The implementation date for the employer's CTR program will be extended an equivalent number of days.

The jurisdiction shall review each employer's program description and annual report to determine if the program is likely to meet the applicable CTR goals. *Based on RCW 70.94.534[3]*. Until 1995 (or the employer's first goal year) the local jurisdiction will notify the employer of any comments or suggested modifications. In and after 1995 (or the employer's first goal year) the jurisdiction may suggest or require program modifications within the following guidelines:

1. If the employer meets or exceeds either or both the SOV rate and the VMT per employee goal(s), the jurisdiction shall not require program modifications.

2. If the employer achieves neither the SOV rate nor the VMT per employee goal but is making a good faith effort as defined in RCW 70.94.534[2], the jurisdiction shall work collaboratively with the employer to continue the existing program or implement program modifications likely to result in improvements to the program over an agreed upon length of time.

3. If an employer achieves neither the SOV rate nor the VMT per employee goal and has not made a good faith effort as defined in RCW 70.94.534[2], the jurisdiction shall work collaboratively with the employer to propose modifications to the program and shall direct the employer to revise its program within 30 days.

If an employer fails to meet both the SOV rate and the VMT per employee goals, the employer may be required to provide the local jurisdiction with information regarding subsidies to their employees participating in the CTR program. That is, the

employer must include a per participating employee subsidy level, for each mode of transportation, and for each period of time the subsidy covers. (Example: Each employee using transit can receive a $21 per month transit subsidy if they sign up with the ETC.)

2.7.5 Employer and Employee Exemptions

An affected employer may request that its jurisdiction grant an exemption from all CTR program requirements or penalties for a particular worksite. An exemption may be granted if the employer is unable to implement any measures that could reduce the proportion of SOV trips and VMT per employee. *The Task Force believes it will be extremely rare for a situation to arise in which it is impossible to take any steps to improve the proportion of SOV trips and VMT per employee.*

An exemption from the requirements of a CTR ordinance may be granted to a worksite if the employer can illustrate how the business conditions, site characteristics, and organizational factors at the worksite make it infeasible for that worksite to implement even the minimum requirements of a CTR program. Examples of conditions that may qualify a worksite for an exemption include bankruptcy; financial reorganization; significant employee reductions; or a protracted labor strike by a significant portion of the worksite's employees. Exemptions granted by jurisdictions shall remain in effect as long as the condition, which led to the granting of the exemption, is present. All exemptions shall be reviewed annually by the jurisdiction.

The process of exempting some affected employees from the requirements of a CTR program is sometimes known as an affected employee adjustment. Specific employees or groups of employees who are required to drive alone to work as a condition of employment may be exempted from a worksite's CTR program. Exemptions may also be granted for employee who work variable shifts throughout the year and who do not rotate as a group to identical shifts. Conditions which should be considered in assessing requests for employee exemptions include but are not limited to: employee flexibility in scheduling start time; ability to telework or utilize alternative work schedules; the number of employees on similar schedules; and the need for private vehicles to conduct work activities. Affected employees who are exempted from a worksite's CTR program should be counted when determining the total number of affected employees at the worksite. Affected worksites that receive exemptions for some employees based on the conditions identified above shall measure progress towards the applicable SOV or VMT goals based on the employees who remain affected by the program, even if this number is less than 100 employees.

2.7.6 Goal Modifications

An affected employer may request that its jurisdiction modify its CTR program goals. An employer seeking a goal modification should file its request in writing with the local jurisdiction at least 60 days prior to the date which the worksite is required to submit its annual report. The goal modification request should clearly explain why the worksite is unable to achieve the applicable goal. The worksite must also demonstrate to the jurisdiction that it has implemented all of the elements contained in its approved CTR program. RCW 70.94.527[4][f] allows employers, which, as a result of special characteristics of their business or location, would be unable to meet the requirements of a CTR, plan to appeal for a waiver or modification of those requirements. "Special characteristics" include such things as changes in a worksite's workforce, and limited availability of public transportation services including ridesharing vehicles.

Upon receiving a request for a goal modification, the jurisdiction shall inform the TAT of the request. RCW 70.94.527(9) requires that any requests for modifications of the requirements of a CTR plan shall be submitted to the Task Force for review. As staff to the Task Force, the TAT is responsible for acting on behalf of the Task Force on such requests. The Task Force (through the TAT) may not grant nor deny a waiver or modification, but shall make comments and suggestions to promote statewide consistency in implementing the CTR law. Jurisdictions shall also inform the TAT of all approvals or denials of requests for goal modifications, and the TAT will provide regular updates to the Task Force on goal modifications granted or denied.

Jurisdictions should reply to request for goal modification in writing within 30 days of receiving such a request. The jurisdiction must clearly document the factors which went into its decision to grant or deny the request. Requests for goal modifications which are granted by a jurisdiction shall be reviewed annually and considered valid if the worksite continues to face the same special characteristics or location barriers which led to the initial approval of the modification. The Task Force encourages jurisdictions to work collaboratively with employers, local transportation providers, and the TAT to resolve barriers which prevent worksites from reaching the applicable CTR goals.

Jurisdictions may grant the types of goal modifications shown in Table 2 below in accordance with the specified criteria.

Table 2. Modifications

Type of Modification	Criteria
Worksite measured against base year values of contiguous CTR zone	Worksite is within three blocks (1/4 mile) of another CTR zone and the conditions in that zone are more similar to the site characteristics than the conditions in the designated zone. The site characteristics will be compared to its designated zone and the adjoining zone in terms of accessibility of facilities and services; level of transit service and amenities; location of sidewalks/pedestrian trails and bicycle facilities; parking costs and availability; and employment density.
Worksite measured against site specific base year value	No formal request necessary. Granted automatically through baseline survey for newly affected sites and retroactively granted for sites that conducted baseline surveys in 1992/1993. For sites which did not conduct a baseline survey in 1992/1993, or which failed to achieve a 70 percent response rate on its base year survey, a surrogate worksite base year value will be calculated by adding the average change in SOV or VMT reduction between 1993 and 1995 for the zone in which the worksite is located to the measured 1995 SOV or VMT rate for the worksite.

Table 2. Modifications (Continued)

Type of Modification	Criteria
Minor goal modification	A five percent reduction (e.g., reducing the 1997 goal from 25 to 20 percent) may be granted from the applicable SOV or VMT rates after considering all of the following factors: • transit access to the site • frequency of transit service during peak periods • potential for internal ride matching opportunities • potential for ride matching with other employers in the area • access to the site for bicyclists and pedestrians • ability to implement compressed work weeks and/or teleworking • ETC/employer participation in trainings, events, promotions, and networking

	activities • utilization of services provided by the local jurisdiction, transit agencies, and TMAs
Major goal modification	A ten percent reduction may be granted from the applicable SOV or VMT goal (e.g., reducing the 1997 goal from 25 to 15 percent) if all of the following conditions apply: • no transit access within 1/4 mile of the site • limited potential for internal ride matching opportunities • no potential for ride matching with other employers in the area • no reasonable access to the site for bicyclists and pedestrians • limited ability to implement compressed work weeks and/or teleworking due to characteristics of the business • ETC/employer has actively participated in trainings, events, promotions and networking activities • worksite has utilized services provided by the local jurisdiction, transit agency, or TMA

2.7.7 Goal Assessment

Each employer's progress toward attaining its zone's CTR goals shall be assessed in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2005, if that employer was an affected employer at the time the jurisdiction's ordinance was adopted. Employers that later become subject to the terms of the CTR ordinance ("newly affected employers," as described in the CTR law) shall be assessed according to the same goals two years, four years, six, eight , ten, and 12 years after their CTR program was first approved by the local jurisdiction. Goal attainment shall be measured using the method required by the Task Force. *Based on RCW 70.94.527[4][g] and the method prescribed by the Task Force to identify newly affected employers.*

2.7.8 Parking Space Requirements

In working toward the CTR goals, a property owner, as an employer on a single-tenant site, or on behalf of employers on a multiple-employer site, may request from the local jurisdiction a reduction in the parking space requirements for a particular worksite. *Local jurisdictions are encouraged by the Task Force to use an administrative review process by which employers may request a reduction in parking space requirements for a particular worksite. Refer to Chapter 5.0, Parking Guidelines.*

2.7.9 Penalties

The local jurisdiction may impose civil penalties in the manner provided in RCW 7.80 for violations. The intent of the CTR law is to bring about the implementation of effective CTR programs. Penalties should be used only as a last resort.

