

## APPENDIX A SPECIFIC SURVEY RESPONSES

The sections below include each survey question and a summary of findings. Where appropriate, ICF has included a complete listing of actual responses. As mentioned earlier, Section 1 (Role in TDM) applied to all respondents. Those states that do have a TDM role then completed Section 2 (Existing TDM). Those that do not have a TDM role completed Section 3 (Absence of TDM). The survey responses below are organized by section. Please note that the raw data is available upon request, but is very cumbersome.

### SECTION 1: ROLE IN TDM

#### Question 1: What state are you from?

Representatives from 42 states responded, approximately an 82 percent response rate.<sup>i</sup> Below is a list of all respondents.

<i>Table A-1. State Participation in the Survey</i>	
Alabama	Minnesota
Arizona	Mississippi
Arkansas	Missouri
California	Nebraska
Colorado	Nevada
Connecticut	New Hampshire
Delaware	New Jersey
Florida	New Mexico
Georgia	New York
Hawaii	North Carolina
Idaho	Ohio
Illinois	Oregon
Indiana	Pennsylvania
Iowa	Rhode Island
Kansas	South Carolina
Kentucky	Utah
Louisiana	Vermont
Maine	Virginia
Maryland	Washington
Massachusetts	West Virginia
Michigan	Wisconsin

*Jurisdictions that did not respond include Alaska; Washington, D.C.; Montana; North Dakota; Oklahoma; South Dakota; Tennessee; Texas; and Wyoming.*

#### Question 2: What agency are you representing?

Most respondents (37) self-identified solely with the DOT. However, five states listed an additional department or more specific division. Specifically, Colorado, Massachusetts, and West Virginia further identified that they were in Transportation Development/Planning, and North Carolina, and Oregon further identified that they were in Public Transportation/Transit Division.

Respondents were asked in Section 2 to identify the division or department that is specifically responsible for TDM.

**Question 3: Does your state DOT:**

- a) Enforce/support the implementation of localities' plans to reduce SOV travel?
- b) Fund local organizations focused on TDM, such as local jurisdictions or TMAs/TMOs?
- c) Fund/manage a statewide TDM approach?
- d) Provide technical assistance to local TDM organizations?
- e) Use TDM as part of its own activities, such as during construction projects?
- f) All of the above?
- g) None of the above?
- h) Other?

This question aims to identify the role of the state DOT according to a few examples of the types of roles that the DOT may play. Below is a summary of the results:

<i>Table A-2. Common Roles for State DOTs<sup>ii</sup></i>		
<b>Does your state DOT:</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
Enforce/support the implementation of localities' plans to reduce SOV travel?	26%	11
Fund local organizations focused on TDM, such as local jurisdictions or TMAs/TMOs?	38%	16
Fund/manage a statewide TDM approach?	21%	9
Provide technical assistance to local TDM organizations?	36%	15
Use TDM as part of its own activities, such as during construction projects?	43%	18
All of the above?	21%	9
None of the above?	7%	3
Other?	17%	7

Note that the larger number of respondents (43 percent) reported using TDM as a part of its activities, such as during construction projects. This indicates that TDM is most commonly present in projects rather than used as a formal program or agency-wide strategy.

The second most common response (38 percent) was to fund local organizations focused on TDM, such as local jurisdictions or TMAs/TMOs. This indicates that while the DOT may not implement TDM programs, many are funding and or managing TMAs that operate the TDM programs.

The third most common response (36 percent) was to provide technical assistance to local TDM organizations. Using Survey Monkey’s crosstab analysis function, the team determined that the majority of states that fund local jurisdictions are additionally providing technical assistance to those organizations.<sup>iii</sup> This would suggest that rarely does the DOT fund but not provide technical assistance to the TMAs/TMOs.

Finally, the fourth most common response (26 percent) was enforcing or supporting the implementation of localities’ plans to reduce SOV travel. Some states, like Washington State, have regulatory authority in employer commuter reduction plans, while others may only support traffic mitigation plans.

Only 21 percent of states indicated that they fund or manage a statewide TDM approach. This indicates that most states have a decentralized process of supporting TDM across multiple departments and divisions, but do not fund or manage a statewide approach.

