



**Spitfire Strategies**



**Washington State Transportation Energy Efficiency  
Education Campaign**



**State Smart Transportation Initiative**

**Research Brief and Next Steps**

**Table of Contents**

Overview ..... 3

Key Takeaways..... 3

Stakeholder Interview Findings ..... 4

Case Studies..... 8

Impact of Mode Shifts on Fuel Consumption and Costs ..... 20

Public Opinion on Mode Shifts ..... 22

Funding Opportunities..... 23

Recommendations ..... 29

Next steps ..... 32

  

Appendix

    A) Original Stakeholder Interview Discussion Guide..... 36

    B) Campaign and Funding Stakeholder Interview Discussion Guide..... 37

    C) Full List of Featured Campaign Listed Partners ..... 38

## Overview

As part of Spitfire's work with the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI) and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to develop a collaborative transportation energy efficiency campaign, Spitfire conducted a series of research activities to inform campaign planning:

- **Stakeholder Interviews.** Spitfire conducted 11 stakeholder interviews, split into two groups. The first set of interviews focused on identifying campaign objectives, audiences and messages as well as best practices from other statewide advocacy and public education efforts. The second set of interviews focused on funding opportunities.
- **Case Studies.** Based on the findings from the stakeholder interviews and the first group planning meeting, Spitfire reviewed eight past or current energy efficiency campaigns across the country to identify best practices and lessons learned, with a specific focus on messages, campaign outreach activities and funding.
- **Mode Shift Analysis.** Spitfire worked with SSTI to identify ways to calculate the impact of travel mode shifts on energy consumption and costs. Spitfire also identified public tools that have been used in other campaigns to help commuters calculate their own cost savings and outlined which mode shifts are most popular and viable.
- **Funding Opportunities.** Spitfire reviewed private, public and corporate funding opportunities for the campaign, identifying similar projects that have been funded and contact information for each potential funder.

## Key Takeaways

Key takeaways from the above research activities are outlined below.

- **The campaign should promote multiple travel options.** Overall, potential campaign participants desire a campaign that promotes a series of travel alternatives instead of promoting one form of public transportation. Participants emphasized the need to provide realistic options for more suburban residents, like trip chaining and carpooling support, and to lay out a series of options to engage as many people as possible.
- **Other campaigns utilize a wide variety of public and private partners.** The reviewed campaigns utilized a wide variety of partners in their efforts including local governments, colleges and universities, energy companies, environmental and clean air organizations, transportation and transit agencies, public utilities, civic organizations such as city alliances and chambers, car rental companies and retail businesses. Engaging partners from such varied sectors expands the outreach capability of the campaigns and helps to reach a broader target audience. Few partners provided direct funding but were involved in the campaign through cross-promotional activities like offering prizes at public events or offering discounts for products and services for consumers involved in the campaigns.
- **The predominate message in the featured case studies was cost savings.** In fact, all of the mentioned case studies included this messaging in some form. In interviews, stakeholders also noted cost savings as the most effective value to tap when engaging target audiences. The reviewed campaigns also included a number of secondary

messages that focused on the importance of clear air and environment, better health, alleviating stress, decreased traffic and improved quality of life. Many of the campaigns also emphasized that small changes can make a big difference to highlight the role that each individual plays toward achieving the campaign's objectives.

- **The most prevalent engagement method was campaign websites.** All of the campaigns profiled in the case studies maintained a website for the campaign, and a few used their websites as their primary engagement method. Other outreach methods included public events and advertising.
- **Campaigns that had public commuting calculation tools collected the most campaign metrics.** Campaigns with the most public data on their successes had reporting measures built into their campaign websites, such as a trip diary or consumer tool that collected data on behavior changes.
- **The primary audience for all of the campaigns featured in the case studies was local residents.** While many campaigns also targeted audiences like employers, local government and businesses, every campaign focused on outreach to local residents.
- **While funding will be challenging to secure, there are opportunities to take advantage of partnerships and leverage existing resources.** Stakeholder interviews indicated that funding will be challenging to secure and hard to locate, but there are opportunities to build relationships and leverage existing resources, networks and causes that already align with the campaign. While the case studies demonstrate that partnerships are often more useful and practical than grants, private foundations are likely the best opportunity for funding compared with oil companies and public funding, which may be available but harder to anticipate.

### Stakeholder Interview Findings

Spitfire conducted two series of interviews, the first focused on coalition partners' goals and ideas for the campaign (questions are included in Appendix A), and the second looked to answer questions about local best practices for funding public awareness and advocacy campaigns. Key findings from both sets of interviews are included below.

#### Campaign Objectives and Focus

- **While most existing campaigns promote one specific transportation mode, there is interest in a broader campaign that incorporates a series of travel options.** Participants were not able to name any successful campaigns that educated the public on multiple alternatives to single-occupancy driving. They were only familiar with campaigns that promoted one transit service, biking, carpooling, etc. and voiced interest in developing a campaign that takes a more holistic approach and educates the public on all of the transportation options available to them.

*“Transit agencies spend lots of time marketing services. An integrated campaign would be better.”*

*“We don’t want to simply tell people to drive less. It would be more helpful to educate them about all the different options.”*

- **Campaign tone is important.** The way that the campaign introduces travel alternatives is important – it shouldn’t use a judgmental or lecture-like tone. Many participants cautioned against language that makes consumers feel forced to use travel alternatives that are not convenient to them; consumers are also reluctant to listen to government demands. Participants recommended outlining out all of the travel options available and being sensitive to legitimate barriers. People will only choose travel alternatives that are convenient to them or provide significant cost or time savings.

*“There has been a lot of recent publicity in Seattle trying to promote transit, biking and walking. This is nice when convenient, in cases where it works, particularly people making short trips, but there is tension in driving people away from their cars...there can be a middle ground, not all or nothing... If people have a choice, they will make a smart one, but they don’t like the government telling them that they can’t drive cars. It is important to remember choices, not issue a mandate.”*  
*“There is general fatigue about government messaging. It’s not about lecturing down to people, but being on the same level.”*

*“Let people know about the range of options available beyond switching to a hybrid car or getting on a bus.”*

*“At the state level, it is about being aware that travel choices are changing. People want convenience and speed – but that’s not being provided by cars. They need a different mode or route. Travel options equal freedom.”*

- **There is a need to provide realistic travel alternatives for suburban communities.** According to the interviews, most existing campaigns target commuters and urban populations and have a heavy transit focus. Campaign participants would like to provide realistic options for people living in the suburbs where transit is less convenient.

*“Nothing has happened to target people not commuting or living in urban areas – students, retirees, people living further out – they haven’t been reached yet.”*

*“Most outreach I’ve seen doesn’t give you any options if you don’t live in an urban area. If we want this to make a difference, we need options for people who don’t live on bus or rail lines.”*

- **The most effective messages highlight cost savings.** Participants agreed that the most compelling messages show consumers how they can save money on gas by making smarter travel decisions. This feedback is based on their experience working on similar programs and the campaigns they’ve seen succeed in other markets. Participants agreed that it is important to focus on personal benefits and avoid using judgmental language.

*“The high gas prices today make it a great time for a campaign. Gas prices this year are higher than ever before. People understand these costs – appeal to this.”*

*“Saving money is the foremost message.”*

*“Try to sell benefits because people like to be free, not shamed.”*

*“What would I rather do with that gas? Has to be about what is in it for me...something that hits my time and wallet is most impactful.”*

*“Start with, transportation is expensive and it is getting more so. Here’s how you can save your money – there are lots of choices. There are a series of smart choices on how you use transportation: how to link trips, not take unnecessary trips. It’s not about doing one or the other, but each step you take will help you.”*

- **There may be opportunities to tap into the values of the Pacific Northwest and redefine the cultural associations around driving.** Besides the cost-savings message, several participants suggested that the campaign could create links between the region’s values and pride around transportation reform. One interview participant suggested shifting the sexual appeal associated with cars in advertising:

*“There is a real opportunity in transportation efficiency to think in a fun and creative way about how transportation choices reflect and reinforce our culture and values. Advertisers have spent so much money showing that a man’s value is tied to horsepower – but people are not buying it anymore. They want to reconnect with something else... [in campaign materials we can] have fun with contrasting sustainable with unsustainable and reaffirm who we think we are, the values we hold and what kind of place this is.”*

- **We need to make it easier for people to learn and feel comfortable with alternative travel modes; social media and existing tools can help do this.** People are very familiar with road networks and driving, but most do not know how to navigate transit, carpooling or bike lanes. Participants said it was important for the campaign to make alternatives more user-friendly.

*“Information on transit is very hard to read if you’re not a regular user. The bus stop may not have a timetable, or tell you where you’re going. Everyone knows how to use the road network, but very few know how to use the transit network.”*

*“People already understand the personal car and highway system. People accept congestion. If you don’t have a car, there is a whole system, not just one mode. People need to understand how to use the whole system.”*

*“When we talk about transportation options, a lot of people feel intimidated. They don’t know when buses run or they’re not sure what routes to take. They might try light rail, but they don’t know how to connect to other things. If we really want people to change the way they travel, we need to make it easy to figure out.”*

Many transit agencies now have smart phone apps with tools that identify the closest bus or subway and estimate wait times, and stakeholders suggested that the campaign can take advantage of this technology. In addition, the campaign could demystify transportation alternatives by developing tools that show how different travel modes can be linked to plan trips that involve multiple travel modes, for example, bikes and buses.

