

CTR Budget Q&A

Feedback from Budget Scenario Draft Spreadsheet discussed March 22 & 23, 2023

Add-ons

How is “Add-On: Increase Technical Assistance” defined? What would it entail that isn’t already covered under state admins and systems?

It is not yet clearly defined. If selected, we would work with stakeholders later this year to determine the scope and how these services would be provided. This option is presented at the request of stakeholders, some of whom have shared specific ideas: more assistance with the survey and program reports system, data analytics and interpretation, interactive state TDM web portal, planning and policy development, and more.

What would be covered in Add-ons: TDM technologies?

It is not yet clearly defined, but two key thoughts are that this item 1.) is about a service or system available to all TDM practitioners statewide and 2.) it supplements the two existing systems already provided: survey; and ridematching, calendaring, and incentives. If selected, we would work with stakeholders later this year to determine the scope and how these services would be provided. This option is presented at the request of stakeholders, some of whom have shared specific ideas: technology to host commute challenges with a gamification platform, track rides and offer rewards for reduced SOV commutes, email TDM practitioners, email people interested in TDM or using non-drive-alone modes.

How effective were previous statewide marketing campaigns?

That depends upon your perspective and the campaign. The CTR program has provided financial support for various campaigns over the years. Generally, effectiveness is related to public awareness of non-drive alone options and their benefits and has a direct relationship to the reach (size of audience) and frequency (number of times the information is seen per person) of the campaign. The campaign with the greatest reach and frequency was a statewide marketing campaign in the 1990s that used the tagline “Relax. There’s More Than One Way To Get There.” While this campaign generated public awareness, it was cut from state budgets with the support of some transit agencies and CTR practitioners, who wanted to shift the funding to higher priority projects.

State Administrative and Systems

How is the current \$1,800,000 state admin and systems spent?

Per biennium representative budget:

- \$1,500,000 in labor: For six full-time equivalents. Note that more than six people work on CTR at WSDOT; some of these positions involve a mix of CTR and non-CTR responsibilities and funding.
- \$300,000 contracted ridematching, calendaring and incentives system, does not include labor.
- \$65,000 survey system, contracted data storage and processing services (WSU), does not include labor.
- \$25,000 in paper survey costs, printing and contracted data processing services (UW), does not include labor.
- \$15,000 WSRO and ACT memberships.

This representative budget adds up to \$1,900,000. The difference of \$100,000 is resolved through variability in funding needs (e.g. job vacancies, low demand for paper surveys) and the use of other funding sources to support CTR work. These numbers can be seen in the formula in the spreadsheet as the first number in the equation, FYI. The second number is a needed increase for future biennia.

Are there are other funds subsidizing the program?

Yes. You'll find the bulk of the funding for the CTR Program in the state budget under WSDOT's Program V. Examples of other funding used to support the program:

- Local funds: provided by and used by local jurisdictions
- State Parking Fund: supports CTR work focused on state workers, including guaranteed ride home services
- State operating budget: supports ORCA passes and rideshare subsidies for state workers
- Federal planning funds: has been used to support labor associated with the development of CTR and TDM plans and policies
- Federal grants: have been used to support ridematch, calendaring and incentives system
- Research funds: have been used to support specific research projects

Is it correct that the additional \$50k needed for grant administration is largely due to the King County decentralization of the program? Could this cost come from their pot of money?

The additional \$50,000/biennium reflects increased administrative needs due to an increase in the number of cities that contract directly with the state and increased technical assistance needs for city staff in these roles. Three counties currently use this option, King, Pierce and Snohomish. It seems possible to incorporate a factor into budget formulas to support this additional work for state administrators, but it seems like we'd want to apply it to all jurisdictions that opt for this approach, not just King County.

What is the usage and engagement for RideshareOnline? Is it worth \$360,000 or can that go back to grants, or to increase WSRO support?

A recent report on RideshareOnline is available upon request. The following usage information is from that report.

