



WASHINGTON STATE ROAD USAGE CHARGE

*Steering Committee Report and Final WA
RUC Assessment Discussion*



Washington State
Transportation Commission

October 15, 2019
Olympia, Washington

WA RUC Assessment Report

Jeff Doyle
Project Manager
D'Artagnan Consulting

- WA RUC Steering Committee Report, Findings & Conclusions
- Possible WSTC Actions and Recommendations
- Update from Office of the State Treasurer on recent bond sales
- Possible RUC Transition Scenarios
- Opportunity for further public comment

WSTC Responses to Steering Committee Findings and Conclusions

Jeff Doyle
Project Manager
D'Artagnan Consulting

PROGRESS TO DATE

July 16, 2019: WSTC was briefed on Steering Committee findings and conclusions to date

September 10, 2019: Steering Committee provided tentative approval of their Final Report, subject to edits and final review by Committee members.

September 27, 2019: Steering Committee's report (and their findings and conclusions) was finalized; Steering Committee report was transmitted to WSTC on September 30, 2019.

Today:

- *What issues does WSTC want to weigh in* on for their WA RUC Assessment and Pilot Project Final Report with recommendations and/or options for the Governor and Legislature?
- *What additional information or analysis must be provided* so WSTC can consider and adopt the Final Report at the December 17, 2019 meeting?

FORMAT FOR TODAY'S DISCUSSION

[Issue of possible WSTC interest]:

- ✓ [Summary of key Steering Committee Findings or Conclusions] [Chapter cite for more info]

Result: [Practical effect of Finding or Conclusion]

Possible WSTC Actions: [Actions or Recommendations that WSTC could take]

R1 Recommendation #

A1 Action #

FD1 Forward Drive project element #

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Drivers participating in the year-long WA RUC Pilot test:

- ✓ Test drivers became more in favor of RUC over the gas tax throughout the year, with 68% of respondents preferring RUC over the gas tax (or preferred it equally to the gas tax) by the end of the pilot, while 19% preferred the gas tax. [Ch 7]

Result: RUC shows promise to earn drivers' acceptance over the gas tax. Actual experience with a RUC system improves user acceptance.

Possible WSTC Actions:

R1 - Recommend implementation options that allow RUC to gradually scale up, offering drivers an opportunity to try the system and recommend further improvements while RUC is still in an early-implementation stage.

KNOWN LIMITATIONS OF THE PILOT TEST

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Unknown impacts to certain vulnerable driver populations:

- ✓ Despite the pilot evaluation's focus on the user-pay dimension, the RUC Steering Committee recognizes that the concept of equity encompasses many other important dimensions, ranging from potential disparate impacts to lower-income populations, to whether all state drivers should be responsible for contributing to high-cost transportation facilities that primarily serve a single transportation corridor. [Ch 8]

Result: Additional research may be warranted to explore some of these other dimensions of equity.

Possible WSTC Actions:

A1 Per legislative direction, WSTC will develop a plan for assessing potential equity impacts of RUC on communities of color, low-income households, vulnerable populations, and displaced communities.

FD1 *Forward Drive* federal STSFA grant proposal would measure these equity impacts, develop potential mitigation measures, and if warranted, test mitigation measures in a limited-scale RUC test.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Other aspects of equity that should be considered in designing a WA RUC system:

- ✓ During Focus Group sessions and in other direct communications with the Project Team, some participants questioned why vehicle weight, emissions, and other factors they viewed as related to “fairness” of RUC weren’t factored into the pilot test rate.
- ✓ RUC can reflect transportation tax policy at a higher resolution than the gas tax. RUC can be customized to apply different rates based on the characteristics of the owner, or the vehicle, or how (or where) the vehicle is used. [Ch 9]

Result: RUC per-mile rates could be set to reflect other transportation, energy or environmental policy preferences.

Possible WSTC Actions:

R2 Conduct additional research (alone or in collaboration with other states) on differential RUC rates based on driver, vehicle, or infrastructure characteristics.

A2 Develop an illustrative scenario to show how RUC rates could vary based on vehicle weights and/or emissions ratings.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

RUC compliance and enforcement:

- ✓ Several ways of avoiding paying RUC were identified during a tabletop exercise. Measures were developed to minimize the occurrence or impact of RUC tax avoidance. However, more work is required in the area of compliance and enforcement before RUC can be widely-deployed as a replacement for the state's gas tax.
[Ch 6]

Result: Additional research and testing of RUC compliance and enforcement methods are required before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state's gas tax.

Potential WSTC Actions:

R3 - Conduct research in collaboration with other states implementing RUC to understand compliance gaps and potential enforcement measures.