*“There is a lack of knowledge about the type of options available. There is an app called One Bus Way – it is wonderful, we should promote these kind of tools. We need to make using transit easier. There isn’t enough awareness by people who aren’t already on transit.”*

There are additional opportunities to engage residents in social media to make transit more convenient and create a network of transit users who can help each other navigate the systems:

*“One guy had an idea to create a community with transit. On a heavily used route, one person could say that a bus is full and let everyone in community know.”*

## **Campaign Funding**

- **Securing funding will be difficult and require significant staffing commitments and long-term relationship building.** Representatives from local campaigns said it was difficult to secure funding and it required a long-term commitment to relationship building. Even small nonprofits require at least a part-time employee to write grant applications and proposals. According to those interviewed, it takes significant time to build relationships with large private foundations
- **Funders need to see a smart project plan before they will consider funding.** Campaigns need to have clear, specific objectives, tactics that will help achieve campaign goals and measurable outcomes to determine the campaign’s impact:

*“We need a clear plan and set of goals going into the campaign early on. We need to be able to articulate this with partners and potential funders and answer questions on why we’re doing this and what we want to accomplish.”*

*“It is important to have a clear workplan – ask for funding for specific things, not general things.”*

- **Funders need to understand the benefit of the campaign and be confident that their investment will deliver results that can lead to policy change.** Stakeholders said that any grant proposal or funder pitch needs to be tailored to the specific funder’s goals. According to those interviewed, the campaign will need to demonstrate how the funder will benefit from their investment. In addition, funders expect results that can lead to a wider policy change:

*“There are two main keys to success: people want real results that they can count on... But they also want leverage. It is important to describe not just that X number of people are changing transportation behavior but show how that builds awareness, a constituency, and a narrative for higher level policy decisions. Anyone who funds climate work needs to situate their work within the larger strategic view of big environmental change. If you get near-term measurable results and describe how that would drive policy change – you’ll get further with funders.”*

*“People want to give money when they see how the campaign benefits them – whether they’re a company or a foundation, they want to know they’re getting something in return.”*

- **Many partnership opportunities exist with local organizations.** Interview participants noted that many local organizations would be interested in the campaign and could serve as strong partners, such as Future Wise, Cool Moms (whose chair is a transportation advocate and used to work for the City of Seattle and Transportation Choices Coalition), neighborhood sustainability groups such as Sustainable Ballard and SCALLOPS (Sustainable Communities ALL Over Puget Sound).

## **Case Studies**

Spitfire conducted research to identify energy-efficiency campaigns from around the country and in the Puget region for information that could be useful to WSDOT in its campaign efforts. Our research focused on eight past or current energy-efficiency campaigns, six from across the country and two from the Puget region. The following case studies are compiled based on the best, publically-available information in media coverage and online, as well as additional information we were able to obtain from the campaigns themselves.

### **National Case Studies**

#### **Commute Solutions – Austin, TX**

<http://www.commuterolutions.com/>

#### **About:**

Commute Solutions is designed to educate residents about their transportation options. Commute Solutions promotes voluntary trip reduction programs and alternate commuting methods to reduce traffic congestion and improve the region’s air quality.

#### **Funders and Partners:**

Commute Solutions is a federally-funded program operated by the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), which serves Bastrop, Caldwell, Hays, Travis, and Williamson Counties in Texas. CAMPO is governed by a board of regional and local officials. The program has also partnered with local governments, the University of Texas, utility providers, civic organizations, transportation providers and private companies to cross-promote the program’s efforts.

#### **Audiences:**

- Commuters and other transportation-user groups including parents, seniors, students, persons with disabilities and travelers with medical needs.
- Employers

#### **Messages:**

Commute Solutions communicates broadly to consumers by appealing to their desire to save money, improve the quality of the air they breathe and reduce stress caused by traffic.

*“You can save money, spare the air and alleviate stress all at the same time. Where’s the downside?” (Website)*



*"Our on-road emissions amount to about 40 percent of overall emissions that contribute to ozone. Plus, commuters who don't drive arrive at work at more dependable times with less stress," - Shelley Whitworth, who oversees air quality programs for the Houston-Galveston Area Council (Houston Chronicle, July 28, 2011)*

The program also encourages commuters to consider other transportation options, while recognizing people's attachments to their cars.

*"You don't have to ditch your car. You don't have to take the bus every day. No one will require you to ride a bike. Take a look, consider the possibilities and give it a go!"  
(Website)*

The program also appeals specifically to public transportation users, including parents, seniors, students, people with disabilities and travelers with medical need.

*"Do any of these situations sound familiar?"*

- There is always a traffic jam getting in and out of my child's school parking lot.*
- I worry about the safety of my kids getting to and from school, in general.*
- There are a lot of fumes from idling cars in the parking lot. I wonder if it's dangerous to my child's developing lungs.*
- I sure wish I could save some time and gas in the morning by not having to drive my kids to and from school before and after work.*

*Want to fix these problems? Check out these options below available to you!"  
(Website)*

*"Getting old ain't for sissies! There are many things to consider in the Golden Years, and how you get from here to there is a major issue for a lot of folks over 65: about 37 million Americans." (Website)*

*"There are many great transportation options geared towards students. Check it out!" (Website)*

*"Capital Metro offers a variety of accessible fixed-route and flex bus routes, as well as MetroRail service." (Website)*

*"Sometimes, medical conditions can make it seem nearly impossible to get where you need to go. Check out the following services that may assist you in your time of need." (Website)*

Similarly, Commute Solutions appeals to employers by providing them with tools to help employees choose alternative options like telecommuting and alternative work schedules:

*"Teleworking, also referred to as telecommuting, is the act of working without going to the office, and thereby avoiding commute trips. It's one solution to traffic congestion caused by single-car commuting, and the resulting air pollution and petroleum use."  
(Website)*

*"Alternative work schedules benefits:*

- Reduces parking lot and entrance/exit congestion*
- Less employee stress/better productivity*

- *Better employee morale/retention*
- *Reduces tardiness*
- *Economical to provide*
- *Can offer flexibility needed for other Commute Solutions*
- *Staggered hours allow for more coverage because of extended workday” (Website)*

**Engagement methods:**

Commute Solutions uses a variety of methods to engage commuters in its efforts including:

- **A website** including resources such as information on where residents can learn more about commuting options, a “Commuter Cost Calculator” that helps site visitors determine the actual cost of their current commute and links to myCommuteSolutions, an online interactive website where users can plan and track their commutes. The website also features an **events calendar** with monthly transportation events to encourage site visitors to participate. Residents can continue to discuss commute options through the **blog** and **social media** including Facebook and Twitter.
- **Public events** such as transportation fairs and contests that promote transportation alternatives: myCommuteSolutions plans to offer people who enroll a chance to win a prize if they commit to things like taking a bus one day a week, teleworking, riding a bike to work or carpooling.
- **Public advertising** through radio, printed and web advertising as well as a **bookmark campaign** where Commute Solutions distributed bookmarks to commuters reminding them that taking public transportation allows them to enjoy a book on their way to work.

**Asks:**

- Reduce the amount of time you spend in your car by considering alternatives to single-person car trips.

**Metrics:**

myCommuteSolutions’ online tool allows people to track their commuting habits and connect with others who are interested in ridesharing and biking partners. Commute Solutions collects the data from this tool as well.

**Outcomes:**

As of 2011, NuRide, a ride-sharing program, had over 14,000 members reporting a reduction of more than 30 million vehicle miles travelled. Also as of 2011, the regional vanpool program is the third largest in the nation with 749 vanpools and 7,830 average daily riders. The regional telework program boasts 3,500 participants.

**Drive Less, Save More – Portland, OR**

<http://www.driveless.savemore.com/pages/about-us>

**About:**

Drive Less, Save More is a public campaign in Portland, Oregon designed to increase public awareness of transportation choices to reduce car trips and relieve overall traffic congestion in the region. The campaign emphasizes trip chaining, where drivers map out their non-work related driving to combine multiple errands into one trip. The campaign’s beginning dates back to 2005 when members of the Oregon legislature wanted to engage the public in efforts to reduce traffic congestion and the environmental impacts of cars so they included a public

education campaign in transportation legislation. It was launched in the Portland metropolitan area in 2006 and has since expanded to Bend, Eugene/Springfield, Medford and Salem; the program is still active today.

#### **Funders and Partners:**

Drive Less, Save More was initially launched by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Oregon Metro, the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The campaign continues to be funded through ODOT's budget and has to be reauthorized with each budget cycle. Since its inception, the campaign has partnered with agencies, local governments, transportation providers and private companies to support the campaign with giveaways and prizes.

#### **Audiences:**

- Commuters
- Employers

#### **Messages:**

Drive Less, Save More appeals primarily to consumers by tapping into their desire to save money and eliminate time spent in traffic. To a lesser extent, it also emphasizes how taking these steps will help the environment and improve the overall quality of life in the region.

*"Simply put, fewer trips mean better traffic flow." (Campaign website)*

*"A campaign that helps drivers save money at the gas pump and time on the road, while improving traffic flow." (Campaign website)*

*"Traffic congestion now costs Portland-area residents hundreds of millions of dollars a year in wasted time and wasted fuel. It reduces our quality of life and hurts our local economy. We simply cannot ignore the problems caused by congestion." (Campaign website)*

*"Save wear and tear on you, your wallet and the planet." (Campaign website)*

The campaign's messages also target employers, with appeals that focus on employee recruitment, retention and quality of life.

*"Improve employee recruitment and retention, as well as facilitate carpool, vanpool and transit arrangements for employees, help employees better manage their personal and professional responsibilities and reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality." (Campaign website)*

#### **Engagement methods:**

Drive Less, Save More engages consumers with the following tactics:

- **A website** with resources for drivers, including tips and information on various travel options including biking, walking, carpooling, car-sharing programs and telecommuting toolkits for employers and employees. The website features a community forum where people can discuss new transit ideas, ask questions and read about new initiatives, programs, news, events, research and studies. It also features a trip diary where visitors can track the progress they have made reducing car trips; commuters can win prizes if they keep a trip diary. **Social media** including Facebook and Twitter continue the

conversation and provide similar resources to visitors such as links to find walkable communities and information on how to participate in National Bike to Work Day.