Twenty-one percent of states indicated that their state DOT did all activities listed. These states include Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Maryland, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Washington State. Those that reported none of the above include Arkansas, Idaho, and Kansas.<sup>iv</sup>

Respondents were offered the opportunity to select “other” roles and provide an explanation. Seven respondents listed additional roles. Below are the responses of those states that reported “other” roles in TDM:

<i>Table A-3. Additional Roles of the State</i>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Additional Response</b>
<b>AZ</b>	Arizona also addresses these on a state agency level with programs such as Capital Rideshare.
<b>NM</b>	Commuter benefits for state employees, flexible schedules for state employees.
<b>OH</b>	Access Management Policy
<b>UT</b>	Forming Strong Employer, Agency, and Community Partnerships. Major promotion, marketing, educating of travel demand management strategies, <a href="http://www.travelwise.utah.gov">www.travelwise.utah.gov</a>
<b>VT</b>	We implement many TDM activities as a normal course of doing business (P&R lots, bike lanes, etc.)
<b>WA</b>	Managing demand is one of the three approaches of WSDOT for addressing roadway capacity. <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Congestion/arsenal.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Congestion/arsenal.htm</a>
<b>WV</b>	WV DOT has encouraged our MPOs to incorporate TDM planning activities in their annual work programs. We have no TMAs in this state.

#### **Question 4: Does your DOT play a role in encouraging...**

Respondents<sup>v</sup> were provided with a list of 17 activities and asked whether the state DOT played a role in each. They were asked to provide additional comments as deemed helpful. The most common response was biking, which is not surprising since all states have bicycle and pedestrian coordinators. The following most common responses were: carpooling, promotion of transit use, vanpooling and walking (all receiving response from at least 33 states). The least common responses were pay-as-you-drive insurance, parking pricing/management and congestion/road pricing (none receiving more than five state responses). See below for a more in depth discussion of each activity.

Table A-4. Common Activities Encouraged by State DOTs

Does your DOT play a role in encouraging...? (If yes, please state yes and add details, program name, etc.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Bicycling	95%	39
Carpooling	88%	36
Commuter Financial Incentives	44%	18
Congestion/Road Pricing	12%	5
Employer-based Outreach/Programs	46%	19
HOV (High Occupant Vehicle) Lanes/Priority	44%	18
Special Event Planning	41%	17
Parking Pricing/Management	7%	3
Pay-As-You-Drive Insurance	2%	1
Promotion of Transit Use	83%	34
Ride matching	68%	28
TDM Marketing	49%	20
Telecommuting	49%	20
Transit-Oriented Development	39%	16
Trip Chaining	22%	9
Vanpooling	80%	33
Walking	80%	33

Some recurring themes in the responses include:

*Biking:*

- Nearly all respondents indicated that the state DOT plays a role in encouraging bicycling as a TDM strategy (39 of 41<sup>vi</sup> states responded affirmatively).
- Most states referenced a statewide bike/pedestrian plan/planner or a complete streets plan.
- Many states reported that state legislation requires the inclusion of bicycle facilities in new highway construction.
- West Virginia and Washington State mentioned the Safe Routes to School Program, which promotes biking for students.

*Carpooling:*

- Nearly all respondents indicated that the state DOT plays a role in encouraging carpooling as a TDM strategy (36 of 41 responded affirmatively).
- Many states referenced statewide carpooling programs (e.g., *Commuter Resources Rhode Island*, *Go Maine*, and *MassRides*).
- Others mentioned funding, building and maintaining HOV lanes and Park and Ride Facilities.
- Several mentioned supporting MPO funded programs.

- Several mentioned coordinating with State Transit agencies.
- Several referenced using CMAQ funding for ride matching.
- New Jersey offers gas card incentive programs for carpoolers.

#### *Commuter Financial Incentives:*

- Nearly half of states reported encouraging commuter financial incentives as a TDM strategy (18 of 41 states responded affirmatively). Several states reported supporting MPO commuter financial incentive programs.
- Illinois reported providing free transportation to all seniors.
- South Carolina reported working with local and regional organizations to promote the federal pre-tax commuter benefit programs.
- Utah reported that while the state is not yet using commuter financial incentives, the department is moving in that direction.

#### *Congestion/Road Pricing*

- Very few states reported using congestion or road pricing as a TDM strategy (Only five of 41 states responded affirmatively).
- Several reported that the agencies are looking into the option (Kansas and Colorado).
- Several reported that they are beginning to work on congestion pricing projects; for example, Georgia and Virginia are beginning HOV to HOT conversion projects.