R4 - Recommend additional time and appropriate testing grounds to improve RUC before pursuing a wider implementation.

R5 - In an Initial start-up stage of RUC, test compliance and enforcement mechanisms.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Concern about cost-of-collect for a statewide RUC system:

- ✓ Open-ended responses to survey questions as well as focus group discussions revealed that many drivers are concerned about the potential complexity and cost of a RUC system that would apply to all registered vehicles in Washington. Collecting the gas tax is a long-standing method of revenue collection that people are familiar with and has relatively low administrative overhead. Moving to a per-mile charge will require new reporting and payment systems, and participants had concerns about how this could be done most efficiently. [Ch 7]

Result: Improvements and testing of methods for most effectively and efficiently collecting RUC revenue must be undertaken before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state's gas tax.

Possible WSTC Actions:

FD2 The *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal will undertake a series of intense work sessions (“scrum”) with other RUC-implementing states to identify ways to reduce the cost of collections for RUC.

R6 Consider existing mechanisms (e.g., public-private partnerships) to most efficiently develop a RUC system that reduces the cost of collection.

R7 An Initial start-up stage of RUC can test cost reduction strategies on a limited set of vehicles.

ISSUES UNCOVERED THROUGH PILOT-TESTING

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Vulnerabilities with certain RUC mileage reporting methods:

- ✓ Technical, operational and legal measures must be in place to deter fraudulent mileage reporting before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state's gas tax. [Ch 3; Ch 11]

Result: More development and testing is needed for smartphone-based mileage reporting methods to reduce the possibility of fraudulent out-of-state mileage deductions.

Possible WSTC Actions:

Pursue improvements to MRMs and processes:

- **FD3** Continue development of smartphone-based mileage reporting (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant)
- **FD4** Explore new, simpler methods of mileage reporting, such as in-person mileage verification services (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant)
- Recommend additional time and appropriate testing grounds to improve RUC before pursuing a wider implementation (same as **R4**)

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Improvements in ease-of-use:

- ✓ The frequency, timing and wording of odometer image reporting reminders must be optimized to improve the participant experience while maximizing compliance. [Ch 6]
- ✓ WA RUC invoice is a vital communications tool. Invoice design should be further improved. [Ch 6]

Result: Additional research and testing of methods for properly collecting and allocating per-mile fee revenue is required before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state's gas tax.

Possible WSTC Actions:

Explore new, simpler methods of mileage reporting, such as in-person mileage verification services (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant). (same as *FD4*)

Recommend additional time and appropriate testing grounds to improve RUC before pursuing a wider implementation. (same as *R4*)

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Border-area issues related to RUC:

- ✓ The interconnection between Washington and other states (especially in the greater Portland- Vancouver metropolitan area) presents unique challenges to implementing a RUC system where road payments are paid in fair amounts and remitted to the proper jurisdiction [Ch 1; Ch 6]

Result: Additional research and testing of methods for properly collecting and allocating per-mile fee revenue is required before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state's gas tax.

Possible WSTC Actions:

Increase testing of Mileage Reporting Methods (MRMs) with special focus on cross-border and interoperability issues:

- **R8** Include border-area testing in an Initial start-up stage of RUC.
- **FD5** *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal: test new-and-improved MRMs that are more effective for reporting RUC mileage for frequent cross-border travelers.

R9 Engage with ODOT's OReGO program to explore bi-state RUC solutions for frequent WA-OR travelers.

ENHANCEMENTS FOR NEXT WA RUC PROTOTYPE

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Privacy:

- ✓ The Steering Committee identified gaps in the legal protections for personal privacy in a RUC system. For example, current state law does not specifically exempt RUC mileage data from public disclosure laws. The Steering Committee considered a model privacy policy that could be used to craft appropriate privacy protections in any RUC enabling legislation. At minimum, RUC mileage data should be granted similar privacy protections that currently exist for the state's tolling program, where information related to roadway use and payments are exempt from public disclosure. [Ch 8]

Result: extend privacy protections that already exist in state law for tolling to RUC.

Possible WSTC Actions:

- R10** Recommend specific changes in Washington statutes that protect personal privacy in a RUC program.
- R11** Test new personal privacy protections during an Early-Adoption stage of RUC.
- R12** Leverage public agency vehicles as test subjects for privacy protection testing.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Interoperability with other states:

- ✓ A RUC Interoperability HUB is a simple, effective way to achieve interstate and international interoperability for distance-based road usage charge systems. [Ch 6]

Result: Continue to develop the WA RUC HUB (or a similar multi-jurisdictional system) in collaboration with other states that are implementing RUC.