Users (members of the public) are considered active if they have logged into RideshareOnline.com in the last 180 days. There are more than 8,000 active system users. Immediately before the coronavirus pandemic, on March 1, 2020, there were 20,955 active users. During the past year new users joined at a pace of about 250 per month. Before the coronavirus pandemic, new users joined at a pace of about 1,200 per month.

Administrators (TDM practitioners) are considered active if they have logged into RideshareOnline.com in the last 180 days. Of the more than 1,000 total historical networks with active administrators about 200 have active administrators as of June 15, 2022. About 25 private companies have active administrators. Historically there have been 1,288 system administrators and they have developed 2,034 total incentive programs, which have distributed more than \$5,000,000 in rewards. .

In 2018, there were 1,600 active vanpool groups in King County, a number which increased slightly to 1,650 in 2019 before falling to 400 at the end of 2020, after the beginning of the coronavirus pandemic. As of mid-2022, the number has begun to increase and is now over 600. There are 12 transit agencies with at least one vanpool in RideshareOnline.com.

We have been conducting stakeholder engagement on the future of TDM technology and the state's role in it. While this work is ongoing, the consensus seems to be that the state should continue to play a role in providing TDM technology statewide. This implies that the state should continue to spend state funds to support this technology.

State Agency CTR

How is the current Guaranteed Ride Home funding for state workers reflected on this budget?

It is not reflected in this budget. This budget focuses on the Multimodal Fund, which is source that supports the vast majority of CTR work statewide. It does not include funding from the State Parking Account, which provides funding to support a subset of CTR projects that are focused on state workers. WSDOT will work with agencies who provide guaranteed ride home service to update cost estimates for 2023-2025.

Formula for Cities and Counties – Number of Worksites

Could Employment Security Department share more granular data on number of employees / employers over 100 employees?

The Employment Security Department will not release this data for CTR Program use. In addition, the Employment Security Department does not have data required to meet criteria for a worksite to be CTR-affected. These gaps include whether employees are full- or part-time, when employees get to work, whether employees are permanent or seasonal/temporary, and number of employees at a worksite (they use FTEs vs number of workers). As a result, this data source is not suitable to determine the number of CTR-affected worksites.

How will # of CTR-affected worksites be counted?

We proposed self-reporting by cities and counties for 23-27 budgets and gathered this information from many jurisdictions for our budget scenarios. Some stakeholders expressed strong concerns about this approach so we're developing an alternate based upon CTR affected worksites to be entered into the new CTR survey system.

How will jurisdictions be held accountable to their site numbers? Let's say I tell you have 300, but only survey/get reports from 40, do you adjust my funding? If so, not until the next cycle of funding updates? Just want to try to validate some of these numbers folks are coming up with. Must you survey your sites and get annual reports for them to count? One or the other? What is the mechanism?

Unknown. These are the kinds of details we need to develop with you and other stakeholders. Ideas include publishing a table in 2025 that compares city and county estimates to actual number of CTR-affected worksites surveyed and creating a mechanism to adjust budgets in 2027 (or 2025) based upon difference in reported numbers and actual number of CTR-affected worksites surveyed.

Formula for Cities and Counties – Equity

How is middle/low income defined?

In the Equity scenario published the week of March 20, middle/low income was defined as follows: workers in industries with a statewide median income less than that of Washington's median income in 2021 (\$62,836). Using data from the American Community Survey 5-year estimates, these industries are: agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting; wholesale trade; retail trade; transportation and warehousing; administrative and support and waste management

services; health care and social assistance; arts, entertainment, and recreation; accommodation and food services; other services, except public administration.

Would looking at race & income demographics for each city/county be easier to track & replicate? Or is there a statewide source like the WA Health Disparities map?

U.S. Census city and county race and income demographics and the Washington Tracking Network are both based upon residence, not workplace. We suggested a different approach because the CTR program is workplace focused.

Manufacturing was not included. Can you confirm that industry did meet the income threshold?

Manufacturing median earnings were \$71,769. As a result, they exceeded the income threshold for the purposes of our analysis.

What are the percentages of underserved people who work for large employers? Does it make sense to use this to determine funding levels?

