

## **Mandatory vs optional participation in CTR – a quick comparison**

### **Optional participation example:**

One can read about Steer's work with SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments) in Geoff English's description on Steer's website. SANDAG's iCommute seems a noble effort that is/was handicapped by not having full participation mandatory for all employers. Nonetheless, it is encouraging to learn of an 18% reduction in SOV mode share at the 9 participating employers.

A skeptic might point out that this 18% reduction corresponds to about a 0.009% reduction in SOV mode share over the total commuting population. [18% reduction for 9 out of the region's 1000 companies that might together employ 50% of all commuters.]

### **For comparison, a mandatory example:**

Washington State's DOT believes its mandatory program for the Seattle area has achieved about 8% reduction in VMT (vehicle miles travelled) by employees of large employers – which might translate to 4% reduction across all commuters. This underscores the power of "mandatory."

Even so, their program's effectiveness would have been increased were it not for these two factors:

1. it has never promoted proximate commuting (aka CloserCommutes) as a tactic, and
2. it has never included employers with less than 100 employees at a single site - which eliminated all bank branches, most schools, most health clinics, etc.

### **The take-away**

We expect a mandatory, modern CTR program that provides support and resources for a full range of tactics (including CloserCommutes) could achieve 8% to 10% reduction in VKT (vehicle kilometres travelled) across an urban region within three years.