PSRC TDM Work Program

Goal Statement
Integrate Transportation Demand Management into policies, programs, and projects throughout the region to get the most efficient use out of the transportation system.

Work Program Elements
• Update baseline on TDM data, markets, and performance metrics
• TDM opportunity/gap analysis
• Implementation based on opportunity/gap analysis
• Raise awareness of TDM at PSRC committees and boards
Draft Plan Schedule

January – June 2020: Preparatory Plan Work
- Identify key focus areas and preliminary alternatives

Summer 2020: SEPA Scoping
- Public input on approach, environmental review, major issues to address

Fall 2020 - Summer 2021: Preliminary Plan Analysis
- Scenario analysis, refinement of alternatives, policy discussions; Public engagement

Fall 2021 – Winter 2022: SEPA Analysis and Draft Plan
- Release of Draft SEPA analysis for public comment; Release of draft plan for public comment

May 2022: Plan Adoption
Vision 2050 Transportation Goal

The region has a sustainable, equitable, affordable, safe and efficient multimodal transportation system, with specific emphasis on an integrated regional transit network that supports the Regional Growth Strategy and promotes vitality of the economy, environment and health.

Regional Transportation Plan Core Elements

- Financial Strategy
- Equity
- Integrated Transit Systems
  - Network Refinements
  - Access Improvements
- Climate
- Regional Performance Measures
- Technology/Shared Mobility
- Safety
TDM Data Collection

2018-2020 Update of TDM Baseline Data in PSRC Region

• TDM Funding Landscape
• CTR Data
• Local Programs inventory

Moving into Next Step

• What did we learn from data collection?
• How can it be applied to Regional Transportation Plan update?
TDM Funding Landscape

- Completed 2018 TDM Funding Survey
  - Sample size for TMAs
  - Varying funding cycles and grant durations
- Trends
  - Lack of primary dedicated source of TDM funding across implementers
  - State provides more than 1/3 of all funding (CTR + WSDOT grants)

Survey Results

- **$11.2 million**
  - **$4.2 million**
  - **$4.1 million**
  - **$2.2 million**
  - **$705,000**

**Funding Sources**

- Federal Government: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ)
- WSDOT/State: Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Program
- Local: Transit Agency Partnerships, General Funds
- Private: Fee for Service

- **CMAQ 27%**
- **CTR 14%**
- **WSDOT Grant 21%**
- **General Funds 40%**
- **Fee for Service 16%**
- **Transit Agency Partnership 1%**
CTR Data

Regionwide and Statewide Share of Non-Drive-Alone Work Trips

Share of non-drive-alone work trips taken by surveyed CTR-affected worksite employees in the Central Puget Sound Region and Washington State compared to share of non-drive-alone work trips taken by all worksite employees in the Central Puget Sound Region. Source: Washington State Department of Transportation and Puget Sound Regional Council
### CTR Data

#### Surveyed CTR-Affected Worksites in the Central Puget Sound Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Worksites</th>
<th>Surveyed CTR-Affected Worksites</th>
<th>CTR Worksite Share of Total Worksites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>50,852</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>13,983</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish</td>
<td>13,734</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>82,984</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of surveyed CTR-affected worksites compared to total worksites in the Central Puget Sound Region. Source: Washington State Department of Transportation and PSRC.

#### Share of employees at surveyed CTR-affected worksites compared to employees of all worksites in the Central Puget Sound Region

Non-CTR-Affected Employees (2018), 1,634,183

Surveyed CTR-Affected Employees (2017/2018), 507,917

Share of employees at surveyed CTR-affected worksites compared to employees of all worksites in the Central Puget Sound Region. Source: Washington State Department of Transportation and PSRC.
Local Program Inventory

Inventory aims to capture information on TDM programs from 2015-2019. To date, have received returned inventory information on 83% of the identified programs:

- 46 CTR Programs
- 53 Non-CTR Programs

Program Characteristics

- Geographic Coverage
- Trip Purpose
- TDM Programs by Employer Sizes Addressed
- Strategies
- Promoted Modes
- Target Audiences, incl. Audiences with Special Transportation Needs

Program Performance Measures 2015-2019

- Number of Participants
- Drive-Alone Miles Not Traveled
- Drive-Alone Trips Not Taken

Geographic Coverage

- City: 48%
- County: 39%
- Sub-county: 8%
- Neighborhood: 6%
- Statewide: 2%
- Regional: 0%

Trip Purpose

- Work: 63%
- All: 27%
- School: 15%
- Non-work: 0%
Local Program Inventory

### Strategies

- **Education**: 80%
- **Marketing**: 72%
- **Consultation**: 67%
- **Regulatory**: 57%
- **Incentives**: 46%
- **Trip Planning**: 43%
- **Gamification**: 42%
- **Financial Support**: 35%
- **Rewards**: 31%
- **Other**: 16%

### Promoted Modes

- **Bike**: 81%
- **Walk**: 81%
- **Fixed-Route Transit**: 77%
- **Carpool**: 75%
- **Vanpool**: 75%
- **Alternative Work Schedule**: 62%
- **Telecommute**: 62%
- **Mobility on Demand**: 55%
- **Flexible Transit**: 39%
- **Other**: 13%
- **Transportation Network Companies**: 7%
Local Program Inventory

TDM Programs by Employer Sizes Addressed

- Small (5-49): 28%
- Medium (50-99): 28%
- Large (100-499): 60%
- Extra Large (500+): 60%
- All Employers: 22%

TDM Programs 2015-2020

- 2015: 79
- 2016: 81
- 2017: 81
- 2018: 86
- 2019: 94
- 2020: 94
Local Programs Inventory

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
Programs in Central Puget Sound Region Cities

Note: All Central Puget Sound Region Cities have access to (a) county and/or transit agency TDM program(s).
TDM Assessment

1. Define role of TDM
   *Why are we collecting data?*

2. TDM baseline inventory methodology
   *How did we collect data?*

3. Key Findings
   *What did we learn from the data?*
Preliminary Findings for TDM Assessment

• Key finding, overall:
  Defining TDM creates challenges—common framework or terminology with consistent application would be valuable

• Key finding from funding landscape survey:
  There is no single dedicated TDM funding source that accounts for the majority of implementer budgets

• Key findings from CTR data analysis:
  • State CTR program is effective in reducing non-drive alone trips
  • Not all CTR-affected employers participate, demonstrating room for additional growth
  • Surveyed CTR-affected employers a small percentage of total employers in region → large percentage of workforce in region
Preliminary Findings for TDM Assessment

- Key findings from local TDM programs:
  - Geographic Distribution: All cities/unincorporated areas have access to some program
  - Temporal Nature: The number of programs we identified increased from 2015-2020
  - Trip Purpose: Most programs focus on work trips, whereas most trips in region are non-work trips
  - Promoted Modes: More than 75% of programs promote fixed-route transit, active transportation and carpooling
  - Performance Measurement: Performance is measured differently across programs; even common performance measures may be calculated differently.
Thank you.

Gil Cerise
gcerise@psrc.org