We did not consider this approach because there is no clear relationship between large employers and some key CTR program participation requirements. For example, a large employer may have lots of employees but they are all at worksites that have fewer than 100 employees per site, may have many employees who primarily commute outside 6-9 am peak hours, or may have a mix of employees who work inside and outside the jurisdictions required to participate in the CTR program.

Does not have a clear nexus to the CTR Law. We have the mobility partnerships grant on the table and if we already meet the equity criteria for MAW, so why this?

Many stakeholders asked to see an option that incorporated equity into the funding formula.

How could we get better data and a better way to see income and VPOC inequities, to get it to those who need it (e.g. not include blanket healthcare workers (many of whom make a lot of \$) but target the lower paid workers in that field?

> Get better data/better way to see inequities: Maybe invest in research and analysis?
> Get TDM to those who need it: Hundreds of stakeholders wrestled with this question in 2021 and 2022 and came up with the Mobility Grants Partnerships proposal as the best approach.

The only cities I see benefiting from Equity distribution are Tacoma and Everett. Could you give more information on why – where is that employment growth concentrated for those cities and how does it compare with industries in Kent, Renton, SeaTac, Tukwila, etc.?

The presence of workers in certain industries relative to other CTR-affected counties, not growth, was used for this scenario. Here's the methodology: In the Equity scenario published the week of March 20, middle/low income was defined as follows: workers in industries with a statewide median income less than that of Washington's median income in 2021 (\$62,836). Using data from the American Community Survey 5-year estimates, these industries are: agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting; wholesale trade; retail trade; transportation and warehousing; administrative and support and waste management services; health care and social assistance; arts, entertainment, and recreation; accommodation and food services; other services, except public administration.

How can we reflect equity on a more granular level? The equity is only on the statewide level.

The equity funding scenario uses data at county level.

It doesn't take equity within counties into account. For example, King County would get slightly lower overall funding because it has more high-paying jobs, but within the county, where there are

high paying jobs and lower paying jobs, this isn't taken into account. For the equity scenario, should we also look at the breakdown of middle/low-income industries within counties?

This idea would add a factor to the funding calculation for cities: to include a factor both number of CTR-affected worksites and number of workers in certain industries to determine each city's share of the county CTR funding. Number of workers by industry in a city is not readily available from the U.S. Census.

How can we balance this attempt at equity, with a discussion around what it means to emphasize equity in where dollars go without supporting discussion on how the needs are identified and addressed seems one-sided?

Great idea. We've been struggling with this. We are eager to start discussions about how to address equity and Climate Commitment Act requirements within the boundaries of the CTR Law and program. We have received feedback that it might be best to address equity outside the funding formula, for example, in state and local CTR plans, reporting (particularly greenhouse gas emissions reductions), surveys, research, work plans, and work plan reporting.

Formula for Cities and Counties – Cities

Why are some cities listed and others are not?

We are updating the spreadsheet to show all cities. We also plan to indicate which implement their CTR program (contract directly with the state) and which rely upon a partner agency in their county to implement their CTR program (contract with a local organization). Generally, the cities listed in the most recent versions of the CTR Budget spreadsheet are those that implement their own program.

How is the money allocated to cities shown on the spreadsheet?

First, we allocate money to each of the nine counties in the program. Then these funds are further divided to cities based upon their number of self-reported CTR-affected worksites.

Why does Kent still show \$106K as starting point and down to \$20K +/- in the options?

This calculation reflects the effects of a decrease from 30 CTR-affected worksites reported in the 2011-2013 biennium and 4 sites recently reported. Stakeholders previously decided through that no implementer should have their budget reduced. This scenario creates a dilemma that needs resolved.