#### *Employer-based Outreach/Programs*

- Nearly half of states reported that the state DOT plays a role in encouraging Employer-based Outreach/Programs as a TDM strategy (19 of 41 states responded affirmatively).
- Several states reported on commuter programs that encompass employer outreach, such as *Rhode Island Commuter Resources*, *Go Maine*, *New Jersey Smart Work Place Program*, and *Clear the Air Challenge*.
- Several other states reported that the DOT either encourages, funds or provides technical support to employer-based outreach programs through another transit agency's program, an MPO's program or TMA/TMO programs.
- Michigan reported that the DOT actively encourages employer outreach programs only during major construction projects.

#### *HOV Lanes/Priority*

- Nearly half of states reported that the State DOT plays a role in encouraging HOV Lanes/Priority as a TDM strategy (18 of 41 states responded affirmatively).
- Two states reported that the DOT is conducting a feasibility study for HOV or HOT lanes (South Carolina and Illinois).

#### *Special Event Planning*

- Nearly half of all states responded that the State DOT plays a role in encouraging special event planning as a TDM strategy (17 states responded affirmatively).
- Several states referenced local support of event planning rather than agency level support.

- New York State reported encouraging special event planning at the state level as part of standard maintenance and protection of traffic during major highway project construction/reconstruction.
- State responses on special event planning varied and included the following strategies: dynamic message boards, ride matching, and bus services to offsite parking.

#### *Parking Pricing/Management*

- Very few states responded that the state plays a role in parking pricing/management (only three states responded affirmatively).
- Two states that responded affirmatively (Maine and Arizona) reported providing preferred parking or priority covered parking for carpoolers and vanpoolers.

#### *Pay-As-You-Drive Insurance*

- Only one state (Washington State) responded that the state plays a role in pay-as-you-drive insurance. Utah indicated that the state might consider it in the future.

#### *Promotion of Transit Use*

- Most respondents (34 of 41) indicated that the state plays a role in promoting transit use.
- Some states mentioned fiscal support for transit promotion, while others mentioned general marketing program support.
- Washington State referenced a transit promotion marketing program called *Reinvent your Commute*. Others referenced increased promotion of transit use during construction projects, such as Illinois' *Avoid the Ryan* campaign during a major construction project in Chicago.

#### *Ridematching*

- The majority of all respondents (27 of 41) indicated that the State DOT plays a role in encouraging ride matching as a TDM strategy. The responses were similar to those provided in carpooling.
- Many states referenced statewide commuter programs (e.g., *Commuter Resources Rhode Island*, *Go Maine*, and *MassRides*).
- Several mentioned supporting MPO funded programs, TMOs/TMAs and local/state transit agencies.
- Several referenced using CMAQ funding for ride matching.

#### *TDM Marketing*

- Nearly half of states (20 of 41) reported undertaking TDM marketing. The responses were similar to those provided in carpooling.
- Many states referenced statewide commuter programs (e.g., *Commuter Resources Rhode Island*, *Go Maine*, and *MassRides*).
- Several mentioned supporting MPO and TMO/TMA programs.

#### *Telecommuting*

- Nearly half of states (20 of 41) reported encouraging telecommuting, though most responses indicated indirect involvement, through either the MPO or TMA/TMOs.

- Virginia reported contributing funding to a program that provides financial incentives to employers to offer telecommuting.
- Washington State reported that the State DOT funded a recent telework pilot project in Kitsap County.

#### *Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)*

- Sixteen of 42 states reported encouraging transit-oriented development, though most responses indicated that most involvement was at the local level.
- Some states indicated working with MPOs on TOD and others reported working with transit agencies.
- South Carolina reported working with local government to identify TOD policies.

#### *Trip Chaining*

- Only about one quarter of states (nine of 42) reported involvement in encouraging trip chaining.
- Pennsylvania indicated that trip chaining is encouraged through a state air quality program.

#### *Vanpooling*

- Most states (33 of 42) indicated involvement in vanpooling. Most reported coordination with MPOs, TMA/TMOs, and local, state, and regional transit agencies. Some provide management and coordination for statewide programs, while others provide funding.

#### *Walking*

- Most states (33 of 42) indicated involvement in walking. Many referenced Safe Routes to School Programs, Complete Streets Plans and Statewide Bicycle/Pedestrian Plans or Coordinators.