2.7.10 Record Keeping

The local jurisdiction and the employer shall agree on the record keeping requirements as part of the accepted CTR program. The local jurisdiction will not request additional or different records except as part of a required modification of the employer's CTR program (see Document Review and Program Modifications section above). The local jurisdiction shall not require proprietary information, including personal identification of individual employees. The local jurisdiction will acknowledge the need for consistent record keeping by employers with worksites in multiple jurisdictions.

2.7.11 Technical Guidance and Support

Technical guidance and support may be provided directly by staff of the local jurisdiction or other organizations, agencies, or consultants as contracted by the local jurisdiction.

The local jurisdiction shall work collaboratively with affected employers to provide basic services to help employers set up and maintain their CTR programs and to reach the applicable program goals. Jurisdictions are considered to be working collaboratively with employers if, at a minimum, the following basic services are provided:

1. Written information on basic requirements of the CTR ordinance, CTR zones, and an explanation of how the plan is intended to achieve its goals;

2. Basic training for ETCs;

3. Informational materials that explain a range of measures and activities that may help the employer achieve the CTR goals of the ordinance (which may include model employer programs);

4. Forms for annual progress reports that are consistent with the Task Force requirements;

5. Guidance for employers to prepare their CTR program descriptions and annual program reports;

6. State-supplied employee survey forms;

7. Annual review of an employer's CTR program including a determination of whether the employer is acting in good faith to meet the goals established by the CTR law;

8. Professional assistance in developing, implementing, and/or modifying an employer's CTR program;

9. Regular opportunities for an employer's ETC to network with other local ETCs; and

10. Promotional material such as posters, clip art, or articles which will assist the employer in implementing a worksite CTR program.

After the initial training offered to ETCs at no charge, periodic and regular training should be provided for which the local jurisdiction, state, and employers share the cost. *Chapter 4.0, Training Guidelines, contains more specific information about technical assistance, training, and materials.*

2.7.12 TMOs/TMAs

TMOs, TMAs, or other business partnerships may submit a single program description that describes the common program elements. The program should also describe specific program elements at individual employers' worksites. The TMO/TMA, as an agent for its members, should provide individual performance data for each company as well as combined measurements to the jurisdiction. Each employer shall remain accountable for the success of its program. Adjustment of a program that does not meet the goals shall be specific to that employer; it shall not apply to other employer members. TMOs/TMAs that straddle jurisdictional boundaries shall submit the employer members' CTR programs to the appropriate jurisdiction(s).

3.0 Measurement and Evaluation Guidelines

3.1 Preamble

This chapter contains the methodology for all measurement and evaluation processes necessary to be consistent with the CTR law. Affected local jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to follow the guidelines in this chapter when administering their CTR ordinances.

These guidelines were first written in 1992 and have been revised to reflect policy changes and to eliminate sections that applied only during the initial years of the CTR program. Revisions adopted in 1994 spell out requirements for data on employee commuting submitted by employers to be equivalent to data collected using the CTR employee questionnaire. (*CTR Task Force Policy Statement: Equivalent CTR Data for Measurement and Evaluation adopted October 7, 1994*)

Changes made in 1996 enabled employers to select between surveying all employees or only affected employees. *(Guide for Employee Surveys Update, November 1996)* The evaluation workplan also was updated by the Task Force in 1996.

Changes made in 1997 define the level of credit available to employers, and under what circumstances employers may receive credit, for shifting their employees outside of the commute window. (*CTR Task Force Policy Statement: Credit for Schedule Changes Which Move Some or All Employees Outside of the Commute Window* adopted June 25, 1997)

3.2 Purpose

The purpose of the measurement and evaluation guidelines is to establish the methods by which base year values of VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips and the subsequent goals will be established; the methods by which employers will receive credit for the results of TDM efforts; the methods for determining progress toward achieving reductions in VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips; and the framework for evaluating the costs and benefits of the CTR law.

A basic concept in the law is the CTR zone. It recognizes that employers located in different areas may have different opportunities for affecting the commute behavior of their employees because of such factors as transit service, employment, and population density. To require all employers to strive for the same goals without recognizing those differences would clearly be unfair. The CTR zone identifies areas that are similar in their opportunities for alternatives to the SOV. Affected employers within each zone are required to work toward goals for reductions in VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips based on VMT and SOV rates in that zone.

This chapter is structured as follows: designation of CTR zones; determination of preliminary base year values of VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips for those zones; a procedure to ensure that employers with successful TDM efforts receive credit for the results of those efforts; determination of the goals for VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips for each CTR zone;

methods by which employee commuting (VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips) will be assessed and compared against the goals; survey guidelines; and evaluation of the CTR law.

3.3 Designation of CTR Zones

3.3.1 Organizations That May Designate CTR Zones

Preliminary designation of CTR zones shall be undertaken by RTPOs, as established in RCW 47.80.020, in areas subject to the requirements of the CTR law. RTPOs may assign, when appropriate, another organization which is representative of the affected cities and counties to complete the CTR zone designation. The CTR zone designation process shall involve affected employers.

A city or county may modify the initially designated CTR zone boundaries during the ordinance adoption process if it finds that failure to do so would result in treating affected employers inconsistently. In modifying the CTR zone boundaries, the city or county should first consult with the RTPO and affected employers on the merits of the proposed changes as they relate to the intent that there be consistent treatment of employers across jurisdictional boundaries.

In order to ensure consistent treatment of affected employers from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, the RTPOs or their designees are the logical choice to initially designate the CTR zone boundaries. These organizations also have access to the VMT per employee and SOV information necessary to identify the CTR zones. The Task Force recognizes, however, that the authority and responsibility for adoption of the CTR zones rests with the local jurisdictions and that the local jurisdictions may have knowledge of local conditions that might alter the designation of a CTR zone. Provision is made for modification of the designation of the CTR zone boundaries recommended by the RTPO.

3.3.2 CTR Zones Based on TAZs

CTR zones shall be based on combinations of TAZs used in transportation planning that have similar values for VMT per employee and SOV rate. These modeled values for VMT per employee and SOV are adequate indicators of other characteristics such as "employment density, population density, level of transit service, parking availability, and access to high occupancy vehicle facilities..." *RCW 70.94.524[3]* Determination of similarity for VMT per employee and SOV estimates shall be made by the RTPOs or their designees. RTPOs and their designees may take additional information into account in drawing zone boundaries.

The Task Force has determined that modeled values for VMT per employee and the SOV rate are adequate indicators of the characteristics specified in the CTR law such as "employment density, population density, level of transit service, parking availability, [and] access to high occupancy vehicle facilities."

3.3.3 Number of CTR Zones in a Jurisdiction

CTR zones shall not cross county lines but may cross other local jurisdictional boundaries. Cities may be divided into more than one CTR zone where appropriate. Each zone shall contain enough worksites to ensure that no one employer has a large effect on the VMT and SOV values for the zone.

County and local jurisdiction CTR plans shall provide a description of the boundaries of CTR zones in the county or jurisdiction.

Example 1:

The boundaries of the CTR zones for *(city/county)* are defined as follows: CTR Zone 1 -- Northeast of Interstate 82/Highway 12 CTR Zone 2 -- Southwest of Interstate 82/Highway 12 CTR Zone 3 -- West of Highway 97

Counties and other jurisdictions also may want to include a map in the county CTR plan and/or local CTR ordinances clearly marking the CTR zones.

3.3.4 CTR Zones' Relationship to Federal Non-Attainment Areas

CTR zones should be compatible with federally designated non-attainment areas for carbon monoxide and ozone.

3.3.5 GMA Considerations

RTPOs or their designees are encouraged to coordinate their efforts to the extent possible with staff performing similar functions as part of the GMA. *RCW 70.94.527[6]*

3.4 Determination of Preliminary Base Year Values of VMT per Employee and Proportion of SOV Trips

3.4.1 Origin of Information Used for Base Year Values

Base year zone values for VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips shall be determined either by surveying affected worksites with the state supplied survey form or by using existing transportation modeling data.