Corrections

- Tacoma's original CTR amount was added
- Bothell considered Snohomish County for the purposes of this work, not King County
- Methodology information added for proposed way to determine workers in middle/low-income industries
- Corrected math error in formula to calculate percent change from Current Budget to Base Option with additional MAW money

Statewide CTR Budget Admin + Systems and Add-Ons Options (2023-2033)

working draft, 2023-03-23

all numbers per biennium (two years, July - June)

Current		
	share	
\$3,900,000	68%	grants
\$1,800,000	32%	state admin + systems
\$5,700,000		

Base Option			
	share		change
\$6,020,000	68%	grants	54%
\$2,780,000	32%	state admin + systems	54%
\$8,800,000			54%

State admin + systems costs	
\$1,800,000	maintain current staffing (6 FTEs)
\$500,000	maintain new survey system
\$55,000	paper surveys (optical recog.)
\$360,000	maintain existing ridematching and incentives system
\$15,000	maintain ACT and WSRO memberships/sponsorships
\$50,000	added grant admin due to counties delegating city CTR grant admin to state
\$2,780,000	

With Add-ons			
	share		change
\$6,020,000	68%	grants	54%
\$2,780,000	32%	state admin + systems	54%
\$0	0%	add ons	N/A
\$8,800,000			

Add-ons		
	include?	
\$250,000	no	increase technical assistance
\$500,000	no	new TDM technologies
\$1,000,000	no	statewide marketing
\$0		

State admin key responsibilities
grant administration
compliance and reporting
data analytics, including technical assistance
TDM Tech Committee
TDM Executive Board
planning and policy development
planning and policy technical assistance
engagement and public information

More details about costs are available for some items in the state admin + system costs section. To see these details, click on the cell in this section highlighted in green. Look above at the formula bar. If you see a formula (e.g. = x + y) the first number (x) reflects current costs per biennium and the second number (y) is an estimate of additional costs per biennium needed to continue to provide the service in future years. If there is no formula, there is either no change in costs projected (ridematching and incentives system and memberships/sponsorships) or it's a new expense.

Notes:
Projected future budget, pending legislative consideration
\$250,000 per full time equivalent employee now, estimated \$300,000 average over ten year period
Add-ons include labor, which could be contracted out or state force work
Systems are partially funded via the state parking account/State Agency CTR

PROPOSAL COMPARISON

	Percent of Total Worksites	Total Funding (biennial)				Share of Total Funding		
		Original	Inflation	1 - Simple	2 - Equity	Original	1 - Simple	2 - Equity
Counties								
Clark	12.0%	\$204,011	\$295,800	\$365,100	\$601,100	5.2%	6.1%	10.0%
King	52.3%	\$1,925,790	\$2,792,400	\$2,991,600	\$2,720,400	49.4%	49.7%	45.2%
Kitsap	2.8%	\$165,469	\$239,900	\$244,500	\$197,900	4.2%	4.1%	3.3%
Pierce	6.2%	\$279,966	\$406,000	\$424,700	\$660,200	4.4%	7.1%	11.0%
Snohomish	7.4%	\$391,864	\$568,200	\$584,800	\$617,800	10.0%	9.7%	10.3%
Spokane	10.7%	\$371,001	\$532,200	\$580,700	\$586,000	9.4%	9.6%	9.7%
Thurston	6.1%	\$263,973	\$382,800	\$402,300	\$312,400	6.8%	6.7%	5.2%
Whatcom	1.6%	\$153,316	\$222,300	\$219,000	\$158,400	3.9%	3.6%	2.6%
Yakima	0.9%	\$148,610	\$215,500	\$207,400	\$165,800	3.8%	3.4%	2.8%
TOTAL		\$3,904,000	\$5,655,100	\$6,020,100	\$6,020,000			
Cities								
Tacoma (Pierce)	2.3%	\$151,093	\$150,600	\$157,500	\$244,900		2.6%	4.1%
Everett (Snohomish)	2.6%	\$146,058	\$199,600	\$205,500	\$217,100		3.4%	3.6%
Auburn	1.2%	\$27,938	\$64,400	\$69,000	\$62,800		1.1%	1.0%
Bellevue	8.0%	\$204,946	\$429,600	\$460,200	\$418,500		7.6%	7.0%
Bothell	1.3%		\$69,800	\$74,800	\$68,000		1.2%	1.1%
Burien	0.2%	\$5,080	\$10,700	\$11,500	\$10,500		0.2%	0.2%
Des Moines	0.4%	\$10,159	\$21,500	\$23,000	\$20,900		0.4%	0.3%
Federal Way	0.9%	\$38,869	\$48,300	\$51,800	\$47,100		0.9%	0.8%
Issaquah	0.9%	\$28,268	\$48,300	\$51,800	\$47,100		0.9%	0.8%
Kent	0.4%	\$106,007	\$21,500	\$23,000	\$20,900		0.4%	0.3%
Kirkland	1.5%	\$40,636	\$80,500	\$86,300	\$78,500		1.4%	1.3%
Mercer Island	0.0%		\$0	\$0	\$0		0.0%	0.0%
Redmond	2.8%	\$194,346	\$150,400	\$161,100	\$146,500		2.7%	2.4%
Renton	2.6%	\$81,272	\$139,600	\$149,600	\$136,000		2.5%	2.3%
SeaTac	1.7%	\$56,537	\$43,000	\$97,800	\$88,900		1.6%	1.5%
Seattle	27.6%	\$897,524	\$1,476,700	\$1,582,100	\$1,438,700		26.3%	23.9%
Shoreline	0.7%	\$15,239	\$37,600	\$40,300	\$36,600		0.7%	0.6%
Tukwila	1.5%	\$74,205	\$80,500	\$86,300	\$78,500		1.4%	1.3%
Woodinville	0.1%	\$12,698	\$5,400	\$5,800	\$5,200		0.1%	0.1%
TOTAL		\$2,090,875	\$3,078,000	\$3,337,400	\$3,166,700			