## **SECTION 2: EXISTING TDM**

*These questions only apply to those agencies that indicated they played a TDM role.*

*Thirty-nine states out of 42 states indicated that they have a role in TDM.*

### **Question 1: In which department/division is TDM located at your State DOT?**

Thirty-eight states responded to the question, over 90 percent.<sup>vii</sup> Of those states, the greatest number (17) indicated that TDM is located in the planning division or planning department at the DOT, approximately 45 percent. The next most common responses were the public transportation division (seven states) and the response that TDM is spread across multiple divisions (seven states), combined over 37 percent. These responses were followed by operations division, project development division, and another state agency. Below is a list of all responses.

<i>Table A-5. Department or Division Responsible for TDM</i>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Agency</b>
<b>AL</b>	Transportation Planning Bureau/Multimodal Division
<b>AZ</b>	At state level throughout State Government and at the Arizona Department of Administration
<b>CA</b>	No one division is assigned complete TDM responsibilities.
<b>CO</b>	Division of Transportation Development, Bike/Pedestrian/TDM Unit
<b>CT</b>	Bureau of Public Transportation, Office of Transit and Ridesharing
<b>DE</b>	Transit and Planning
<b>GA</b>	Planning, Traffic Operations and another state agency - Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA)
<b>HI</b>	Highways Division
<b>IL</b>	Operations Division
<b>IN</b>	Multiple divisions
<b>IA</b>	Multiple divisions
<b>KY</b>	Transportation Cabinet (Planning, Office of Transportation Delivery)
<b>LA</b>	Traffic Safety Section within Planning and Programming Division
<b>ME</b>	Bureau of Transportation Systems Planning
<b>MD</b>	State Highway Administration, Maryland Transit Administration and Maryland Transportation Authority
<b>MA</b>	Office of Transportation Planning
<b>MI</b>	All divisions
<b>MN</b>	Office of Transit
<b>MS</b>	Transit, Traffic Engineering and Planning Divisions
<b>MO</b>	Multiple divisions
<b>NE</b>	Planning and Project Development
<b>NV</b>	Intermodal Planning Division
<b>NJ</b>	Division of Statewide Planning
<b>NM</b>	Transit and Rail Division
<b>NY</b>	NYSDOT Policy and Planning Division All NYSDOT Regional Planning and Program groups Regions 1-11) -- primary Regions are 8 (lower Hudson Valley); 10 (Long Island); and 11 (New York City)
<b>NH</b>	Bureau of Rail & Transit, Bureau of Planning and Community Assistance
<b>NC</b>	Public Transportation
<b>OH</b>	Division of Transportation Systems Development
<b>OR</b>	Public transit Division
<b>PA</b>	Planning Office
<b>RI</b>	Intermodal Planning and Traffic Management
<b>SC</b>	Multiple divisions
<b>UT</b>	Planning



<i>Table A-5. Department or Division Responsible for TDM</i>	
State	Agency
VA	Transportation Planning
VT	Operations Division
WA	Public Transportation Division
WV	Program Planning and Administration Division
WY	Division of Transportation Investment Management and Division of Transportation Infrastructure Development

**Question 2: How much is spent annually on TDM by your agency?**

Thirty-eight states responded to the question. Most respondents were uncertain of the amount spent annually on TDM. Of those that were aware of the amount, most spend either \$1-5 million or \$100,000-\$500,000 annually.

Although it might seem that those states spending the most money would be most likely to fund or manage an entire statewide program, the survey indicates otherwise. Using Survey Monkey's crosstab analysis function, the team determined that those states that spend \$1-5 million are most likely to report that they fund or manage a statewide program and/or that they provide technical assistance to local organizations. However, those states that spend \$100,000-500,000 are also most likely to report that they also fund or manage a statewide program and/or that they fund local organizations or TMO/TMAs. One inference is that a large amount of funding is not necessarily the only indicator in a state's ability to fund or manage a statewide program. Another possibility is that the larger amount includes the funding of the local TMAs/TMOs, whereas the smaller option does not.