Using surveys of affected worksites to determine zone baseline values for VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips gives a baseline founded on the same methodology that will be

used to measure progress toward goals in future years. In areas where many affected employers have existing TDM efforts, a county may wish to consider using existing transportation model estimates of average VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips for all worksites in a zone. This would minimize the potential for existing TDM efforts to affect the base year values. However, in most cases, average VMT per employee at affected worksites has been higher than the modeled values for all worksites. A county should compare existing SOV and VMT estimates against results of worksite surveys before using existing estimates for baseline values.

3.4.2 Base Year Values Consistent within Counties

Determination of base year values shall be consistent within counties and within RTPO areas. All jurisdictions within a county and all counties within a single RTPO shall use the same methodology.

It is essential that all jurisdictions in a county or an RTPO (Puget Sound Regional Council is the only multi-county RTPO) use the same method to determine base year values, in order to ensure consistent treatment of affected employers.

3.4.3. Dominant Employers

A jurisdiction may adjust the base year values if any employer that implemented a TDM program prior to 1992 dominates the zone and significantly skews the proportion of SOV trips and VMT per employee.

3.5 Goals for VMT per Employee and Proportion of SOV Trips

The goals for 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2005 for reducing VMT per employee (as of January 1 of each year) are specified in RCW 70.94.527 [4][g] to be 15, 20, 25, and 35 percent, respectively, from the base year values for a worksite or for the CTR zone where the worksite is located. The 1995 goal is 85 percent of the base year value, the 1997 goal is 80 percent of the base year value, the 1999 goal is 75 percent of the base year value, and the 2005 goal is 65 percent of the base year value.

The goals for 1995, 1997, 1999, and 2005 for reducing the proportion of SOV trips (as of January 1 of each year) are 15, 20, 25, and 35 percent, respectively, from the base year values for a worksite or for the CTR zone where it is located. *RCW 70.94.527[4][a] requires local governments to adopt specific goals for reductions in the proportion of SOV trips. The Task Force determined that these goals should be the same percentage reductions as required for VMT per employee.*

<u>Example 2</u>:

Given a CTR zone (CTR Zone 1) or worksite with a base year value of 20 VMT per employee and a proportion of SOV trips of 0.90, the goals would be as follows:

CTR Zone 1

	VMT per Employee	Proportion of SOV Trips
1992 (base year)	20	.900
1995 (15% reduction)	17	.765
1997 (20% reduction)	16	.720
1999 (25% reduction)	15	.675
2005 (35% reduction)	13	.585

These calculations shall be done for each CTR zone designated within a jurisdiction.

3.6 Credit for TDM Efforts

3.6.1 Background and Purpose

Employers with successful TDM programs implemented prior to the base year are entitled to credit for their efforts. *RCW 70.94.537[f]*

The overall scheme of establishing goals for VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips in relation to the base year values for all employers in a CTR zone inherently gives credit to employers that have already implemented effective TDM programs. Since most employers have not implemented TDM efforts, it is expected that those who have will be able to demonstrate lower VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips than average for the CTR zone.

In addition, the recommendation that the CTR zones be configured to include as many affected employers as possible reduces the likelihood that any single employer would significantly affect the overall zone averages. Analysis indicates that a very large employer that has had an effective TDM program prior to 1992 usually does not have a large impact on the overall zone average SOV rate and VMT per employee. However, a jurisdiction may adjust the base year values if any employer with previous TDM programs dominates the zone and significantly skews those values.

As public recognition for their efforts, employers with VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips lower than the zone average will receive a CTR Certificate of Leadership from the local jurisdiction.

In addition to inherent credit and leadership certificates, employers that can demonstrate lower VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips than the CTR zone goals may apply for program exemption credit.

3.6.2 Credit For Programs Implemented Prior to the Base

Year

Employers with successful TDM programs implemented prior to the base year may be eligible to apply for program exemption credit, which exempts them from most program requirements. When these employers apply for the program exemption credit within 90 days of CTR ordinance adoption, they shall be considered to have met the first CTR reduction goal (15 percent) if their VMT per employee rate and proportion of SOV trips are equivalent to a 12 percent or greater reduction from the final base year zone values. This three percentage point credit applies only to the 15 percent reduction goals.

Example 3:

Given a CTR zone with a base year value of 20 VMT per employee and a proportion of SOV trips of 0.90, the goals for employers that had TDM programs prior to the base year would be adjusted as follows:

	VMT per Employee	Proportion of SOV Trips
1992 base year value	20.0	.900
1995 zone goal (15% reduction)	17.0	.765
1997 goal with credit (20% reduction)	17.6	.792

In the above example, an employer with a TDM program prior to 1992 could receive a program exemption credit if its VMT per employee is 17.6 or lower and its SOV rate is 0.792 or lower. The employer must also commit to continue its current TDM program.

3.6.3 Process To Apply for Program Exemption Credit

Affected employers may apply for program exemption credit for the results of past or current TDM efforts. Affected employers can apply for program exemption credit within 90 days of adoption of the applicable CTR ordinance or as part of any annual report to their local jurisdiction or designee. The application shall include results from a survey of employees or equivalent information that establishes the applicant's VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips. The survey or equivalent information shall conform to all applicable standards established elsewhere in this chapter.

Employers that apply for credit and that have VMT per employee and proportion of SOV trips equal to or less than goals for one or more future goal years, and commit in writing to continue their current level of effort, shall be exempt from the requirements of the ordinance except for the requirements to report performance in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2005. *RCW 70.94.531[2][c]* If any of these reports indicate the employer does not satisfy

the next applicable goal, the employer shall immediately become subject to all requirements of the CTR ordinance.

3.7 Determination of Proportion of SOV Trips and VMT per Employee

3.7.1 Basic Methodology

The proportion of SOV trips and VMT per employee for each affected employer will be determined using data from a survey of employees about their commute mode choice as described in this chapter. If an affected employer has equivalent information that has been collected within 12 months of the measurement period, such information may be submitted by the employer in lieu of survey data. Criteria for establishing the equivalency of the employer information are described in this chapter.

3.7.2 Calculation Assumptions

The following assumptions will be used in counting commute vehicle trips:

- Each SOV trip counts as one trip (includes one-person motorcycle and drive-on ferry trips).
- Carpool trips count as the inverse of the number of occupants in the vehicle:
  - Two-person carpool counts as 1/2 trip
  - Three-person carpool counts as 1/3 trip
  - Four-person carpool counts as 1/4 trip
  - Five-person carpool counts as 1/5 trip
  - Six-person carpool counts as 1/6 trip.
- Vanpools of seven or more occupants and transit (bus and bike-on ferry or walk-on ferry) count as zero vehicle trips.
- Teleworking, days off due to alternative work schedules (excluding flex-time), bicycling, and walking count as zero vehicle trips plus a 20 percent credit: each commute trip eliminated or via a non-motorized mode is counted as 1.2 trips eliminated. This assumption applies to both proportion of SOV trips and VMT per employee.
- Employers that modify work schedules so that employees who previously arrived at work between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m., but who now arrive before or after this period, shall receive a 20 percent credit for each trip shifted outside the 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. commute window. To receive this credit, an employer must report such schedule changes and the number of employees whose schedules were changed to its local jurisdiction in its annual program report.

For calculation purposes, VMT per employee is assumed to be the average trip length multiplied by the number of vehicle trips per employee (based on the above assumptions). As SOV trips are eliminated, fewer vehicle miles will be traveled.

In the local government review of employer programs, there are two acceptable methods for calculating VMT per employee. First, an affected employer may choose to use its own average measured survey data to determine VMT for its worksite. Alternatively, VMT per employee can be calculated using the baseline average commute trip length in the affected employer's CTR zone multiplied by the number of vehicle trips per employee for that employer. Using this method, reductions in the number of vehicle trips per employee are used as a surrogate for reductions in VMT per employee. Independent verification may be conducted by the local jurisdiction using ZIP Codes or other data.

For evaluation and calibration purposes, actual VMT per employee shall be calculated using commute trip length data from the employee survey for all employers.

3.8 Survey Guidelines

3.8.1 Background and Purpose

The Legislature, local governments, program managers, and affected employers desire consistent, accurate, timely, and valid information about the CTR law for use in decision-making, resource allocation, program development, evaluation, and other purposes.