- **Public engagement** like partnering with UPS to host travel makeovers where participants tracked their travel patterns, UPS audited their habits and made recommendations on how to make them more efficient. The campaign hosted a similar event where they invited families to undergo a similar travel audit and adjust their habits. The family that made the most positive changes won the “family challenge” and was celebrated at a media event. The campaign also hosted a video competition that challenged participants to produce a television commercial for the campaign.
- **Public advertising** on TV, magazines, newspapers and buses. The campaign has received over \$1.5 million in donated advertising.

#### **Asks:**

- Reduce the amount of time you spend in your car by trip chaining and/or using alternative travel options such as public transportation, carpooling, biking and walking.

#### **Metrics:**

Drive Less, Save More’s online trip diary allows people to track their driving habits and tells them **how many miles** they have eliminated and how much air pollution they have prevented by reducing the number of car trips.

#### **Outcomes:**

Research conducted in 2009 indicates that Drive Less, Save More has engaged more than **222,000 people** – or 19 percent of Portland’s residents. The campaign reports at least 21.8 million vehicle road miles have been reduced and approximately 10,700 fewer tons of greenhouse gases have been released into our atmosphere. It also estimates it has saved the public more than \$8 million in auto-operating costs. Of those who participated in the campaign:

- 95% combined errands/trip chained
- 48% increased/started using transit
- 47% increased/started walking to places they had driven to in the past
- 35% started/increased carpooling with others
- 27% started/increased use of biking
- 19% avoided commuting by working from home

#### **Driven to Drive Less – Boulder, CO**

<http://www.driventodriveless.com/>

#### **About:**

Driven to Drive Less describes itself as a community-driven effort in Boulder, Colorado to encourage residents to move towards a “car light” culture and lifestyle to increase transportation conservation, decrease vehicle emissions and improve the quality of life in the region. Launched in 2010, the campaign asks commuters to use their cars one day less each week. As of January 2012, the campaign ran out of dedicated funding but the website remains active with the intention that additional funding will be secured in the future.

#### **Funders and Partners:**

The Driven to Drive Less campaign was funded by a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation, the City of Boulder, and by corporate sponsors.

**Audiences:**

- Commuters, particularly those who have been resistant to changing their transportation behavior in the past.

**Messages:**

Driven to Drive Less asked residents to make small changes and appeals to environmental and quality of life values:

*“Let’s live like we did before cars were the norm. For at least one day a week. Take horsepower literally. Blast our quads on our way to work. Take the bus. Stagecoach it. Or at the very least, carpool. Let’s create a community of carelessness, meet new friends and get free stuff. One day a week without a car. That’s 14.3% less pollution. Less traffic. Less road rage. Less fossil fuels. And 14.3% more freedom.” (Website)*

*“Why burst a vein sitting in traffic when you could be reading a book, getting work done, catching some shut-eye or even contemplating world domination en route to your destination? That’s the beauty of a bus. Not to mention reducing congestion, pollution and your blood pressure. Here are some links to the wonderful world of the Boulder bus system.” (Website)*

*“If there’s one thing Boulder surely has, it’s an expansive network of biking and walking trails. In addition to the obvious advantages of no traffic and no emissions, the best part about biking and walking is that you get your daily exercise in and get where you want to go in one fell swoop.” (Website)*

*“Carpooling doesn’t end after grade school. In fact, carpooling is actually more rewarding as an adult, when you’re able to drive yet opt not to drive for environmental reasons. But the coolest thing about carpooling is it’s like a daily road trip. With friends. To work (or anywhere else)! Plus, you get to drive fast in the HOV lane and laugh at all the single drivers stuck in traffic.” (Website)*

*“Oh, the gas-saving joys of working from home. Telecommuting rocks, because you can work and get paid and reduce pollution and congestion in just your underwear, and your co-workers are none the wiser.” (Website)*

**Engagement methods:**

Driven to Drive Less engages residents with the following tactics:

- **A website** where residents could sign a pledge to leave their cars at home one day a week. It also provides resources to give people information about public transportation, biking, walking, carpooling and telecommuting. **Social media** including Facebook and Twitter continue the conversation and provide similar resources to visitors.
- **Incentives** like discounts at participating businesses for taking the pledge and chances to win prizes.
- **Public advertising** encouraging residents to join the campaign and take the pledge.

**Asks:**

- Make a pledge to leave your car at home one day a week.

**Metrics:**

Driven to Drive Less surveyed participants at the beginning and end of the program on their driving habits.

**Outcomes:**

Based on the survey results, Boulder reported that, on average, Driven to Drive Less participants reduced their driving distance by 15.5 miles a week -- or more than 800 miles a year. Participants reported a combined 38 percent drop in single-occupant vehicle trips to work or school while bike commuting increased 44 percent and transit use increased 27 percent.

**Recharge Colorado – Colorado**

<http://rechargecolorado.org/>

**About:**

The Recharge Colorado program was established in 2010 through funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). As of February 2012, the program's funding expired. To continue the momentum from the campaign, Recharge Colorado became an independent nonprofit dedicated to providing resources to promote energy efficiency, water efficiency and renewable energy projects in Colorado.

**Funders and Partners:**

Recharge Colorado began as a product of ARRA funding and was guided by an advisory committee made up of representatives from the Governor's Energy Office (GEO), the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), municipal utilities, nonprofits, energy service companies, consumer advocates and the Treasurer's office.

**Audiences:**

- Homeowners
- Businesses
- Contractors/retailers

**Messages:**

Recharge Colorado appealed to homeowners, businesses and contractors by focusing on cost-savings and the role they can play in achieving the state's conservation goals:

*"There's no doubt about it. The choices you make at home can lead to significant savings—in energy and money." (Website)*

*"Colorado businesses and public institutions have numerous opportunities to save money by cutting energy use and reducing peak demand by implementing low cost tips, making wise investments and taking advantage of available incentives and rebates. By visiting this site, you have already taken the first step towards saving money by actively seeking out cost-effective ways to reduce your energy use. Let us help guide you through how to get started and the best places to look for savings opportunities. Explore the following links to find more information on how your business can save." (Website)*

*"At Recharge Colorado, we know that contractors and retailers are vital to helping Coloradoans use energy more efficiently. Contractors help homeowners, businesses and other entities complete energy efficiency and renewable energy projects throughout the state." (Website)*

**Engagement methods:**

Recharge Colorado engages its target audiences with the following tactics:

- **A website** with resources for homeowners, including information on energy audits, energy saving tips, weatherization, rebate applications and the Energy Star program. The website also features a section for businesses that includes an energy cost calculator and energy saving tips for their buildings, lighting, HVAC, equipment, refrigeration, commercial food equipment and vehicles. For contractors, it offers information on how to make sure their customers can become more energy efficient and receive incentives. Recharge Colorado also utilizes **social media** like Facebook and Twitter to provide similar resources.

**Asks:**

- Learn how to make energy savings a simple part of your everyday lives, as homeowners, businesses and contractors.

**Metrics:**

Recharge Colorado monitors its website traffic and the number rebate applications to measure engagement with its target audiences.

**Outcomes:**

Recharge Colorado reports that its website averaged 34,000 visitors per month with more than 45,000 rebates issued since April 2010.

**RecycleNOW Philadelphia – Philadelphia, PA**

<http://www.recyclenowphila.org/index.html>

**About:**

RecycleNOW Philadelphia is a campaign created in 2005 by the Recycling Alliance of Philadelphia. It is a coalition of organizations and individuals in Philadelphia working to expand recycling efforts to improve the environment, economy and quality of life in Philadelphia.

**Funders and Partners:**

The Recycling Alliance of Philadelphia was founded in 2000, and describes itself as "a coalition of environmental, civic and business organizations and individuals allied to promote expanded recycling in Philadelphia to improve the environment, the economy and the quality of life in our City."

**Audiences:**

- Residents of Philadelphia
- Local government

**Messages:**

RecycleNOW Philadelphia primarily taps into residents' desires to help the environment through recycling, and protect the long-term health of the community and its residents:

*"Zero Waste is a goal that is both pragmatic and visionary, to guide people to emulate sustainable natural cycles, where all discarded materials are resources for others to use. Zero Waste means designing and managing products and processes to reduce the*

*volume and toxicity of waste and materials, conserve and recover all resources, and not burn or bury them. Implementing Zero Waste will eliminate all discharges to land, water or air that may be a threat to planetary, human, animal or plant health.” (Website)*

The campaign also applauds the commitment local government has made to its efforts:

*“Mayor Nutter deserves great credit for growing the Philadelphia recycling program through the great financial uncertainty of the past several years. In addition to the city’s budget crisis, recycling commodity markets had a crisis of their own. In 2008-2009, Philadelphia went from getting paid for every ton of recyclables, to having to pay to dispose of its recyclables. Though prices have since recovered, Nutter recognized that even in tough times recycling makes economic and environmental sense.” (The State of Philly Recycling – Winter 2012)*

### **Engagement methods:**

RecycleNOW Philadelphia employs primarily an online presence to engage with residents including a number of engagement methods such as the following:

- **A website** with information on the city’s recycling program and recycling events around the city as well as resources, including a one pager, on how to start a recycling program in their apartment, condominium or office community. It also features a petition visitors can sign in favor of an increased focus on recycling in the city. RecycleNOW Philadelphia also utilizes **social media** like Facebook and Twitter.
- **Individual support** from RecycleNOW on gathering tenant support and working with building management.