<i>Table A-6. TDM Funding by State DOT</i>		
<b>How much is spent annually on TDM by your agency?</b>		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Under \$100,000 (AL, AZ, MN, WV)	11%	4
\$100,000-\$500,000 (DE, LA, ME, NM, NV, WI)	16%	6
\$500,000-\$1 million (MS, NC, PA)	8%	3
\$1-\$5 million (CT, MA, MO, OR, UT, VA)	16%	6
\$5-\$10 million (NJ, NY)	5%	2
Over \$10 million (GA, WA)	5%	2
Not known	39%	15

**Question 3: How many employees/full time equivalents (FTEs) are working in the area of TDM?**

Thirty-eight states responded to this question. Most respondents (15) indicated that they had between one and five FTEs. Eight states responded that they were unaware of an exact number, primarily because the TDM work is spread across so many regions. Nine states also responded that the question did not apply (in some cases because TDM is incorporated in the regular business model, in other cases because there simply are no FTEs dedicated to TDM).

Three states responded that there were more than 20 FTEs. These results imply that there is often no clear, standard position for TDM at the state level. ICF suggests that the variability depends on how one defines their TDM “program.”

<i>Table A-7. TDM Employees per DOT</i>		
<b>How many employees/full time equivalents are working in the area of TDM?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
0-5 (AL, AZ, CO, CT, DE, LA, MN, MS, NH, NJ, NM, OR, UT, VA, WI)	39%	15
6-10 (NY)	3%	1
11-15 (MA, WA)	5%	2
16-20	0%	0
More than 20 (GA, HI, MO)	8%	3
Not known	21%	8
N/A	24%	9

**Question 4: Is the state considering changing its role towards TDM? Please describe the change in the role and why.**

Thirty-eight states responded to this question. Seventeen states reported that the state is considering changing its role; 10 indicated that the state is not considering changing its role, and 11 listed “N/A” (potentially indicating that the state is not considering changing its role). The large amount of states already actively considering a change in role indicates that states are interested in learning more about opportunities, benefits and options for programs, whether they are decentralized or statewide.

Of the 17 states that reported that the state is considering changing its role towards TDM, several states indicated that the DOT is reviewing plans or conducting studies to determine the best way to manage demand. Several others indicated that the DOT is continuously updating and reviewing strategic approaches to reduce single occupant vehicles.

A few states provided specific examples of possible changes:

- Utah indicated that UDOT is launching a TDM program called *TravelWise* that will change its role in TDM, moving to a statewide approach.
- New York indicated that rather than making Commuter Choice so much about alternative commute modes (supply side), the DOT is focusing on providing information and support to commuters and travelers to encourage them to choose other commute modes or alternative arrangements to driving alone (demand side).
- Additionally, Connecticut indicated that it is considering moving towards a single vendor solution for statewide TDM services.

Ten states reported that the state is not considering changing its role towards TDM. One specifically reported that budget constraints and staffing limit program support improvements.

Nonetheless, this state indicated that the authorization of the transportation bill might provide additional opportunities for improvements.

<i>Table A-8. Active States Considering a Change in Role</i>		
<b>Is the state considering changing its role towards TDM?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Percent</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	45%	17
No	26%	10
N/A	29%	11

**Question 5: Please provide a paragraph summary of your state's involvement with TDM. Please provide web addresses, if available.**

Twenty-nine states provided a supplemental and voluntary summary of the DOT's involvement with TDM. Several of these states just provided web addresses. The substantive responses of 21 states are included below. Most responses provide a snapshot of the state's program and offer a forecast of the direction of the state's involvement in TDM.

<i>Table A-9. Summary of Additional State DOT Involvement in TDM</i>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>AL</b>	The state is on the verge of completing the Statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to encourage alternative means of transportation. In addition, the state has developed a statewide ITS architecture plan to encourage efficient movement of traffic in congested urban areas of the state.
<b>AZ</b>	AZ Department of Administration manages our Capitol Rideshare Program, which includes carpooling matchup, telework program, subsidy programs, and promotional incentive programs.
<b>CO</b>	We encourage TDM activities by working with local communities on strategies involving TDM. Financially, TDM efforts are sponsored primarily through CMAQ funding which is distributed through the MPOs and managed by the DOT.
<b>CT</b>	ConnDOT contracts with 4 regional vendors to provide TDM services throughout the state.
<b>DE</b>	We require and enforce traffic mitigation agreements, and promote TDM to all.
<b>IN</b>	TDM efforts tend to be concentrated in the larger urban areas where MPOs are more involved. INDOT works with the MPOs in areas such as congestion management on TDM efforts.
<b>KY</b>	Human Service Transportation Coordination encourages multiple programs to rideshare.
<b>LA</b>	Bicycle and pedestrian program and Safe Routes to school program.