The basic success indicators of the CTR law are reduced VMT per employee and SOV rates. Because employee surveys of commuting patterns will be a primary source of data regarding program performance, the Task Force has established these guidelines for the use of surveys in the CTR program.

In all phases of survey administration, the TAT shall provide assistance to local jurisdictions and affected employers, when it is appropriate and feasible.

3.8.2 Uses of the Survey

Several possible uses of surveys are identified below. When surveys are required, affected employers shall provide to their local jurisdiction either survey data using the official state-provided survey form (see Appendix E) and in the reporting format established by the Task Force; or an alternative report that provides information equivalent to the official survey as described below.

When surveys are voluntary, the Task Force strongly urges affected employers to use the official state-provided survey forms. This way the employer does not pay for the design or printing of survey forms, and the state will provide centralized processing (data entry and analysis). Furthermore, the surveys provide consistent data, ensuring that the employer's information is acceptable over the entire duration of the CTR law for any reason listed below.

- To establish a baseline measure of employee commuting habits for use by employers in designing their CTR programs *(voluntary).*

- To evaluate the costs and benefits to employers and the public of the CTR law and to assess the effectiveness of the program *(voluntary)*.

- To establish worksite and CTR zone base year values *(required, except in counties that elect to use existing SOV and VMT estimates for base year values).*

- To give credit for TDM programs existing prior to the base year *(voluntary).*

- To measure progress toward goals in 1995, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2005 *(required)*.

- To establish site-specific base year values for employers that request modifications of program requirements *(voluntary).*

3.8.3 Alternative Data on Employee Commute Patterns

Local jurisdictions and the state should make every effort to minimize the cost and burden of surveys on employers. Therefore, employers may use an alternative report that provides information equivalent to the official survey. The information must have been collected within the 12 months before the time a survey would have been conducted. The employer must demonstrate to the local jurisdiction that the information is equivalent, based on the following criteria:

1. Employees are verified as regular, full-time employees who begin their regular work day between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. (inclusive), two or more weekdays, for 12 continuous months;

2. Teleworking and alternative work schedules, such as compressed work weeks, are documented and categorized by type and frequency;

3. Commute mode choice is identified for the dominant mode for each trip; and

4. If employees use carpools or vanpools, the number of people in these vehicles is provided.

Alternative data may be used by employers according to the following specifications:

3.8.3.1 Equivalent Information

- Equivalent information stands alone as a substitute for the state-provided survey. Data to be considered equivalent and useful for measurement of SOV and VMT reductions must

provide information on the actual commute usage for employees during the measurement week. This information, in turn, must be linked to employee status and work schedules. These data characteristics are critical and necessary for calculating the worksite SOV and VMT and for identifying what program elements are successful at the work site. When alternative information is provided, the affected employer shall provide the raw data file upon which the information is based to the local jurisdiction, with all employee identifiers removed, in a format specified by the TAT.

In examining the effectiveness of the CTR program, the evaluation will analyze the impact transportation incentives have on employees' choice of commute modes. For example, if an employee is given a transit subsidy, how frequently will he or she use transit? Answering this type of question requires actual data on daily mode usage during the week. Without accurate information on actual commute mode usage, the impact of the worksite CTR program will be impossible to determine. Besides actual mode use, the following information must be collected for each commute mode:

- Carpoolers
  Daily commute trip mode(s) for the week
  How many people age 16 or older are typically in the carpool
  Confirmation that carpooling was the dominant commute mode (50 percent or greater of the commute distance)
  Estimated or actual one-way commute distance

- Vanpoolers
  Daily commute trip mode(s) for the week
  How many commuters were typically in the vanpool for the week
  Confirmation that vanpooling was the dominant commute mode (50 percent or greater of the commute distance)
  Estimated or actual one-way commute distance

- Transit/Bus Riders
  Daily commute trip mode(s) for the week
  Confirmation that transit/bus was the dominant commute mode (50 percent or greater of the commute distance)
  Estimated or actual one-way commute distance

- Walkers
  Counts at completely monitored access and egress points for the week
  Daily commute trip mode(s) for the week
  Confirmation from each walker that walking was the commute mode used for 50 percent or more of the commute distance (i.e., each person entering a worksite on foot must be interviewed)
  Estimated or actual one-way commute distance

- Bicyclists
  Counts at completely monitored access and egress points for the week
  Daily commute trip mode(s) for the week
  Confirmation from each bicyclist that bicycling was the commute mode used for 50 percent or more of the commute distance
  Estimated or actual one-way commute distance

Linking employees to actual commute mode usage provides critical information on how CTR elements work together and helps determine how effective these elements are for the worksite. For example, reducing commute trips for employees with shorter commutes will have a different impact on worksite programs than reducing commute trips for employees with longer commutes. Without the ability to link individual affected employees to actual commute mode usage, the impact of worksite CTR programs will be impossible to determine.

At a minimum, the information must include for all affected employees:

- IDs for all affected employees located at the worksite and daily attendance for a one-week period
- Home ZIP Code
- Job classification
- Weekly work schedule
- The number of days the employee is scheduled to telecommute in a two-week period
- Primary commute mode classification (SOV, bus, carpool, vanpool, walk, bike, other). This can be collected through a variety of means, including a list of non-SOV registrants, a list of employees who purchase passes for bus or vanpool use, a list of employees who are registered to use carpool or vanpool set-aside parking spaces, or a list of employees who indicated they commute non-SOV through CTR TRACK. All non-SOV commuters who cannot be identified or for whom complete information is not provided by the employer will be assumed to commute via SOV.
- Employee’s scheduled start time

Data must be collected for a one-week period, or the employer must be able to demonstrate that the typical data collected is representative of actual weekly commuting behavior.

3.8.3.2 Supporting Information

Supporting information does not stand alone, but can be used in addition to survey data if an employer's response rate is below 70 percent. For example:

- Transit pass sales or records of subsidies paid for carpools or vanpools. Acceptable as "supporting" data in all measurement years. In the 1992-93 base year only, these records may also be accepted as "equivalent" information.

- Parking lot counts, where affected employees' actual commute trip behavior is measured and documented during the peak period, Monday through Friday. Access and egress points must be completely monitored. Acceptable as "supporting" data in all measurement years.

3.8.3.3 Unacceptable Information

Any information that cannot be validated by the employer and/or local jurisdiction is unacceptable information. For example:

- Aerial photographs.

- Driveway counts where access and egress is not completely monitored.

If an employer can provide basic mode choice information, but not all information required to be equivalent, the local jurisdiction shall use minimum default values. For example, if an employer can verify that a vanpool has at least seven employees on a passenger list (who may work for different employers) then that vanpool shall count as zero vehicle trips. If an employer can provide the number of employees who use carpools or vanpools, but not the occupancy in those vehicles, the local jurisdiction shall assume that they have two occupants. If an employer does not provide adequate information on alternative work schedules or telecommuting, the local jurisdiction shall assume no employees use these alternative modes.

3.8.4 Survey Design

The local jurisdiction shall use the state-provided survey to measure affected employers' progress towards goal attainment. The local jurisdiction may not require employers to hire professionals to administer the survey.

Employers considering the use of equivalent data should notify the local jurisdiction in writing at least six months prior to the worksite's scheduled survey date. In turn, the jurisdiction will notify the TAT. The employer's notification should detail, at a minimum, the employer's burden of surveying all employees at the worksite or surveying a sample of employees at the worksite (e.g., cost of surveying, administrative obstacles, union issues).

Following the initial notification, the local jurisdiction and the employer are encouraged to work together to determine the feasibility of obtaining equivalent data for the worksite. If the employer decides to proceed with the use of equivalent data, it should file a written request with the jurisdiction at least two months prior to the worksite's scheduled survey date. The jurisdiction will notify the TAT when an employer has asked to use equivalent data. The employer's request should include, at a minimum, the following:

- A detailed description of the information to be provided;
- The methodology used to collect the information;

- The period (week) during which equivalent data will be collected;
- A plan for archival of the equivalent data;
- A letter from the CEO or CEO's designee indicating that the information provided is accurate and is the result of a good faith effort by the employer to collect complete and accurate information; and
- The date by which the equivalent data will be submitted to the local jurisdiction. This date must be no later than the scheduled survey completion date for the jurisdiction.