### **Asks:**

RecycleNOW Philadelphia makes several requests of its target audiences including:

- Get involved and spread the word at recycling events by becoming a “Waste Watcher.”
- Start a recycling program in your apartment community.
- Demand more recycling by being informed, enroll neighbors in the Philadelphia Recycling Rewards Program, talk to local government about the importance of recycling, and lead by example by helping to fight global warming and starting a compost.
- Ensure all residents have the information and bins they need to participate in the recycling program and enforce the law to make sure every apartment, condo, office, school, and civic building recycles.
- Make recycling gains permanent by appointing someone to the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee (SWRAC) that would advise the mayor of Philadelphia on solid waste policy.
- Submit an updated 10 year plan for recycling to SWRAC and update the city’s recycling ordinance to continue to make recycling the law and reflect present recycling trends.

### **Metrics:**

Metrics were not publically available for this campaign.

### **Outcomes:**

In its State of Philly Recycling report from Winter 2012, RecycleNOW Philadelphia reports that it has collected 12,000 petition signatures, spearheaded the city council hearing on recycling in February 2007 and “helped foster an unprecedented environmental awareness in city



government and politics.” It also notes that the City of Philadelphia reported a 17.97 percent curbside recycling rate at the end of the 2011 fiscal year.

## **Washington Case Studies**

### **In Motion – King County, WA**

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/InMotion/do-it-yourself.aspx>

#### **About:**

In Motion is a public campaign operated by King County Metro in King County, Washington designed to “help more people drive less.” Since 2003, King County Metro has been working to help residents learn about and choose sustainable travel options.

#### **Funders and Partners:**

In Motion has received funding from federal grants and local business sponsorships, and also relies on partnerships. It has received energy efficiency and conservation block grants as well as Federal Transit Administration money from the federal grant, and works with well-known local businesses that help with the marketing and visibility of the program. It has found it helpful to partner with businesses that many consumers identify with and leverage the business’ brand to promote its own campaign.

#### **Audiences:**

- Commuters

#### **Messages:**

In Motion taps into residents’ desire to save money and time, live healthier lifestyles and reduce pollution. They also appeal to their abilities to take small actions for the good of the entire community:

*“King County Metro Transit is partnering with local communities to encourage residents to use healthier travel options like the bus, carpooling, bicycling and walking. We know your life is very fast-paced, and Metro can show you faster travel alternatives that save you time and money. Reap the benefits of getting out of your car and explore other travel choices today! Every car trip we reduce benefits our health and environment.” (Website)*  
*“Help get your neighborhood IN MOTION this season - Leave Your Car Behind.”*  
*(Neighborhood Toolkit)*

*“If each of us does just a little more, it can add up to a healthier neighborhood.”*  
*(Neighborhood Toolkit)*

#### **Engagement methods:**

In Motion employs primarily an online presence to engage residents in its efforts including:

- **A website** with resources for drivers with tips and information on various travel options including public transportation, biking, walking, carpooling, car-sharing programs, traffic cameras and toolkits to help engage their neighborhoods in the campaign. The website features a calculator that helps commuters figure out the cost of their commute.

#### **Asks:**

- Drive less and spread the word on alternative transportation in your neighborhood.

**Metrics:**

In Motion tracks the success of its campaign through data supplied by consumers on its website. Since its campaign website encourages residents to report the trips they don't take over a two week period, it is able to pull this data and tell how many total trips were avoided and how much energy was saved. However, reporting is limited to a 10 to 16 week period and it is difficult to gauge more long-term behavior change.

**Outcomes:**

In Motion's website report several successes of the campaign including:

- 12,997 King County residents participated for an average of twelve weeks and reduced their single occupancy travel to save:
  - 2,547,364 miles
  - 196 miles per participant
  - 126,961 gallons of gas
  - 10 gallons of gas per participant
  - 1,245 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>
- Typical results for In Motion programs reported changes of 20% fewer drive-alone trips and corresponding increases in busing, biking, ridesharing and walking

**Seattle Recycling Campaign****About:**

From 1988 until 1991, Seattle piloted a public campaign to reduce the cost of trash disposal and increase voluntary household recycling enrollment. Not only did the campaign succeed in meeting these objectives, but it has become a highly-visible case study for other cities and received an Innovations in American Government Award from Harvard University in 1990. Although the campaign is older than the others reviewed here, it was cited as a good best practice in several stakeholder interviews.

**Funders and Partners:**

The campaign was completely funded by the Seattle Solid Waste Utility's solid waste customer rates and did not receive any outside funding sources.

**Audiences:**

- Single family households (Seattle's home-owning population was then about 390,000 people).<sup>1</sup>

**Messages:**

The campaign primarily tapped into families' desire to save money on trash collection. Previously, Seattle trash collection fees were based on the number of cans disposed. People who signed up for recycling could save money on their trash bill because recyclables were picked up for free and reduced the total amount of trash for paid pick up - even a second trash could cost Seattle residents \$108 a year for weekly pickup. The Seattle Solid Waste Utility developed materials that explained recycling with a fun tone, using a "Recyclettes" logo that

---

<sup>1</sup> Harvard University Kennedy School of Government, [Seattle Recycling Program](#)

depicted cans, newspapers and other recycling goods that looked liked munchkins walking along a green brick road – below is a billboard used during the campaign:



The Utility also developed the following recycling sign-up card:

RETURN RESPONSE CARD -- MUST BE RECEIVED BY NOVEMBER 18, 1988		POSTAGE PAID																			
<b>Rate and Service Selection</b>		<b>Check The Service Level You Want</b>																			
<p>Let us know the options you want</p> <input type="checkbox"/> No, I don't want Yard Waste Pick-up for \$2.00 per month. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I do want to sign up for curbside recycling and haven't already done so. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I want to charge stickers for extra garbage to my utility bill. Please send me an authorization card. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I am physically unable to take my garbage container to the curb/alley and do not have anyone to help me. Please contact me about an inspector appointment. Your current service level is indicated at the bottom of this card on the right side of the printed label. <b>If you don't return this card, you will receive curbside recycling collection at your present service level, and you will be billed \$2.00 per month for yard waste collection.</b> Printed On Recycled Paper.		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Container Size</th> <th>Curb/Alley Service</th> <th>Backyard Service</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mini-Can</td> <td>Two Month Rate</td> <td>Two Month Rate</td> </tr> <tr> <td>32 gallon (1 can)</td> <td>   \$21.40</td> <td>not available</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60 gallon (2 cans)</td> <td>   \$27.50</td> <td>   \$38.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>90 gallon (3 cans)</td> <td>   \$45.50</td> <td>   \$63.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>More than 90 gallons (give # of gallons)</td> <td>   \$63.50</td> <td>   \$88.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>For each additional 32 gallons above the 90 gallon size add \$18.00 for curbside/alley service, and \$25.20 for backyard service.</p> <p><b>MULTI-FAMILY:</b> Total service level requested _____            (Multi-family residences may have any number of cans at or above the number of households in that building. See Flyer.)</p> <p><b>PLEASE MAKE YOUR CHOICES CAREFULLY.</b></p>		Container Size	Curb/Alley Service	Backyard Service	Mini-Can	Two Month Rate	Two Month Rate	32 gallon (1 can)	\$21.40	not available	60 gallon (2 cans)	\$27.50	\$38.50	90 gallon (3 cans)	\$45.50	\$63.70	More than 90 gallons (give # of gallons)	\$63.50	\$88.90
Container Size	Curb/Alley Service	Backyard Service																			
Mini-Can	Two Month Rate	Two Month Rate																			
32 gallon (1 can)	\$21.40	not available																			
60 gallon (2 cans)	\$27.50	\$38.50																			
90 gallon (3 cans)	\$45.50	\$63.70																			
More than 90 gallons (give # of gallons)	\$63.50	\$88.90																			
		<b>Cart Size (Contractor-provided)</b> 																			
Name _____ Address _____		Signature _____ Daytime phone: _____ Date: _____																			
		<p>Seattle Solid Waste Utility            Division of Seattle Engineering Department            684-7600</p>																			
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">OFFICE USE ONLY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>  </td> <td>Auth card sent</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  </td> <td>Recycle sign-up done</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  </td> <td>Exempt appt. mace</td> </tr> <tr> <td>  </td> <td>78 Dr    79 Cr</td> </tr> <tr> <td>\$</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		OFFICE USE ONLY			Auth card sent		Recycle sign-up done		Exempt appt. mace		78 Dr    79 Cr	\$	_____						
OFFICE USE ONLY																					
	Auth card sent																				
	Recycle sign-up done																				
	Exempt appt. mace																				
	78 Dr    79 Cr																				
\$	_____																				

In addition, "please be patient" became an unofficial campaign tagline. The Utility told reporters that it would take six months for recycling to run smoothly and acknowledged that there would be some confusion and obstacles to work out before getting it right. Although there was media coverage of problems with the new system, because the Utility had developed a strong

relationship with reporters and had been up front about its imperfection, media coverage overall was not damaging. Even negative stories were usually accompanied by practical instructions and recycling guidelines that helped the public understand the new policies.

#### **Engagement methods/Communications:**

The recycling campaign's main communications activities were robust and sustained media outreach, focus groups with local opinion leaders, recruitment of community volunteers and materials' development and ad buys. The campaign spent \$375,000 a year on the campaign on external consultants, materials' development and bill inserts.