*Table A-9. Summary of Additional State DOT Involvement in TDM*

<b>State</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>MA</b>	Massachusetts provides a comprehensive statewide travel options program, MassRIDES, operated by our consultant, URS Corp. under a 5-year contract. See <a href="http://www.commute.com">www.commute.com</a> .
<b>MN</b>	The state's involvement in TDM is to provide technical assistance to Greater Minnesota population who want to increase transportation options such as ridesharing and transit. People can access the Public Transit web page to receive information about rideshare events.
<b>MO</b>	Through several efforts related to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit promotion. In addition, intelligent transportation systems provide some assistance.
<b>MS</b>	The state is being very proactive in its TDM efforts using and encouraging the use of every means available and effective for rural traffic conditions. MDOT supports its Transit Division, the TMAs, and MPO of the state. Considers and implements bicycle friendly facilities at every justified opportunity.
<b>NC</b>	The Public Transportation Division provides administrative funding to TDM Programs in four urbanized areas of our State and we use JARC money for a rural vanpool program.
<b>NH</b>	State involvement has been closely tied to local and regional efforts through regional planning commission-led projects, TMAs, local transit systems and their state association, bicycle groups, etc. DOT support has been largely through staff assistance to these efforts and funding through CMAQ, TE, FTA, and SRTS sources. DOT support has also taken the form of improved facilities supporting TDM such as bike racks, bike paths, and intermodal facilities for commuters.
<b>NV</b>	We support MPO employee trip reduction programs with federal funds. We have an Intermodal Planning Division with a Bike/Pedestrian Coordinator who promotes the installation and use of bike/pedestrian facilities. We have a separate section that works solely on Travel Demand Reduction strategies such as the installation of ITS signs throughout NV.
<b>NY</b>	For over twenty years, NYSDOT has implemented two primary, strategic program initiatives. These are: 1) the Metropolitan New York Commuter Choice Integrated Service Delivery Program for the New York metropolitan region [i.e., in NYSDOT Regions 8, 10, and 11] and 2) Strategic TDM and Commuter Choice Operations and Service Planning [i.e., individual project initiatives having statewide significance].
<b>OH</b>	Most of the TDM activities have been supported thru support of MPO planning activities, thru transit grant administration, and a few special programs. The department is dedicated to multi-modal transportation systems and is actively engaged in expanding intercity passenger rail service and other non-highway transportation alternatives as described in the referenced document.
<b>PA</b>	My Bureau manages the TMA program. We currently have 3 TMAs in Pittsburgh and 6 in Philadelphia. We coordinate development of an annual work program with the TMAs and MPOs.

<i>Table A-9. Summary of Additional State DOT Involvement in TDM</i>	
State	Answer
SC	SCDOT has and continues to become more involved in TDM activities, from development of new opportunities to raising awareness of existing activities. The state provides both funding and technical assistance for a variety of TDP activities/programs at the local, regional, and state level.
VT	TDM is part transit-part bike/pedestrian and is integrated into the way we do business.
VA	Support the regional TDM program, which includes DC, Maryland, and northern Virginia with funding in excess of \$2 million per year. Also, provide considerable funding and staff to implement TDM and transit services as part of transportation management plans associated with construction of large-scale transportation projects.
WI	TDM efforts began as an element of air quality compliance in the 1990s. Ongoing TDM efforts were not adopted at the state level or at the regional level as part of air quality compliance strategies after these initial efforts. Consideration of TDM strategies to serve other goals remains a largely voluntary concept in Wisconsin, centered at the local or regional level.

**Question 6: Please enter your contact information if you would like us to consider your program for a future case study.**

More than half of the survey participants agreed to submit contact information for a potential case study. The following list of 23 states provided contact information:

<i>Table A-10. States providing contact information for case studies</i>	
Alabama	New Hampshire
Arizona	New Jersey
California	New Mexico
Connecticut	New York
Delaware	North Carolina
Georgia	Pennsylvania
Illinois	Rhode Island
Maine	Utah
Massachusetts	Vermont
Minnesota	Washington
Mississippi	West Virginia
Missouri	

**Question 7: Please feel free to offer any additional information about your program or state's TDM activities, if desired.**

Eleven states provided additional information. The following lists the substantive comments provided by seven states.