If employers do not have an alternative source of equivalent information, they shall use the official state-provided survey. The employer may not delete questions from the state survey. However, the last two questions on the state-provided survey are voluntary. This voluntary attachment includes questions related to program planning and demographics, which the employer may use to design its own program. The information from the voluntary survey attachment will be used for planning and research purposes only.

In addition, the employer may add its own supplemental questionnaire to the official survey for the purpose of developing its own CTR program. The employer may voluntarily provide the information derived from the additional questions to the TAT to be used for evaluation purposes; it could be very valuable in helping the state assess the effectiveness of elements in the CTR law. The employer also may voluntarily provide the information derived from the additional questions to the local jurisdiction.

3.8.5 Sampling at Worksites

Employers may survey a sample of employees rather than surveying all affected employees. General guidelines for sampling will be provided by the TAT. Samples shall be random. Stratification shall be done to ensure that all major work groups are represented in the sample. The employer shall demonstrate to the local jurisdiction and/or the state that the sampling method is in accordance with generally accepted research sampling methods before sampling is undertaken.

The sampling method used at a specific worksite shall be developed by staff professionals with expertise in sampling techniques, in consultation with the local government and the TAT. Employers must, for example:

- Use a professional survey firm to draw the sample; or

- Use its own staff, with demonstrated expertise in sampling techniques, to draw the sample. In this case, the sampling frame must have prior approval from the local jurisdiction, with guidance from the TAT; or

- Use a public agency with staff that has demonstrated expertise in sampling techniques.

Employers choosing to undertake random sampling shall follow the sampling procedures outlined herein and in the Guide for Employee Surveys prepared by the TAT.

Employers should be aware that there are costs associated with developing valid samples.

3.8.6 Distribution and Collection of Survey Forms

Employers are responsible for the distribution and collection of surveys at their worksites. The accomplishment of these tasks is at the discretion of the employer, but certain techniques are effective in increasing response rates. Recommendations for increasing survey response rates will be provided to the local jurisdiction and affected employers by the TAT.

If an employee works 35 or more hours in a week and is scheduled to report to a single worksite between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. on two or more weekdays for at least 12 continuous months, he/she is an affected employee (as defined in Chapter 1) and should be surveyed. That person is counted as an affected employee at one location: his or her primary worksite. Seasonal agricultural employees are excluded from the count of affected employees.

Employers may choose to survey all employees at the worksite if they believe the commuting characteristics of the total employee population are significantly different than those of the affected employee population. For example, if a worksite believes the VMT rate per employee or the proportion of SOV trips is significantly lower for all employees than for affected employees, it would be in its interest to survey all employees. This approach will also be advantageous if the worksite cannot easily determine in advance of the survey which employees are and are not affected. If an employer chooses to survey all employees, it will have the option of choosing the calculated VMT rate or SOV rate for all employees or only for affected employees in order to determine the achievement of program goals in each measurement year.

3.8.7 Survey Response Rate

The target minimum response rate for the survey is 70 percent of all affected employees (in the population/sample) who typically arrive between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. on weekdays for at least 12 continuous months. If employers cannot determine and document which employees are affected, they should survey all employees at the worksite. For worksites that achieve at least a 70 percent response rate the SOV rate and VMT per employee calculated from the survey responses will be accepted as valid estimates of SOV and VMT for all affected employees.

Because some employers may have difficulty achieving the target minimum response, there are acceptable alternatives if they do not achieve a 70 percent response rate:

1. If an employer can demonstrate that they have followed all steps in the technical assistance document for maximizing response rate and they have "supporting" information, they may request that the local jurisdiction accept their survey as valid; or

2. An employer may choose to designate all non-responses below 70 percent of the affected employee population/sample as SOV trips; or

3. A combination of options 1 and 2 above, negotiated between employer and local jurisdiction.

3.8.8 Data Entry and Analysis

Affected employers should send their official state-provided survey forms directly to the local jurisdiction or its designee for processing. The state will process the official state-provided measurement survey at no cost to the employer. In these cases, the local jurisdiction shall provide verification to employers that the survey forms were received. The survey data will be processed within 60 days of receipt by the jurisdiction, and the jurisdiction shall notify the employer of the survey results as part of its annual review of employer programs.

The employer may enter and analyze the state-provided survey, but is not required to do so. If the employer undertakes data entry of its surveys, that entry should be done to professional standards, where data entry staff verify at least 20 percent of the surveys by re-entering and checking for errors. If the employer adds a supplemental questionnaire to the official state-supplied survey, the employer will be responsible for processing the supplemental data.

Local jurisdictions may provide PC-based analysis software, in either DOS- or Macintosh-compatible formats to employers that want to analyze their own surveys. If an employer does data entry and analysis, it shall provide the raw survey data file to the local jurisdiction for verification purposes. The local jurisdiction shall provide verification to employers that the raw data file was received.
If an employer opts to provide equivalent data, it must be submitted electronically in a format approved by the TAT.

3.8.9 Reporting Survey Results

Employers that do data entry and analysis are responsible for reporting their results to the local jurisdiction. All affected employers, including those that send their surveys to the local jurisdiction for processing, are still accountable for the results of their surveys.

The Task Force believes that survey processing should be centralized and that the state should provide funding to support this activity throughout the CTR program.

3.8.10 Credit for Schedule Changes Which Move Some or All Employees Outside of the Commute Window

In 1997, the Washington State Legislature directed the Task Force to develop guidelines and methods to ensure that employers which have modified their employees' work schedules so that some or all employees are not scheduled to arrive at work between 6:00 and 9:00 a.m. are provided credit when calculating SOV trips and VMT per employee. *RCW 70.94.537[2][I]* This credit is to be awarded if implementation of the schedule change was an identified element in a worksite's approved CTR program or if the schedule change occurred because of impacts associated with RCW 36.70A, the GMA. *RCW 70.94.527[11]*

Although these schedule changes may result in less congestion during peak commute hours, the air quality and energy consumption benefits are minimal. Consequently, the Task Force believes that the credit level should be proportional to the benefit associated with the policy goals. The Task Force has determined that the credit level for such changes should be less than a full trip eliminated and should be established within the context of existing credit methodologies for SOV and VMT. Currently, trips eliminated through telecommuting, alternative work schedules, bicycling, and walking are awarded a 20 percent credit. The Task Force has determined that the same level of credit should be applied to the schedule changes described above. The effect of this level of credit is that for every five employees whose schedules are changed in order to avoid a peak-hour commute, a worksite will be credited with one full trip reduced.

Worksites will be awarded credit beginning in August 1997. Any worksite may apply for a retroactive credit for schedule changes implemented prior to the 1997 measurement survey, provided the schedule change was consistent with the criteria identified in RCW 70.94.527[11]. Application for the retroactive credit should be made in writing to an employer's local jurisdiction before December 31, 1997. At a minimum, the credit application must include the following information:

1. An explanation of how the schedule change is related to the provisions of the GMA or a demonstration that the schedule change was an identified element of a previously approved CTR program.
2. The number of employees whose schedules were changed.
3. The date on which the schedule change became effective.
4. The previous schedule for those employees for whom the credit is being claimed.

Upon receipt of an employer's credit application, the local jurisdiction shall notify the TAT. The validity of all credit requests shall be determined by the local jurisdiction. The local jurisdiction shall inform the employer of its decision in writing within 30 days of receiving the request. The local jurisdiction shall also notify the TAT of its decision. The TAT shall be responsible for recalculating the 1997 SOV and VMT rates for any worksite for which a local jurisdiction approves retroactive credit.

Beginning January 1, 1998, information to determine the legitimacy and amount of schedule change credit will be collected through the Employer Annual Report and Program Description form; no special application will be required. Jurisdictions shall notify the TAT when approving employer annual reports that contain requests for schedule change credit.

The TAT will ensure that the credit is applied in the subsequent measurement year to the worksite's SOV and VMT calculations.