- **Media Outreach.** After working with a consulting firm to undertake market research on recycling, the Utility hired a public relations firm and a full-time in-house public relations professional for the agency to lead press outreach. The utility developed a well-organized and thorough media outreach strategy, starting with two days of media training for senior staff and a briefing for reporters before the campaign launch to explain logistical questions about recycling. Director Diana Gale and other senior staff also briefed the editorial boards of the city's two newspapers and spoke on radio shows. Senior staff also participated in personal newspaper profiles to show they were not "faceless bureaucrats." Once the campaign was underway, they continued to work with media to explain the new procedures to residents and report on how many families had signed up for recycling. One useful media tactic was tracking progress toward specific enrollment goals. For example, the Utility created a media opportunity around the family that helped the city reach the 50 percent enrollment mark by asking the mayor to deliver the recycling bin to the family.
- **Focus Groups with Opinion Leaders.** Months before launching the campaign and explaining specific recycling policies, the Utility organized a series of small group discussions with 150 decision makers outside of the government, including business representatives, community activists and media. These discussions were designed to create a more open and collaborative process for the project.
- **Community Volunteers.** The Utility also recruited community volunteers who went door to door to houses with materials to explain the recycling process.
- **Materials Development and Ad Buys.** The utility developed a series of print education materials, including brochures, door hangers, mailings and bill inserts and also purchased the following ads: TV, radio, newspaper, bus and billboards.

#### **Asks:**

- Sign up for free recycling to reduce your trash collection bill

#### **Metrics:**

The program tracked the amount of total trash that went to recycling and recycling enrollment rates. In addition, the program created an assessment tool based on an economic model from the electric industry. The Utility's "Recycling Potential Assessment" was one of the first government forecasts of garbage creation and waste. The tool was used to justify the cost of the public campaign, since it compared trash incineration costs against recycling.

#### **Outcomes:**

The program was hugely successful: 42 percent of all of the city's trash went to recycling bins and 90 percent of all single-family homes volunteered to participate in recycling.

<b>Impact of Mode Shifts on Fuel Consumption and Costs</b>
--

The campaign will want to quantify how different mode shifts impact energy use. While there are several ways to measure the impact on energy consumption, stakeholders suggested that fuel consumption is the most effective measure.

Fuel consumption will be an important internal metric, but when communicating with consumers, we recommend the campaign focuses on how much money can be saved from these mode shifts and identifies the behavioral changes people are most likely to make. Previous campaigns have successfully used tools to gather cost savings data and show people the benefit of their behavioral change so that they can feel good about their choices. Below is a selection of formulas and tools that can help calculate fuel and cost savings.

**Trip Chaining.** It is difficult to quantify the amount of energy that can be saved through trip chaining. Many people already combine trips but may not think of it as “trip chaining” and the amount of energy saved depends on the distance of destinations. However, according to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), combining three short trips into one trip every week could save 200 miles, 10 hours and 10 gallons of gas every year.<sup>2</sup> Beyond averages, it does not appear that there are any existing tools that allow drivers to easily plug in errands and calculate the amount of fuel they would save by joining trips.

However, several groups have developed lists of tips for drivers trying to combine multiple trips. For example, a trip chaining tip sheet from the Drive Less, Save More campaign can be found [here](#). Other groups have developed tip sheets to reduce fuel costs that include trip chaining, such as this [sheet](#) developed by the Drive Smarter Challenge. Additionally, Drive Less, Save More encourages consumers to use smart phone applications like [RedLaser](#) that allows users to search nearby for products they want to purchase to avoid traveling too far or visiting multiple stores before finding an item.

**Carpooling.** When people share similar work trips, carpooling can reduce fuel consumption and parking costs by 50 to 75 percent with 2 to 4 passengers per car. Vanpools with greater numbers of passengers can achieve further reductions.

There are several tools available for drivers to calculate cost savings associated with carpooling, including:

- [RideSearch](#) – Calculates the monthly cost of a driver’s commute based on the length of the commute, the vehicle’s MPG and the cost of parking, gas and vehicle depreciation per mile. RideSearch also has an [iPhone app](#).
- [Transportation Choices Coalition](#) – Calculates the monthly and yearly cost of a driver’s commute and shows the amount of money and energy that would be saved by carpooling, vanpooling, taking the bus, walking or biking (based on Seattle transit prices).
- [Commute Solutions](#) – Calculates the yearly cost of a driver’s commute based on commute distance, the vehicle’s MPG, the price the user pays for gas, estimated cost of owning the car, monthly car payments and the costs of parking. This tool does not calculate estimated savings from carpooling.
- [Drive Less. Connect.](#) – Calculates the monthly and yearly costs of a driver’s commute and compares that to the cost of a carpool with one other person and a vanpool with six other people.
- [Intercity Transit](#) – Calculates the monthly and yearly costs of a driver’s commute and estimates savings from carpooling with 1 to 3 people or using Intercity Transit, the local

---

<sup>2</sup> Federal Highway Administration, [Fact Sheet on Trip Chaining](#)

public transportation system. Also calculates the monthly CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with the driver's commute.

By making these (or similar) tools available to consumers the campaign can help consumers identify the real-world cost savings of rethinking their transportation options.

**Public Transit.** According to the American Public Transportation Association, the average commuter can save over \$10,000 per year by taking transit.<sup>3</sup> In Seattle, commuters using transit can expect to see annual savings of over \$12,000.<sup>4</sup> Governments can also save significant amounts of their transportation budgets by investing in public transit. Kamloops, British Columbia's TravelSmart program, has yielded substantial transportation savings through a combination of land use strategies, bicycle and pedestrian programs, improved transit and lower cost roadway improvements. The program has reduced planned road expenditures by 75 percent and significantly lowered energy consumption and emissions.<sup>5</sup>

### **Public Opinion on Mode Shifts**

While most program participants expressed interest in a campaign that promoted a range of alternative travel options, it will be important for the campaign to be aware of which transportation modes are the most appealing to different population segments. Anticipating barriers to specific mode shifts will be critical to develop strong messages that overcome these barriers. In addition, it will be important to recognize when a travel mode is not a viable option for some target audiences and tailor campaign communications so they do not promote that mode.

For commuters who live within a relatively short distance of their workplace in an area where walking and biking are feasible, many may choose these options. For those who drive, trip chaining, which requires the lowest amount of behavioral change and provides benefits in terms of cost and time, is probably the most feasible.

---

<sup>3</sup> American Public Transportation Association, [Money saved by consumers taking transit instead of driving in top 20 metro areas](#)

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> [Victoria Transport Policy Institute](#), TDM Encyclopedia, Least-Cost Planning

**Table 5 Demand Characteristics By Transit Mode (CTS 2009)**

Transit Service	Definition	Type of Rider	How Transit is Accessed	Trip Characteristics
Light-Rail Transit	Light rail between downtown and suburbs, with several stops	Mostly (62%) choice	Balanced between bus, walking, and park and ride	Home locations spread throughout the region; the average rider lives more than three miles from the line.
Express Bus	Express routes between downtown and suburbs	Primarily choice (84%)	About half park-and-ride (48%)	Home locations clustered at the line origin
Premium Express Bus	Express routes with coach buses	Almost exclusively choice (96%)	Mostly park and ride (62%)	Home locations clustered at the line origin
Local Bus	Serves urban and suburban areas with frequent stops	Mostly captive (52%)	Nearly all bus or walk (90%)	Home locations scattered along route; most riders live within a mile of the bus line

*Rail transit and express bus services tend to attract many discretionary users.*

When it comes to transit modes, local bus service is likely to be the least attractive option. As shown in the table above, over half of bus riders in North America feel forced into taking a standard, local bus, while rail transit and express bus services attract riders who have other transportation options. It may require more effort to persuade drivers to take local buses than to use other alternative modes.<sup>6</sup>

## Funding Opportunities

Based on the research, it is clear that the coalition will need broad funding support that brings together partners, foundations, public funding and corporations. As the campaign develops, its funding needs will change and may include additional opportunities for in-kind funding from additional partners.

While the campaign is in development, we recommend approaching foundation funders to support its strategic planning and building. There are a variety of local and national foundations (listed below) with grant portfolios closely aligned to the campaign direction.

### Potential Foundation Funders

Based on conversations with campaign participants and WSDOT, Spitfire has identified the following private foundations as prospective funders for a transportation, energy-efficiency campaign. Contact information for each foundation has been included in the attached spreadsheet.

#### **The Bullitt Foundation**

Based in Seattle, the Bullitt Foundation's [Urban Ecology program](#) aims to "promote progressive planning and smart growth" and to "build efficient and reliable transportation systems." This program seeks to expand existing transit-oriented development and smart growth leadership in Northwest cities.

<sup>6</sup> [Victoria Transport Policy Institute](#), Evaluating Public Transit As An Energy Conservation and Emission Reduction Strategy, November 2011

Since 1999, the Bullitt Foundation has consistently given grants to Transportation Choices Coalition to fund work on urban ecology and energy, industry, and technology in Washington state. Additionally, the foundation awarded grants to Citizens for Smart Growth to support a Livable Communities Program, a collaborative effort that consisted of community forums, a media outreach campaign and production of the Rural Guide to Informed Citizen Involvement.

### ***The Surdna Foundation***

The Surdna Foundation's Sustainable Environments program funds projects that improve transportation systems and encourages smart growth. According to the [program website](#), the Sustainable Environments program is interested in projects that "reduce automobile dependency through federal, state and regional policies which foster infrastructure investments that improve transportation networks, increase mobility and accessibility and reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions."

In 2011, the foundation approved two transportation grants in Washington state. The foundation gave Transportation Choices Coalition a \$75,000 grant to "support the 'Transportation for WA' campaign" – an initiative to secure new funding streams for more equitable transportation, sustainable communities and TOD project." Additionally, the foundation gave Climate Solutions a \$225,000 grant for "statewide coalitions in Washington and Oregon to establish cutting-edge transportation policies, critical solutions to climate change, develop models for implementation and engage in the national climate change and transportation debate."