City allocations are based on the number of worksites that each city has, compared to the total for its county. For example, Tacoma has 37.1% of the sites in Pierce County, so it gets 37.1% of Pierce County's funding. The inflation numbers are consistent with this methodology.

PROPOSAL 1: Simple

Metrics	
	Multiplier
Universal increase	35%
Amount per worksite	\$376.68

County Funding Calculations							
County	Universal increase		Number of CTR affected worksites		Fiscal Year Total	Biennial Total	Share of Funding
	Base	Funding	Number	Funding			
Clark	\$102,006	\$137,708	119	\$44,825	\$182,534	\$365,100	6.1%
King	\$962,895	\$1,299,908	520	\$195,876	\$1,495,784	\$2,991,600	49.7%
Kitsap	\$82,734	\$111,691	28	\$10,547	\$122,238	\$244,500	4.1%
Pierce	\$139,983	\$188,977	62	\$23,354	\$212,332	\$424,700	7.1%
Snohomish	\$195,932	\$264,508	74	\$27,875	\$292,383	\$584,800	9.7%
Spokane	\$185,500	\$250,425	106	\$39,929	\$290,354	\$580,700	9.6%
Thurston	\$131,986	\$178,181	61	\$22,978	\$201,159	\$402,300	6.7%
Whatcom	\$76,658	\$103,488	16	\$6,027	\$109,515	\$219,000	3.6%
Yakima	\$74,305	\$100,312	9	\$3,390	\$103,702	\$207,400	3.4%
GRAND TOTAL						\$6,020,100	

City Funding Calculations					
City	Number of worksites	Percent of county sites	Fiscal Year Total	Biennial Total	Share of Funding
Tacoma (Pierce)	23	37.1%	\$78,768	\$157,500	2.6%
Everett (Snohomish)	26	35.1%	\$102,729	\$205,500	3.4%
Auburn	12	2.3%	\$34,518	\$69,000	1.1%
Bellevue	80	15.4%	\$230,121	\$460,200	7.6%
Bothell	13	2.5%	\$37,395	\$74,800	1.2%
Burien	2	0.4%	\$5,753	\$11,500	0.2%
Des Moines	4	0.8%	\$11,506	\$23,000	0.4%
Federal Way	9	1.7%	\$25,889	\$51,800	0.9%
Issaquah	9	1.7%	\$25,889	\$51,800	0.9%
Kent	4	0.8%	\$11,506	\$23,000	0.4%
Kirkland	15	2.9%	\$43,148	\$86,300	1.4%
Mercer Island	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	0.0%
Redmond	28	5.4%	\$80,542	\$161,100	2.7%
Renton	26	5.0%	\$74,789	\$149,600	2.5%
SeaTac	17	3.3%	\$48,901	\$97,800	1.6%
Seattle	275	52.9%	\$791,040	\$1,582,100	26.3%
Shoreline	7	1.3%	\$20,136	\$40,300	0.7%
Tukwila	15	2.9%	\$43,148	\$86,300	1.4%
Woodinville	1	0.2%	\$2,877	\$5,800	0.1%
GRAND TOTAL				\$3,337,400	