<i>Table A-11. Additional Information from States</i>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Answer</b>
<b>CO</b>	It is difficult to define our activities because they branch out in various areas as listed above. We work with other state agencies to encourage TDM activities; same for local governments and businesses. We do not have a dedicated funding stream for TDM on the state level; but we do fund quite a bit through CMAQ. Our bike/pedestrian policy will provide more options to transportation users and hopefully lead to reductions in SOV usage.
<b>DE</b>	Our program has teeth!
<b>IL</b>	While Illinois does not have a formal process, I would be interested in a case study of the benefits, feasibility, and implementation of a formal process and its impact on the department...if that is a possibility.
<b>MA</b>	We also oversee the Boston Region MPO's Suburban Mobility and TDM programs, totaling \$650,000/year.
<b>OR</b>	To make a real impact, my TDM program needs much more high-level support than it currently has. Oregon's leaders in TDM are in the Portland area: the Lloyd TMA, and Metro's RTO program.
<b>PA</b>	No specific TDM organization in PennDOT. The 9 TMAs do the majority of our TDM effort. However, we do support transit, bike/pedestrian improvements, carpooling/ridesharing, intercity rail as much as possible.
<b>VA</b>	This perspective is only at one of the Districts of the VDOT, in Northern Virginia. Do not have a statewide program through the DOT, but our sister agency, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation does.

### **SECTION 3: ABSENCE OF TDM**

*These questions only apply to those agencies that indicated they did not play a TDM role. Three states indicated that their DOT does not play a role in TDM (Kansas, Idaho and Arkansas).<sup>viii</sup>*

#### **Question 1: If no TDM approach exists, why not?**

The three states that indicated that the DOT did not play a role in TDM provided the following explanations: the state is too rural for TDM; congestion is not a statewide problem; there is not enough staffing.

<i>Table A-12. Explanation for Absence of TDM Program</i>	
<b>If no TDM approach exists, why not?</b>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>AR</b>	Our state is too rural to warrant funding this type of program.
<b>ID</b>	Congestion problem is limited to Boise-Nampa corridor and only during rush hour. Not a statewide problem.
<b>KS</b>	There is no formal TDM approach, mostly because of staffing issues and lack of substantial congestion.

**Question 2: Is state considering changing its role towards TDM? Please describe the change in the role and why. (Use N/A for not applicable).**

No state responded affirmatively that the state would be willing to change its role towards TDM. Kansas indicated an interest in change, but reported that a lack of staffing would make it difficult to establish a formal agency-wide strategy towards TDM. Arkansas and Idaho indicated that the state is not considering changing its role towards TDM.

<i>Table A-13. Non-active States Considering a Change in Role</i>	
<b>Is the state considering changing its role towards TDM?</b>	
<b>State</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>AR</b>	No.
<b>ID</b>	Not officially.
<b>KS</b>	There is more consideration for TDM, but lack of staffing will make it difficult to formalize approach.

## ADDITIONAL REFERENCES FOR APPENDICES

---

<sup>i</sup> For the purposes of this survey, the total potential survey response is 51 (50 states plus the District of Columbia).

<sup>ii</sup> Note respondents were able to choose more than one option, meaning that the total percents do not equalize 100%.

<sup>iii</sup> Fourteen of 22 states that reported funding local organizations also provide technical assistance.

<sup>iv</sup> Note that Florida marked “all of the above” and “none of the above.” Based on other activities reported by Florida, it was determined that “none of the above” was accidentally clicked in the survey. ICF eliminated Florida from the list of states that reported none of the above activities.

<sup>v</sup> Note that one respondent skipped this question (Arkansas).

<sup>vi</sup> See Footnote i, but only 41 states responded to this question. Percentages are derived from the 41 respondents, not 42 as in the other questions.

<sup>vii</sup> Florida did not respond to the questions in section 2.

<sup>viii</sup> Note that Louisiana answered questions in all three sections (most likely the respondent clicked the “none of the above” box in section 1, question 3, but changed the answer later). Due to the nature of the responses in sections 1 and 2, the ICF team removed Louisiana’s responses from section 3. The respondent indicated that the state does have a role in TDM.