### ***Fund for the Environment & Urban Life, The Oram Foundation, Inc.***

The Fund for the Environment & Urban Life believes that efforts to improve the environment must focus on how we live our daily lives. As such, the fund supports efforts that make the hard choices people have to make to improve the environment – such as the type and size of a person's home and what kind of cars and how many a family owns – a little easier. The fund currently focuses on sustainable urban development, which includes public transportation issues, transportation planning, traffic mitigation and livable communities.

The fund encourages organizations interested in receiving funding to become familiar with their [Advisory Board](#), which includes several members who have a background in the urban transportation field.

### ***The Seattle Foundation***

The Seattle Foundation strives to make grants that make the greater Seattle community "a vital and healthy place to live." The foundation is one of the nation's largest community foundations and is governed by a board of community leaders. The foundation's agenda, A Healthy Community, aims to support the environment, health and wellness, and neighborhoods and communities.

The foundation's [environmental grant making](#) strives to support efforts to restore and preserve Puget Sound, as well as educate the public about protecting the health of the Sound; support efforts that address environmental disparities, train workers for a clean economy, and foster efforts to engage youth through environmental education; educate the public on our impact on the environment; and support sustainable growth by bringing together many parties and varied interests across elements and sectors to create a livable region for decades to come.

In the past, the foundation has awarded grants to the Transportation Choices Coalition. The foundation has also supported Futurewise, a Washington group advocating for the development of smart growth policies in the state.



### ***The Rockefeller Foundation***

The Rockefeller Foundation's [Equitable, Sustainable Transportation program](#) focuses on six interconnected change levers that the foundation believes represent the pressure points for changing transportation policy in the United States.

One of these change levers is “building the internal capacity of state DOTs and metro planning organizations,” which includes helping state DOTs develop strategies to change transportation policy as well as practices, which aligns with SSTI’s goals for this campaign. Another one of the foundation’s change levers that aligns with the campaign is “encouraging sustainability and equity through market and consumer levers,” which includes investments by the foundation in efforts that identify and accelerate consumer preferences for affordable transportation options.

The Rockefeller Foundation also funds Transportation Choices and a collaboration with Futurewise , that seeks to increase transit funding, promote transit-oriented communities and reform transportation policy in Washington State. The Rockefeller Foundation also funds SSTI’s work.

### ***Boeing Charitable Trust***

Boeing Charitable Trust aims to reduce the environmental impact of its operations and invest in community-based programs that:

- Inspire environmental citizenship and educate citizens to minimize their impact on the environment;
- Reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, increase recycling and energy efficiency; and
- Protect and restore critical natural assets and habitat.

From 2009 to 2011, Boeing invested \$20 million to help communities reduce their environmental impact. As part of this effort, Boeing provided grants to a program called “Inside the Outdoors NSI: Nature Scene Investigators” in Southern California, which provides low cost, hands-on environmental education programs that teach students about environmental stewardship.

In keeping with the program goals listed above, Boeing has invested in programs that seek to increase recycling and/or reduce waste. For example, Boeing funds [ResourceFull Use](#), which provides manufacturers with workshops and web-based tools to access resource needs and exchange resources so that the waste of one organization becomes an input for another.

In addition to Boeing’s environmental efforts, Boeing also supports two educational programs at IslandWood, a 255-acre (103-hectare) outdoor environmental learning center on Puget Sound, Washington. One of the projects, Homewaters, is an urban environmental science program that provides students with engaging, hands-on science investigations within walking distance of their classroom.

### ***Northwest Fund for the Environment***

The Northwest Fund for the Environment’s [Growth Management Program](#) promotes smart growth land use policies to prevent damage to environmentally sensitive areas that are threatened by development, climate change impacts and the weakening of existing environmental laws and regulations. The program encourages community-driven land use planning and management within the State of Washington, promotes land use practices that reduce impacts, increases the effectiveness of citizen advocates to implement smart growth policies and supports compliance with growth management in state laws.

Northwest Fund for the Environment's grantees promote the protection and preservation of natural resources in the State of Washington. For example, they recently awarded a grant to The Lands Council in 2011 for its Washington Beaver Recovery Plan. In addition, the Lands Council works on an Urban Ecology program that promotes smart growth, progressive transportation planning, ecologically-sensitive urban design, toxics outreach and education, and sustainability. The Northwest Fund for the Environment also supports Futurewise, a Washington group that advocates for smart growth policies.

In 2011, Northwest Fund for the Environment funded two Puget Sound projects, including Friends of the Earth's Puget Sound Clean Vessels Program, which augmented the group's work to ensure that vessels operating in Puget Sound use clean energy, and the Puget SoundKeeper Alliance, which supports the Stormwater Regulation and Clean Water Act Enforcement Program.

### ***The Energy Foundation***

The Energy Foundation's [Transportation Program](#) makes grants that promote "innovative federal and state policies that reduce global warming pollution from vehicles, encourage low-carbon fuels, and discourage high-carbon fuels." According to the foundation's [list of past grantees](#), the program has provided funding for at least one campaign in the past; from 2009 to 2011 the foundation funded the Sierra Club Foundation's Dirty Fuels Campaign, which promoted administrative policies that deterred high-carbon fuels and encouraged low-carbon fuels.

The Energy Foundation does not support local projects unless they "have been consciously designed for further replication or have broad regional or national implications." While the majority of the programs they fund are regional or national in scope, they have also funded state-wide programs, but have not supported work that was more localized. As a result, a proposal to the Energy Foundation to support the campaign should focus on how the campaign will be alternated and scaled up across Washington state, as well as the potential for replication in other states.

### **Potential Public Grants**

As part of our research into partnership opportunities, Spitfire researched potential ways for the campaign to partner with and/or receive funding from government institutions. Spitfire found that although opportunities for public funding exist, public funding is a less reliable funding source than foundation grants, and will probably be harder to attain. The findings from this research are presented below in two categories. The first section includes a program that is currently being funded, while the second includes programs that are not currently being funded or are not currently accepting applications, but provide examples of the type of funding that could be a good fit for the campaign. The campaign should keep programs in the second category in mind and monitor government funding websites to identify similar programs that may develop.

### **Current Programs**

#### ***Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program***

##### ***U.S. Federal Highway Administration***

According to [Smart Growth America](#) (SGA), federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding may be used by states to support smart growth projects. The CMAQ program provides support for transportation projects such as improvement of public transportation and reductions in vehicle travel and traffic congestion. According to the [Federal Highway](#)

[Administration](#), the original goal of the CMAQ program, which was established in 1991, was to “support surface transportation projects and other related efforts that contribute air quality improvements and provide congestion relief.”

The federal government allocates a minimum of 0.5% of CMAQ funds to each state. Washington state receives additional funding due to three of the state’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations’ classification as maintenance areas for ozone or carbon monoxide. According to WSDOT’s [2010-2015 CMAQ funding allocations document](#), the vast majority of the state’s funding has been directed to the Central Puget Sound MPO, so there may be an opportunity to leverage CMAQ funding for this program.

## **Potential Future Opportunities**

### ***U.S. Department of Energy: Energy Efficiency and Conservation Program***

As part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the U.S. Department of Energy began awarding Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants (EECBG), which were designed to assist state and local governments reduce fossil fuel emissions and total energy use, and improve energy efficiency in the transportation and building sectors.

The [EECBG website](#) says that applications for these grants closed in 2009. The grant is not listed as a current opportunity on grants.gov, the government’s official site for identifying grant opportunities, thus it does not appear that the program has been reauthorized. However, this is the type of opportunity that the campaign should consider, should funding become available again.

### ***Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program***

#### ***U.S. Federal Highway Administration***

The goal of the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Program is to “investigate the relationships between transportation, community, and system preservation plans and practices and identify private sector based initiatives to improve such relationships.” State and local governments are eligible for grants that integrate transportation, community and system preservation plans and practices that improve the efficiency of transportation systems, reduce the environmental impacts of transportation and reduce the need for costly future public infrastructure developments, among other things.

The deadline for applying for FY2012 TCSP grants was January 6, 2012 and the program’s authorization expired on March 31, 2012. If the program is reauthorized, the campaign should consider applying for a TCSP grant. Information about the TCSP program can be found [here](#).

## **Corporate Social Responsibility Opportunities – Oil Companies**

As part of our research into potential campaign partnerships, Spitfire researched the Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programs of three major oil companies: Royal Dutch Shell (and the Shell Foundation), BP and ExxonMobil. Although none of these companies have programs that represent a direct overlap with the transportation energy efficiency campaign, all three companies have programs or agendas that, broadly speaking, may provide an opportunity for partnership. The findings from this research are presented below.

### ***Royal Dutch Shell***

Shell’s CSR initiatives fall into three categories: environment, society, safety and performance data. Below is an example of Shell’s CSR work that may be relevant to the campaign:

### ***The Great Energy Challenge***

In 2011, Shell [announced](#) support for the [Great Energy Challenge](#), a website run by the U.S. National Geographic Society that helps people learn more about energy and how they can reduce the amount of energy they use. According to National Geographic's [website](#) about the initiative, the organization maintains autonomy over the Great Energy Challenge website content, despite the partnership with Shell. Visitors to the website can calculate their energy use and then see how changing behavior will save energy. The website also hosts the latest energy news and other interactive web content, such as quizzes and a map that shows visitors where the world gets its power.

In a [statement](#) by the company on the Great Energy Challenge website, Shell said that finding ways to “harness energy sources in a clean, safe, and sustainable way” is one of the defining challenges of our age, and through this and other initiatives, Shell is “doing its part to meet the world’s growing energy demand in a responsible way.”

### ***The Shell Foundation***

The Shell Foundation, launched by Royal Dutch Shell in 2000, focuses on global development and environmental challenges linked to the impact of energy and globalization. The foundation has a range of program goals, but the one most relevant to the campaign aims to help provide modern energy and infrastructure services to the poor.