3.9 Evaluation of the CTR Program

3.9.1 Background and Purpose

The Task Force is responsible for evaluating the CTR law. It must make recommendations to the Legislature at set intervals beginning December 1, 1995; and on December 1, 1999; December 1, 2001; December 1, 2003; and December 1, 2005; assessing whether the program should be continued, modified, or terminated. *RCW70.94.537[4]* The Task Force must also report to the Legislature by December 1, 1997, on employers' use of the ridesharing tax credit. *RCW 82.04.445B as amended in 1996.*

Specifically, the Task Force must review progress toward the law's implementation; evaluate the costs and benefits of the law; consider the costs of not having implemented the law; and examine other TDM programs nationally and incorporate its findings into its recommendations to the Legislature, as required by the CTR law.

The Task Force and Legislature will base major decisions on the evaluation results, so it is important that the information be of good quality. Employers will be interested in the evaluation results as well, since they are bearing a large part of the burden of this program, and will need information about the most cost-effective TDM strategies for their particular situations.

3.9.2 CTR Evaluation Workplan

In 1996, the Task Force developed and adopted a workplan for producing a report to the Legislature by December 1, 1999. This section lists the topics that the Task Force plans to address in that report and the tasks required to address those topics. Following the 1999 report, the Task Force will establish a new work plan to guide its evaluation efforts in subsequent years.

3.9.2.1 Evaluation Topics

The Task Force has adopted the following list of topics for evaluation between July 1996 and September 1999:

<u>Topics Required by the Legislature</u>

- Benefits and costs of CTR: Identify and estimate the benefits and costs of CTR and determine whether the benefits are likely to be greater than the costs. Report to Legislature in 1999.

- Review of other TDM programs: Examine other TDM programs nationally, documenting successes and failures, to see what lessons they have for CTR. Report to Legislature in 1999.
- Results of expanded ridesharing tax credit: Determine number of employers applying for credit, number of employees ridesharing because of credit, and amount of credit. Report to Legislature in 1997.

Topics Related to Improving the Existing Program

- Reasons why commuters do and do not change modes in response to CTR: Identify program elements that have been most and least successful in reducing drive-alone commuting. Identify types of employees who are most likely and least likely to participate in CTR programs. Identify points where employees are most likely to consider changing commuting behavior. Provide information to local jurisdictions and ETCs. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.
- Impacts of other factors on commuting and CTR: Identify other reasons why people change commuting behavior. Verify that changes in SOV and VMT are due to CTR and not other factors. Identify conditions outside of CTR that encourage or discourage non-SOV commuting. Provide information to local jurisdictions and ETCs. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.
- Benefits and costs to employers and commuters: Identify benefits and costs that accrue to employers and commuters. Determine whether benefits are likely to exceed costs for each group. Identify ways to increase benefits and reduce costs to employers and commuters. Provide information to local jurisdictions and ETCs. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.

Topics relating to the structure of CTR after 1999

- Baseline for SOV and VMT goals: Determine relationship between 1993 SOV and VMT and current and predicted future congestion and emissions. Examine procedures for setting baseline values. Determine whether procedures for setting baselines treat employers consistently and fairly. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.
- Appropriate level for goals: Identify reductions in SOV and VMT that employers can reasonably be expected to achieve. Determine whether there is a point at which the costs of further reductions become greater than the benefits. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.
- Appropriateness of zones: Examine differences is SOV, VMT, and conditions that affect employees' commuting choices in areas covered by the CTR law. Determine advantages and disadvantages to employers and local jurisdictions of having worksites grouped in zones. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.
- Geographic areas covered by the law: Examine car-related pollution and congestion in areas covered by CTR law and in the rest of the state. Examine trends in pollution and congestion, especially in growing areas or areas

expected to experience growth. Identify any areas not currently covered by the CTR law where CTR could reduce current or future pollution or congestion problems. Identify any areas currently covered by the CTR law where air pollution and congestion are not problems. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.

- Guidelines for zone construction, if there are to be zones: Examine various configurations of zones and procedures for drawing zone boundaries to ensure consistent treatment of employers, fairness to employers, costs to develop and administer zones, and relationship between zones and pollution, congestion, and conditions affecting commuters' mode choices. Incorporate into report to Legislature in 1999.

3.9.2.2 Evaluation Tasks

Providing information on these topics requires completion of a number of tasks. There are several tasks that develop information for more than one topic. They are:

- Calculate aggregate SOV, VMT, trips, and miles by mode from the measurement survey. This will be done in 1997 and 1999.
- Design, administer, and process a survey of a sample of employees. Convene an expert review panel. Specify the information to be collected. Design, pretest, and administer a survey to collect the information. Analyze the results.

- Design, administer, and process a survey of a sample of employers. Convene an expert review panel. Specify the information to be collected. Design, pretest, and administer a survey to collect the information. Analyze the results.
- Estimate impacts of program elements, worksite characteristics, and occupation on employees' commute mode choices. This will be done using the 1995, 1997, and 1999 measurement surveys and annual reports.

There are seven categories of benefits and costs of CTR to be estimated:

- Estimate changes in fuel, operation and maintenance, and depreciation costs. Calculate the miles traveled using each mode from the 1997 and 1999 measurement survey results. Project the miles that would have been traveled using each mode without CTR. Obtain cost per mile for each mode from published sources and the transit agencies. Calculate changes in costs.
- Estimate changes in commute times and amenities. Estimate average trip speeds and times from published sources and traffic counts. Apply speeds and times to estimated trip numbers and trip lengths from measurement survey. Estimate changes in amenities and their values for people who switch modes from the sample survey of employees.

- Estimate value of freed-up parking spaces. Estimate the number of spaces freed up using the 1997 and 1999 measurement survey results. Estimate changes in use and the value of spaces freed up using the results of the sample survey of employers.
- Estimate changes in profitability and employee satisfaction. Estimate changes in employee satisfaction due to CTR and mode shifts from sample survey of employees. Estimate changes in profitability from sample survey of employers.
- Estimate worksite program costs. Estimate from the results of the employer cost survey.
- Estimate value of increased highway capacity. Estimate the number of additional person trips made possible by CTR from the measurement surveys. Obtain estimates of traffic capacity and current use for highways in CTR counties. Identify capacity constraints eased or delayed by CTR. Review published estimates of the value of an additional person trip.
- Estimate value of reduced emissions. Obtain updated estimates of emissions per mile from Washington State Department of Ecology (DOE). Calculate changes in emissions from the results of the measurement surveys in 1997 and 1999. Obtain estimates of health and other impacts from DOE published sources. Update estimates of the value of reduced health risks and obtain any available estimates of the value of increased visibility and other impacts. For some impacts, estimates may not be available by 1999. Obtain estimates of reductions in the costs of complying with other air and water quality regulations from DOE and other agencies.

Addressing the other topics in the workplan requires completing the following tasks:

- Review other TDM programs nationwide. The TAT performed a preliminary review of other TDM programs. Complete and update this review by interviewing parties involved in other programs and reviewing published accounts and reports.
- Determine results of the expanded ridesharing tax credit. The number of worksites claiming the credit, the number of employees for whom credit is claimed, and the incentives paid that will be collected by the Washington State Department of Revenue (DOR). Analyze the information from DOR and compare it with the measurement survey results for affected worksites that claim the credit. Prepare a report for the Legislature.
- Determine reasons why employees do and do not change modes in response to CTR. Most of the information to address this issue will be collected through the sample survey of employees. Analyze this information to determine effects of worksite program elements on employees' commuting choices, identify worksite barriers to shifting away from drive-alone commuting, and identify opportunities to change commuting behavior.
- Estimate impacts of other factors on commuting and CTR. The information to address this issue will be collected through the sample survey of employees. Analyze this information to identify effects of personal characteristics and

other factors outside CTR on employees' commuting choices and identify which groups of employees are most likely and least likely to change commuting behavior.