PROPOSAL 2: Equity

Metrics	
	Multiplier
Amount per worker in low/middle-income industry	\$1.00
Amount per worksite	\$1,477.50

County Funding Calculations							
County	Workers in middle/low-income industries		Number of CTR affected worksites		Fiscal Year Total	Biennial Total	Share of Funding
	Number	Funding	Number	Funding			
Clark	124,714	\$124,714	119	\$175,822	\$300,536	\$601,100	10.0%
King	591,903	\$591,903	520	\$768,298	\$1,360,201	\$2,720,400	45.2%
Kitsap	57,605	\$57,605	28	\$41,370	\$98,975	\$197,900	3.3%
Pierce	238,477	\$238,477	62	\$91,605	\$330,082	\$660,200	11.0%
Snohomish	199,580	\$199,580	74	\$109,335	\$308,915	\$617,800	10.3%
Spokane	136,383	\$136,383	106	\$156,615	\$292,998	\$586,000	9.7%
Thurston	66,086	\$66,086	61	\$90,127	\$156,213	\$312,400	5.2%
Whatcom	55,549	\$55,549	16	\$23,640	\$79,189	\$158,400	2.6%
Yakima	69,595	\$69,595	9	\$13,297	\$82,892	\$165,800	2.8%
GRAND TOTAL						\$6,020,000	

City Funding Calculations					
City	Number of worksites	Percent of county sites	Fiscal Year Total	Biennial Total	Share of Funding
Tacoma (Pierce)	23	37.1%	\$122,450	\$244,900	4.1%
Everett (Snohomish)	26	35.1%	\$108,538	\$217,100	3.6%
Auburn	12	2.3%	\$31,389	\$62,800	1.0%
Bellevue	80	15.4%	\$209,262	\$418,500	7.0%
Bothell	13	2.5%	\$34,005	\$68,000	1.1%
Burien	2	0.4%	\$5,232	\$10,500	0.2%
Des Moines	4	0.8%	\$10,463	\$20,900	0.3%
Federal Way	9	1.7%	\$23,542	\$47,100	0.8%
Issaquah	9	1.7%	\$23,542	\$47,100	0.8%
Kent	4	0.8%	\$10,463	\$20,900	0.3%
Kirkland	15	2.9%	\$39,237	\$78,500	1.3%
Mercer Island	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	0.0%
Redmond	28	5.4%	\$73,242	\$146,500	2.4%
Renton	26	5.0%	\$68,010	\$136,000	2.3%
SeaTac	17	3.3%	\$44,468	\$88,900	1.5%
Seattle	275	52.9%	\$719,337	\$1,438,700	23.9%
Shoreline	7	1.3%	\$18,310	\$36,600	0.6%
Tukwila	15	2.9%	\$39,237	\$78,500	1.3%
Woodinville	1	0.2%	\$2,616	\$5,200	0.1%
GRAND TOTAL				\$3,166,700	

Methodology

Workers include those in industries with a statewide median income less than that of Washington's median income in 2021 (\$62,836). Data from the American Community Survey 5-year estimates. These industries are:

- Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting
- Wholesale trade
- Retail trade
- Transportation and warehousing
- Administrative and support and waste management services
- Health care and social assistance
- Arts, entertainment, and recreation
- Accommodation and food services
- Other services, except public administration