The Shell Foundation is based in London, and their programs all seek to solve issues that are mostly confined to developing countries, such indoor air pollution caused by biomass-burning stoves and unreliable access to energy. Furthermore, the descriptions of these programs on the foundation’s website explicitly link these programs in developing countries, and never mention grantmaking in the developed world. As a result, Spitfire doesn’t see the foundation as a potential partner for the campaign, but has included an example of transportation related grantmaking.

### ***EMBARQ***

EMBARQ, a network that seeks to catalyze and help implement environmentally and financially sustainable transportation solutions to improve the quality of life in cities, was founded in 2002 with an initial \$7.5 million investment from the Shell Foundation. EMBARQ works to combat the problems associated with sprawling urban expanses in the developing world, which create traffic congestion and smog pollution that disproportionately impact the urban poor.

According to the Shell Foundation, EMBARQ brings together government, businesses, civil society and transportation experts to create beneficial public-private partnerships. For example, in Mexico City, EMBARQ helped develop Metrobus, which carries more than 315,000 people a day and has helped reduce travel times and pollution in the city. Although the organization’s website mentions a program in Washington, D.C., where it is headquartered, the majority of the organization’s programs are concentrated in the developing world.

### ***BP***

Since the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, BP’s CRS has focused on rebuilding the Gulf of Mexico and people’s trust in BP. Last year, the company outlined three CSR-related goals: safety must be enhanced; trust earned back; and greater value delivered to BP’s shareholders.

### ***Global Climate Change***

BP's 2011 Sustainability Report highlights the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's finding that the climate system is warming as a result of increasing greenhouse gas emissions and increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. The company's report includes a number of steps it has taken to reduce the impact of climate change, including incorporating carbon pricing into its projects, developing efficient fuels and lubricants and stressing efficiency in its operations. The report also mentions that creating solutions for climate change will require public and private entities to work together, which may present an opportunity for partnership.

### ***Energy Sustainability Challenge***

The [Energy Sustainability Challenge](#) (ESC) is a research program that aims to understand how pressure on sources of freshwater and increasing competition for land and minerals will influence energy production technologies. BP is funding this coalition of 13 universities around the world as they investigate the effects of natural resource scarcity on patterns of energy supply and consumption. The coalition includes several U.S. universities, such as Stanford University, Berkeley University and Princeton.

### ***ExxonMobil***

ExxonMobil's CSR work focused on improving education in the fields of technology, engineering, math and science and for programs that improve economic outcomes for women; these programs are concentrated in developing countries and thus are not relevant to the campaign. Similarly, ExxonMobil's has a record of partnering with governments, however none of the case studies represented on the page are from the U.S.

### ***Global Climate Change***

ExxonMobil seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by increasing energy efficiency in the short-term, implementing emission-reducing technologies in the near and medium-term and developing breakthrough technologies in the long-term. ExxonMobil has already taken a number of steps toward investing in long-term research that has transformative potential. For example, in 2002 the company became a founding sponsor of the Global Climate and Energy Project at Stanford University. This research project is focused on identifying breakthrough technologies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and could be developed on a large scale in a 10 to 50 year timeframe. Aligning with ExxonMobil's long-term energy reduction goals may be a stretch, but we believe it represents the best opportunity for partnering with an oil company.

## **Recommendations**

Based on the above findings, lessons learned and best practices, Spitfire recommends the group considers the following recommendations to develop its transportation energy efficiency campaign:

- **Target Puget Sound residents with access to one or more alternative transportation options.** Within this broad audience, suggested segments include:
  - Urban residents who frequently take public transit
  - Commuters who take public transit for work but not for leisure
  - Suburban dwellers whose main transportation option is a personal car
  - Retired residents
  - Families with children
  - Local employers
  - Local businesses

The campaign can work with a variety of influencers, including employers and businesses, to reach this target audience.

- **Focus campaign messages on consumer benefits, and tailor materials to the campaign’s target audiences.** All outreach from the campaign should be informative in tone and highlight the benefits to consumers – particularly cost savings – rather than focusing on the benefits to the environment. Materials should be tightly tailored for each audience segment and include tools that help the consumers understand how taking the suggested actions will help them save money and give them more options to get where they need to go.
- **Engage a wide variety of partners from different sectors to help the campaign reach a larger, broader audience.** In addition to working with the “usual suspects”, including local governments, businesses, transportation agencies and environmental organizations, Washington’s campaign should seek out allies at colleges and universities, energy companies, public utilities and even car rental companies to both help spread the word and get involved in the campaign’s efforts.
- **Create a user-friendly website to provide resources on transportation options and help consumers know how they can get involved in the campaign.** For example, the website should provide information on how the bus system works, the locations and times for bus stops and provide a place travelers can go if they have questions or trouble navigating the system. It should also highlight the benefits of participation, using tools such as a trip calculator that provides them with instantaneous information on the costs and benefits of taking one form of transportation over another.
- **Start with small, easily achievable “asks.”** Of the featured case studies, only one – Driven to Drive Less in Boulder, Colorado -- focused on the lofty goal of achieving a “car-light culture”. Even then, the campaign tempered its request and first asked residents to give up their car for one day a week. Most of the case studies emphasized the ease of the actions they were asking participants to undertake. One campaign, Commute Solutions in Austin, Texas, anticipated the audience’s barriers to action by explicitly letting participants know “*You don’t have to ditch your car. You don’t have to take the bus every day. No one will require you to ride a bike.*” Similarly, Washington’s campaign should be prepared to address these challenges and build on small asks to increase participation.
- **Provide realistic travel options.** For example, commuters who live in suburban areas are less likely to be able or want to take the bus. The campaign should point to a variety of ways that travelers can save energy if they change their transportation behavior. The campaign should recognize that all travel modes are not viable for everyone and tailor campaign communications so they promote appropriate transportation modes for each population segment.
- **Identify the most pressing need for the campaign’s initial success (e.g., web development, a campaign manager, etc.) and target a foundation funder with that specific ask.** Involving funder(s) early in the planning process engages them as a partner and helps build a mutually beneficial relationship.

Aligned with these recommendations, Spitfire suggests the following campaign concept:

**Objective:** Raise public understanding about the variety of transportation options available to Puget Sound residents and increase the use of transportation alternatives including trip chaining, car/van pooling, use of public transit and walking/biking.

Behavior change will be measured by:

- Before and after opinion polling
- Use of the campaign's online tool kit
- Online resident self reporting
- Increased public transit use (will need pre-campaign baselines)
- Increased public demand for alternative transportation such as vanpools, bike racks, and bike lanes and walking routes (will need pre-campaign baselines)

**Target Audience:** Puget Sound residents with access to one or more alternative transportation options. Subsets of this audience include:

- Urban residents who frequently take public transit
- Commuters who take public transit for work but not for leisure
- Suburban dwellers whose main transportation option is a personal car
- Retired residents
- Families with children
- Local employers
- Local businesses

**Campaign Name:** Puget Sound Navigator

**Tagline:** Getting you where you need to go for less

**Campaign elements:** Campaign website featuring tools that help consumers map out travel routes for trip chaining, find carpool opportunities, determine the best public transit options, locate bike lanes and racks, and calculate their cost savings compared to doing the same activities to driving a personal vehicle. (Most of these tools are available through coalition members – campaign website will bring them all to a single online location.) Ideally, the campaign will build a mobile site or app that makes these resources available to residents while they're on the go.

Website will allow users to sign up to track their progress over time and provide feedback and praise for their efforts. Campaign partners could offer incentives for achieving significant progress.

Campaign can partner with local businesses and events (e.g., conventions, festivals, etc.) to create custom maps, include alternative transportation options to businesses and event websites (e.g., take the light rail – we're located a block from the ballpark stop).

The campaign can use traditional media, social media, outreach to community groups and partnerships with local businesses to promote the campaign. The campaign can explore partnerships with local employers.

**Potential Partners/  
Fundors:**

During the campaign's development, we recommend engaging partners in the Puget Sound region who are currently working on transportation and environmental efforts. These include many of the existing coalition members and other aligned groups – particularly those focused on non-urban communities within the Puget Sound. In this phase, we suggest targeting foundation funders such as The Bullitt Foundation and the Seattle Foundation who may be willing to support the development of campaign messaging and the creation of the campaign's website.

Once the campaign development is underway, we suggest expanding the partner base to include local employers and businesses that can join campaign efforts by giving their employers and consumers resources to take alternative transportation to reach them and can support the campaign through funding and in-kind contributions.



## Next Steps

Following up on the transportation energy efficiency education campaign meeting at WSDOT on May 24, this memo outlines key discussion points, decisions and next steps for your review.

Prior to the May 24 meeting, Spitfire conducted a series of research activities including conducting stakeholder interviews with key organizations in the coalition and throughout the state, developed case studies outlining energy efficiency campaigns in Washington and other states and identified potential campaign funding sources. Using this information, WSDOT drafted a campaign concept memo for the coalition to review and react to during the meeting.

## Key Decisions

When reviewing the campaign concept memo, members of the coalition shared concerns that current capacity constraints and the lack of a long-term funding source made it difficult to build a broad scale public outreach campaign around transportation energy efficiency. Without dedicated campaign staff, they felt that the challenges of refining the campaign concept and cultivating the needed partners and funders were beyond their current staff capacity.

Based on these factors, the coalition determined that building a stand-alone transportation efficiency campaign is not advisable at this time. Throughout the state, a diverse group of networks including local transportation agencies, affinity groups, commuter service providers and others are already working with local constituencies to educate consumers about transportation options, help ease local transportation concerns and support the use of a variety of transportation alternatives. At the same time, WSDOT and other groups are working in communities throughout the state to develop programs and share tools and technologies to provide safe, energy efficient transportation options.