- Estimate benefits and costs to employers and commuters. The information needed to address this issue will be collected as part of the overall analysis of benefits and costs. The additional work for this topic will be in organizing and presenting that information.
- Determine what should be the baseline for SOV and VMT goals. Compare baseline SOV and VMT with current and predicted congestion and air pollution. Determine whether goals are related to areas with existing congestion and pollution problems and to areas where growth is likely to produce problems in the future. Develop alternative procedures for setting baselines. Compare baseline SOV and VMT produced by two procedures used in 1993 and other procedures. Determine advantages and disadvantages of procedures for setting baselines, including whether each treats employers fairly and each procedure's administrative difficulty.
- Determine appropriate level for goals. Examine the results of the measurement survey and cost survey and the annual reports to compare SOV and VMT reductions to program effort and program cost. Estimate relationship between program cost and results. To extent possible, compare marginal benefits and marginal cost to determine whether there is a point at which the costs of further reductions become greater than the benefits. To extent possible, compare marginal benefits and marginal costs to employers to identify reductions in SOV and VMT employers can reasonably be expected to achieve.
- Determine whether worksites should be grouped into zones. Examine results of measurement survey, cost survey, sample survey of employees, and annual reports to determine whether there are geographic patterns in SOV and VMT reductions, program costs, or conditions that affect employees' commuting choices. Interview employers and local jurisdiction representatives to determine the advantages and disadvantages to employers and local jurisdictions of having worksites grouped in zones.
- Determine what geographic areas should be covered by the law. Obtain data on car-related pollution and congestion in areas covered by the CTR law and in the rest of the state. Examine trends in pollution and congestion, especially in growing areas or areas expected to experience growth. Identify any areas not currently covered by the CTR law where CTR could reduce current or future pollution or congestion problems. Identify any areas currently covered by the law where pollution and congestion are unlikely to be problems in the foreseeable future.
- Determine how zones should be constructed, if there are to be zones. Examine various configurations of zones and procedures for drawing zone boundaries for their consistent treatment of employers, fairness to employers, costs to develop and administer zones, and the relationship between zones and pollution, congestion, and conditions affecting commuters' mode choices.

4.0 Training Guidelines

4.1 Preamble

The training guidelines contain elements strongly recommended for training instructors and program reviewers, as well as additional training elements the Task Force believes to be appropriate.

4.2 Purpose

The training guidelines set a standard throughout the state for application, review, and evaluation of employer CTR programs. After examining local and national experience with training practices, the Task Force concluded that a comprehensive training program is vital to successful implementation of the CTR law. Training will:

- Help ensure consistent knowledge and understanding of the law, rules, and guidelines and promote consistent review of employer CTR programs statewide.
- Add a sense of professionalism and importance to the program.
- Make future evaluation easier and more effective.
- Permit more interaction and participation among those directly involved in implementation, which will foster future networking.

A training program must be created and used with considerable care to produce non-bureaucratic, unburdensome, and relevant courses. Recommendations contained here will provide for a well-coordinated and highly effective training program.

These guidelines cover types of training, training development, funding, and public education. *The basis for these training guidelines is the report Training Recommendations produced by the Task Force's Subcommittee on Parking, Training, and Model Programs.*

4.3 Training Programs to be Developed for Statewide Use

Three types of standardized training programs will be centrally developed for ongoing use by the state and/or local jurisdictions: orientation, basic training, and specialized training.

4.3.1 Orientation

Presentation and materials should be available locally to familiarize local governments and employers with the CTR law. This optional orientation would be offered to local officials and their staffs to explain CTR requirements and to senior managers of affected employers to gain their commitment to CTR programs (for example, through presentations at business association meetings).

4.3.2 Basic Training

Curriculum and materials that cover the law, rules, guidelines, process, and procedures should be provided locally for governments and employers. In addition, the importance of obtaining high survey response rates will be emphasized. Basic training will be required for instructors and program reviewers but will be optional for others.

4.3.3 Specialized Training

In addition to basic training, specialized training should be tailored to each major applicable job at the local government level and at employer sites, as described below.

4.3.3.1 Local Instructor

Description: A professional who will train others on various operations of the CTR law. Instructors could be staff or consultants of one or more affected jurisdictions or one or more affected employers. An instructor would become qualified to conduct orientations, basic training, and/or specialized training for local government and/or employer personnel involved in administering the CTR law.

Qualifications: Required to complete state-provided training course for instructors and earn a certificate of competency issued by the chair of the Task Force. This training would include the basic training course and the comprehensive ETC training programs, with the addition of subjects related to being an effective instructor. The state should ensure that a formal process is in place to update instructors on any changes to the law, guidelines, or procedures.

4.3.3.2 Local Program Reviewer

Description: Local jurisdiction staff (or others functioning in this role) who will review employer programs and progress reports. Local jurisdiction staff involved in CTR administration are strongly encouraged to attend this training, even if the jurisdiction contracts with another party to review employer CTR programs.

Qualifications: Pass an initial exam to earn a certificate of competency issued by the chair of the Task Force. Following initial certification, program reviewers are required to attend an annual recertification workshop organized by the TAT and must pass a recertification exam at the conclusion of the workshop in order to be qualified to review employer programs during the following year. The intent of the recertification process is to ensure statewide consistency in program review and promote the exchange of ideas and best practices among program reviewers. The recertification process will commence effective July 1, 1997. The state should ensure any changes to the law, guidelines, or procedures are communicated to program reviewers during the annual recertification workshop. The state should host at least two recertification workshops each calendar year. Local jurisdiction staff involved in CTR administration are not required to

complete the initial exam or participate in the recertification process if the jurisdiction contracts with another party to review employer CTR programs.

Local jurisdiction staff (or others functioning in this role) shall conduct workshops in each jurisdiction for employers to discuss the information presented in the annual recertification workshops and any changes to the law, guidelines, or procedures which impact employers or the program review process. Such workshops should be conducted prior to the time when an employer is required to submit its annual CTR program report to the jurisdiction. Local jurisdictions should notify the TAT prior to these workshops and are encouraged to work collaboratively with the TAT in planning the workshops or any other events in which program review issues will be discussed.

4.3.3.3 ETC and Program Developers/Coordinators/ Managers

Description: Staff (or others functioning in these roles) of an affected employer who administer the employer's CTR program, performing such functions as CTR program development, administration, and recordkeeping, as well as promoting alternative transportation modes among employees.

Qualifications: Encouraged to complete the state-developed training course, which will provide ETCs with everything they need to know about the law, along with how to develop, implement, market, manage, and evaluate an effective CTR program at their worksite. The Task Force also encourages local jurisdictions to offer ETC training and continuing education. Ongoing training could be available through an ETC network, workshops on specific topics, etc.

4.3.3.4 Local Service Provider

Description: Operators of services that may be in demand as a result of employer CTR programs, such as parking operators, taxi associations, transit operators, shuttle operators, and consultants.

Qualifications: Encouraged to complete locally provided training about the CTR law. Parties directly contracted by an employer or group of employers to provide assistance in implementing CTR programs may also attend program reviewer training.

4.3.3.5 Consultants

Consultants already on contract to provide any of the administrative services would attend the appropriate training described above.

4.4 Training Program Development

4.4.1 Oversight

The development of training programs is the responsibility of the TAT and shall be overseen by the chair of the Task Force.

4.4.2 Course Development Responsibility

The intent of the Task Force is to have the TAT work with the available resources of local transit agencies, local governments and, if necessary, hire a consultant to create the training curriculum.

4.4.3 Local Supplements

Local jurisdictions should supplement the decision-maker orientation, the basic training course, and the specialized training courses with any additions needed to create a complete package of state and local requirements. Training for ETCs should be customized for local jurisdictions. Local instructor and program reviewer training should be coordinated with the TAT to ensure these training programs are complete and tailored to local conditions.

4.5 Funding

The Task Force recognizes the need to support training over and above what is possible with existing funding and will pursue additional funding sources.

4.6 Public Education

The Task Force considers public education vital to the success of the CTR law and will pursue additional resources for education and information. These efforts will be coordinated with related programs of WSDOT, DOE, and other parties as appropriate.

In 1997, the Washington State Legislature amended the CTR law to include a recognition of the importance of increasing individual citizens' awareness of transportation-related issues and the contribution individuals can make toward solving these problems. *RCW 70.94.521* In addition, the Legislature directed the Task Force to work with jurisdictions, major employers, and other parties to develop and implement a public awareness campaign designed to increase the effectiveness of local CTR programs. *RCW 70.94.537[3]* The Task Force, in cooperation with WSDOT, local governments, and major employers, expects to launch the public awareness campaign in January 1998.

5.0 Parking Guidelines

5.1 Preamble

The parking guidelines contain recommendations for local governments. They are not mandatory.

5.2 Purpose

The parking guidelines respond to the CTR law's requirement that each affected jurisdiction's CTR plan "shall include...a review of local parking policies and ordinances as they relate to employers and major worksites and any revisions necessary to comply with commute trip reduction goals and guidelines..." *RCW 70.94.527[4][e]*

These guidelines are intended to give direction to jurisdictions in their review and revision process and to help achieve regional consistency in parking policy changes.

The Task Force recommendations cover parking supply, parking costs, and site design. They also address parking revisions for existing sites. Because of the focus of the CTR law, the parking guidelines deal with long-term (all-day) parking more likely to be used by commuters rather than short-term, quick-turnover parking most likely to be used by shoppers.

The recommendations are designed to encourage local land use codes to respond to reductions in parking demand as SOV use decreases through CTR programs and to encourage local jurisdictions to provide flexibility to employers to use parking management as an element of their CTR programs.

These guidelines are based on the Parking Policy Report produced by the Task Force's Subcommittee on Parking, Training, and Model Programs, July 1, 1992 (see Appendix F). This report contains analysis and more detailed methodology and reasoning behind the recommendations.

5.3 Findings

The Task Force finds that local parking policy is critical to the success of the CTR law because of the close relationship between commuter behavior and the supply and cost of parking.

Although parking needs are changing, most local zoning codes do not yet reflect these changes. Ample research demonstrates that employee parking is oversupplied, both locally and nationally, particularly at office and industrial developments. A survey sent to planning officials of 29 Washington local jurisdictions indicated that a significant number receive requests from developers to supply less than the minimum parking required in the local code. However, the need to go through a lengthy variance process discourages many developers from providing less parking than required.

Charging for parking has been shown to be a more effective and direct way to influence mode choice than fine-tuning parking supply. Local governments do not now have the authority to require property owners or employers to charge for parking, and many employers are not aware of their true parking costs. A key means for achieving CTR goals is the ability to apply similar parking supply and cost strategies at both existing sites and new developments.

The Task Force also recognizes the influence of site design on travel mode choice. The presence and quality of facilities for pedestrians, transit users, and bicyclists are critical to the convenience, comfort, and safety of commuters using those modes.

Each jurisdiction may make its own decisions regarding the strategies recommended here, as local parking requirements are the result of many factors, including land-use policies. CTR goals are among those considerations. However, the regional nature of transportation systems calls for a coordinated approach to parking policy revisions, and the schedule and requirements of the GMA (*RCW 36.70A.070*) provide an appropriate opportunity to make such revisions.

5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1 Basis for Reviewing Local Jurisdiction Parking Standards

The Task Force encourages local jurisdictions to follow these recommendations as a basis for establishing parking standards for new developments and expansions:

1. Review parking policies and standards in conjunction with and consistent with arterial and transit levels-of-service required under the GMA. The timing of parking policy review should be coordinated with GMA policies adopted by July 1992 and new comprehensive plans adopted by July 1993.

2. Review off-street parking requirements for professional office and industrial uses, as well as related land use categories such as business or industrial parks, high-tech, and light industry. Institutions should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis. Standards should be set to meet actual demand, rather than to provide "ample" parking.

3. Conduct parking demand studies, if desired, to supplement previous national and local studies that analyze the supply of parking at office and industrial sites. Explore the use of Congestion Management Funds available through the Intermodal and Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) to support studies relating to parking policy.

4. Report to the Task Force in the annual progress report any problems experienced in implementing these recommendations, such as inadequate resources.

5.4.2 Adjusting Parking Supply

The Task Force encourages local jurisdictions to consider the following recommendations when adjusting parking standards in land use codes:

1. Lower the minimum parking requirement for all office and manufacturing land-use categories to the level of projected parking demand, commensurate with the achievement of 1995 CTR goals.

2. Allow further reductions below the minimum on a case-by-case basis. Case-by-case deviations below the minimum should be linked to implemented TDM measures. Requests by developers to reduce parking supply below the minimum should be considered by administrative review rather than a variance process.

3. Establish maximum parking standards for new development. Maximums should be set to meet actual demand, including a cushion of ten to 15 percent for practical capacity to guard against spill-over parking. Exceptions to the maximum standard should be handled by administrative review. In areas where maximums are established, jurisdictions may consider residential permit parking programs or other off-site parking controls, such as short-term meters, if spill-over is a concern.

4. Base maximum and minimum parking standards for office and industrial uses on studies that take into account employee densities at specific employer sites and full-occupancy projections.

5. Re-evaluate minimum and maximum standards in 1995 and 1997 to determine whether changes in parking demand resulting from the CTR law warrant additional reductions.

6. Require reserved parking spaces for carpools and vanpools at office and industrial sites to accommodate and encourage HOV commuting. These spaces should be nearest and most convenient to building entrances and should be posted as reserved for HOVs arriving between 5:30 and 9:30 a.m. HOV spaces may be available for other uses after that time. Increase the code requirement for HOV-reserved spaces, commensurate with increases in HOV demand resulting from CTR law implementation.

   A methodology for computing the number of HOV spaces is provided in the Task Force's Parking Policy Report, July 1, 1992.

7. Allow nearby properties with different peak times in parking demand to share parking spaces as a means of reducing unnecessary supply.

8. Allow developers/employers to establish a public parking management program, in lieu of requiring all or some portion of on-site parking.

9. Establish an administrative process that encourages existing developments to reduce excess parking as an element of their CTR programs. These reductions should be consistent with the revised parking standards recommended here for new development.

5.4.3 Site Design Standards

Local jurisdictions are encouraged to establish site design standards for new development that facilitates the use of alternatives to SOVs. Site design recommendations related to parking are as follows:

1. Require secure, well-lit bicycle parking facilities close to building entrances. Encourage property owners and local jurisdictions to cooperate so that cost-effective covered bicycle parking, showers, and lockers can be provided. Bicycle parking should be provided as a ratio of total parking stalls, with a minimum specified. A higher ratio may be warranted in dense urban areas.

2. Require employee parking to be designed and located to ensure direct, convenient, and safe access for pedestrians and transit riders between the street and the building entrance.

3. Work with transit agencies and site developers to establish requirements for transit facilities, if the site is located adjacent to a street with existing or planned transit service. Provision of pedestrian facilities, such as covered walkways, also should be encouraged, in exchange for reductions in required parking.

Guidelines for parking layout and other site design elements that are compatible with transit use can be found in A Guide to Land Use and Public Transportation, Snohomish County Transportation Authority (SNO-TRAN), December 1989; as well as in a myriad of other land-use and urban design publications.

5.4.4 Parking Cost

Employers should be encouraged to consider employee parking charges to help achieve CTR goals, as well as specific parking management suggestions. In addition, jurisdictions should consider the following recommendations.

1. Pursue educational and incentive strategies first to determine if CTR goals can be achieved without parking charges.

2. Pursue the use of Congestion Management Funds available through the Federal Congestion Management and Relief and Surface Transportation Program to support demonstration projects that provide incentives to encourage new and existing property owners to reduce parking supply and/or charge employees for parking.

5.5 Future Task Force Actions

In addition to the guidelines contained here for local jurisdictions, the Task Force will continue to review and recommend local and state actions that will help achieve CTR goals. The Task Force intends to:

1. Develop specific guidelines for employee parking management programs at new and existing employment sites, including employee parking supply.

2. Review local experience with changes in parking demand as reported in local jurisdiction annual progress reports. Incorporate findings and recommend revisions to these guidelines in the Task Force's December 1995 report to the Legislature.

3. Ask the Legislature to amend the 1990 Local Option Commercial Parking Tax to include non-commercial parking sites, if there is insufficient progress toward achieving CTR goals by 1995. The Task Force may bring this issue to the Legislature earlier, if appropriate.

4. Plan and fund, in partnership with local jurisdictions, educational workshops and informational materials designed to increase employer awareness about parking cost and its influence on mode choice. These information materials should be part of the orientation program for employer senior managers and the training for ETCs and employer program developers. Explore the use of Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program funds available through ISTEA.

5. Investigate aspects of the Uniform Building Code, fire codes, zoning codes, and other regulations that increase the costs of providing covered bicycle parking and lockers/showers. Recommend state and/or local changes that would allow these facilities to be provided in a cost-effective manner without compromising the integrity of the regulations.