By tapping into these networks and building on the existing programs, tools and technologies, the coalition determined it could achieve its goal of educating and encouraging Washingtonians to make energy efficient transportation choices within the current capacity and funding constraints. However, there is a need to focus this effort to meet WSDOT's most pressing needs, while operating within WSDOT's and their partners' constraints.

## Phase 2 Provide a strong foundation for energy-efficient transportation

Given the approach identified above, the next phase of this effort should focus on advancing WSDOT's Moving Washington approach with a focus on corridors. Moving Washington represents the state's framework for making transparent, cost-effective decisions that keep people and goods moving and support a healthy economy, environment and communities. Managing demand exemplified through strategies like increasing vehicle occupancy and transit ridership, shifting trips away from peak hours, helping people live closer to work and pricing travel and parking; is an integral part of this framework.

The education/outreach campaign for phase 2 of this effort will build on phase 1 work, and will be developed by incorporating input from WSDOT staff and our partners in the collaborative on how WSDOT can more successfully advance Moving Washington along our corridors.

Phase 2 of this effort will answer the following:

- To improve our state's transportation energy efficiency and support Moving Washington, how can WSDOT staff (in planning, public transportation, communications, highways and local programs, etc.) use both internal and external outreach and education to more fully plan and implement demand management strategies along Moving Washington corridors?
- As part of corridor planning and project development, how can WSDOT staff and our partners build upon our existing demand management infrastructure and networks?
- How can this Phase 2 effort help WSDOT be better prepared to respond to changing conditions and threats to the operation of our transportation system (e.g., increases in population and employment with little expansion in transportation infrastructure, increasing fuel prices, etc.)?

## Phase 2 Tasks

To develop phase 2 of the outreach effort, the following tasks are recommended:

- Obtain input from WSDOT staff and partners on barriers to more fully implementing demand management strategies along key transportation corridors to better support Moving Washington.
- Identify existing networks within the state that can be more fully utilized to promote and advance transportation options. For each network, identify:
  - Which audiences the network engages (demographics and geographies)
  - What audiences the network would like to engage if they were to expand their efforts
  - What infrastructure, messaging and strategic approaches the network uses to provide services and communicate with its audiences
  - The capacity of each network – strengths and limitations
  - What support and resources the network would need to more fully improve energy-efficient transportation on a Moving Washington corridor?
- Review existing tools and technologies that help consumers explore transportation options to determine:
  - What tools and technologies are currently available?
  - Who has access to the tools and technologies?
  - How well do the tools work for key audience? What improvements are needed?
  - Are additional tools needed?
- Explore additional related efforts in Washington State, including:
  - Past campaigns that no longer exist to determine strengths and challenges
  - Short term campaigns that successfully engage one or more of the networks identified above (e.g. 520 Tolling roll out)
- Focus group research about values and motivations (Puget Sound Regional Counsel conducted groups)
- Expand the work done in phase one to examine and document previous efforts to market energy efficient transportation in Washington State, including:
  - Past and ongoing campaigns (Wheel Options/Oil Smart; Relax. There's More Than One Way To Get There; SmartTrek; etc.)
  - Short-term campaigns that exemplify the Moving Washington approach (SR 520 Urban Partnership/tolling launch; Alaskan Way Viaduct construction traffic management, I-405 corridor)
  - Existing market research

- Explore current WSDOT programs and other opportunities to engage the networks identified above to support transportation energy efficient options along Moving Washington corridors, such as JARC grants, GTEC, Mainstreet programs, Walk Score, etc.
- What are some of the possible/likely threats to the operation of our transportation system in the near to mid-term (e.g., inability to expand capacity to meet increasing demand, revenue shortfalls even to properly maintain the system, increasing energy prices, etc.)? How does better outreach and education to advance Moving Washington also better prepare the state to respond to future events such as population/employment increases, gas price increases, etc.?

Based on this research, the coalition will be able to refine it's audience targets and prioritize the networks that can best engage those audiences to better advance Moving Washington.

<b>Timeline</b>
-----------------

We recommend the following timeline for the next six months.

June/July:

- Identify additional WSDOT staff to engage (along with existing partners)
- Identify existing networks, infrastructure, and partnerships
- Identify existing tools and technologies
- Determine which WSDOT programs can be leveraged
- Research other Washington state related efforts and their effectiveness

August/September:

- Conduct analysis of existing networks, partnerships and infrastructure
- Conduct tools and technology review
- Analyze additional related Washington state efforts
- Obtain input from WSDOT staff and partners in the collaborative effort.

October/November:

- Match current networks to priority audiences for Moving Washington corridors
- Prioritize networks for outreach
- Identify additional tools, technologies, and partnerships needed (or improvements to existing tools and technologies and partnerships)
- Obtain input from WSDOT staff and partners in the collaborative effort.
- Develop a guidebook for how WSDOT staff in planning, public transportation, communications, highways and local programs can use both internal and external outreach and education to more fully plan and implement demand management strategies along Moving Washington corridors.

## Appendix A: Original Stakeholder Interview Discussion Guide

1. Have you seen other public campaigns designed to reduce transportation energy use or encourage the use of alternative transportation options?
  - a. Where and when?
  - b. What kinds of outreach tactics were used? (i.e. social media, public service announcement, billboards or other ads, earned media)
2. Do you think these campaigns were successful?
  - a. What specifically worked/didn't work?
  - b. What can we learn from their challenges and successes?
3. Do you know if any of these campaigns partnered with local governments or developed any other partnerships to help fund, implement, and manage the campaign?
  - a. Any other creative approaches to partnership or funding?
  - b. Were these partnerships successful?
4. Which co-benefits did these campaigns highlight? (i.e. saving money, becoming more active and healthy, saving commute time by reducing congestion, preserving the environment, improving air quality, improving the local economy, etc.).
  - a. Do you think this type of messaging was successful?
  - b. Do you think these values would also resonate in Puget Sound/Washington?
    - i. If not, which ones would be more effective?
5. Which alternatives or strategies did these campaigns suggest?
  - a. Do you think Puget Sound/Washington drivers would consider these viable alternatives or strategies?
6. Overall, what do you think a successful public campaign to reduce transportation energy consumption or increase the use of alternative fuels or vehicles looks like?
7. In particular, how would this look in Puget Sound?
  - a. In other parts of Washington state?
8. Which audiences or demographic groups (either Puget Sound or statewide) do you think we need to win over in order to build broader support for reducing energy consumption?
  - a. What arguments for reducing driving and transportation energy use do you think would be most effective in winning over these groups?
9. What are the main barriers that a campaign in Puget Sound/Washington would need to overcome?
10. What ingrained consumer habits do you think we can influence with an education and outreach campaign? Do you think there are consumer habits that are too deeply ingrained to be influenced?
11. Is there anything else you think a collaborative partnership should keep in mind in developing a public campaign?

## Appendix B: Campaign and Funding Stakeholder Interview Discussion Guide

### *Background about organizations*

1. How was your coalition founded?
2. Who is in your coalition?
  - a. What role does each organization play?
  - b. What do they contribute?
3. How does your coalition select new projects/campaigns to try to launch? What criteria do you use?
  - a. Are you aware of any organizations in the Puget Sound region or statewide that might find a transportation energy efficiency outreach campaign to fit within their existing programming?

### *Funding and partnerships*

4. Based on your experience funding campaigns,
  - a. Which foundations do you believe might be most likely to support an outreach/education campaign focusing on improving transportation energy efficiency?
  - b. Which private companies?
  - c. Utility companies?
  - d. Which government grants?
5. What lessons have you learned about being successful in securing funding for your efforts?
6. What obstacles have you encountered in working collaboratively with funders/partners?

### *Outreach/Education Campaign:*

7. Can you describe some of your recent public awareness/education campaigns or advocacy work, if any?
  - a. What was the overall goal of the campaign?
  - b. Who did you target?
  - c. What messages did you use with these groups?
  - d. Are you happy with how the campaigns went?
  - e. Can you tell me about some of the successes? Failures?
8. Do you have any other suggestions about developing a public awareness/education campaign or partnering on campaigns?

## Appendix C: Full List of Featured Campaign Listed Partners

### **Commute Solutions – Austin, TX**

- Advanced Micro Devices
- Austin Community College
- Austin Energy
- Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Capital Area Council of Governments
- Capital Metro
- Car2GoCARTS
- Central Texas Clean Cities
- City of Austin
- CLEAN AIR Force
- Clean Air Partners
- Central Texas Regional Mobility Authority
- Downtown Austin Alliance
- Hertz
- Lower Colorado River Authority
- League of Bicycling Voters
- Safe Routes to School
- Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
- Texas Department of Insurance
- Travis County
- Texas Department of Transportation
- University of Texas at Austin

### **Drive Less, Save More – Portland, OR**

- Wells Fargo
- Intel
- UPS
- REI
- AAA Oregon
- Advantage Dry Cleaning Delivery Service
- Oregon Health and Science University
- Burgerville
- Funnelbox Motion Picture Studios
- Enterprise
- New Seasons Market
- Bike Gallery
- Ecodrycleaning
- Spud!

### **Driven to Drive Less – Boulder, CO**

- Noodles & Company
- KBO FM radio
- The Onion
- Downtown Boulder
- Backpacker

- eGo CarShare
- The Sink
- Pete's Electric
- Full Cycle
- Community Cycles
- 202 Cycling
- Massage Envy
- Go Boulder

**Power 2 Charlotte – Charlotte, NC**

- Bank of America
- Central Piedmont Community College (CPCC)
- Charlotte Center City Partners
- Charlotte Chamber of Commerce
- Clean Air Carolina
- Discovery Place
- Duke Energy
- Mecklenburg County
- Piedmont Natural Gas
- Sierra Club
- UNC Charlotte
- Wells Fargo/Wachovia