Possible WSTC Actions:

FD6 As part of the *Forward Drive* federal project, specifically consider the WA RUC Interoperability HUB (or similar) in collaboration with other states as part of the Reducing RUC Cost-of-Collections workshops

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Administration and Oversight of RUC:

- ✓ A RUC system in Washington can be delivered and operated without creating a new agency. The Washington State Department of Licensing (DOL) would likely take lead role in implementation, while the Legislature may opt to direct the Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) to maintain policy oversight of the new system during a transitional period. [Ch 9]

Result: Roles in implementing a RUC system would remain comparable to how RUC has been investigated and tested since 2012, with the Legislature providing overall policy direction and parameters; WSTC providing policy oversight and reporting back to the Legislature; and DOL and private vendors implementing RUC.

Possible WSTC Actions:

R13 During a transitional period while the gas tax remains in place, retain the same policy-setting and oversight roles between the Legislature, WSTC, and other agencies and the private sector.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Compatibility with other public policies:

- ✓ Another advantage RUC holds over the gas tax is the ability to more narrowly craft roadway tax policy so that it is compatible with other public policies. RUC can be customized to apply different rates based on the characteristics of the owner, or the vehicle, or how the vehicle is used. This level of customization is not feasible under the state gas tax. [Ch 9]

Result: RUC is more flexible in its ability to harmonize with (or reflect) other public policy goals.

Possible WSTC Actions:

A3 Develop example scenario(s) to illustrate how RUC could be tailored to reflect additional public policy goals, such as heavy vehicle impacts to pavement, emissions by vehicle type, rate differentials for low-income or other populations, etc.

ISSUES AFFECTING POSSIBLE TRANSITION TO RUC

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Restrictions on the use of RUC revenue:

- ✓ As directed, the Steering Committee examined RUC as a potential replacement for the gas tax. The Committee took no position on other potential uses of RUC revenue. [Ch 9]
- ✓ To most closely replicate the features of the gas tax it would eventually replace, RUC should be designed, implemented and the proceeds expended subject to Amendment 18 of the Washington State Constitution (i.e., limited to highway purposes). [Ch 9]

Result: If intended to replace the current gas tax, RUC would most closely replicate the gas tax's advantages as a funding mechanism if RUC is made subject to Amendment 18.

Possible WSTC Actions:

A4 Provide analysis to the Legislature on the fiscal, legal and policy implications of reducing or repealing the state's gas tax and replacing it with RUC.

A5 Provide the Legislature with various options for how RUC could be designed and implemented in a manner that places the revenue under Amendment 18 provisions of the Washington State Constitution.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Participants' advice to elected officials based on their year-long experience with WA RUC:

- ✓ When asked for their advice to elected officials as they consider the next steps in implementing a road usage charge system statewide, 61% said move forward with RUC implementation, either immediately or to be phased in over a 5 to 10 year period; 28% said move forward but apply RUC more narrowly, such as requiring high-mileage vehicles like hybrids and/or plug-in electric vehicles to pay; 10% said take no further action on RUC. [Ch 7]

Result: A large majority of participants favored some form of RUC implementation, although opinions varied on how quickly a transition should happen.

Possible WSTC Actions:

A6 Develop specific RUC transition options for legislative consideration that reflect the three scenarios favored by drivers.

A7 Of the scenarios developed, identify the most promising option(s) and the parameters for transitioning to RUC for legislative consideration.

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Transition approach:

- ✓ RUC cannot fully replace the state's gas tax until all outstanding bonds that pledged the gas tax have been paid off or restructured. The soonest this could happen would be 10 years, while the longer time horizon is 25 years. [Ch 9]
- ✓ One advantage to keeping the state's gas tax in place during a transitional period is that the gas tax provides a simple way to collect money from out-of-state drivers who use Washington's roadways. [Ch 9]
- ✓ For practical and legal reasons related to already-issued motor vehicle fuel tax bonds, the state should continue to collect the gas tax for at least 10 to 25 years, regardless of the transition approach to introducing RUC [Ch 9; Ch 10]. Meanwhile, the Legislature can introduce RUC on a portion of vehicles, using the gas tax as a prepayment mechanism to reduce RUC collection costs and evasion risks. [Ch 10]
- ✓ The policies currently in place that provide exemptions from gas taxes or refunds (either directly or indirectly) should remain in place for as long as the gas tax system is in place (i.e., at least 10 to 25 years). [Ch 9]

(Continued on next page >)

STEERING COMMITTEE FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS → WSTC RESPONSE

Transition approach, continued...

Result: An immediate transition from the gas tax to RUC is not financially feasible or legally possible. Any transition to RUC will likely take at least 10 years, and likely longer.

Possible WSTC Actions:

R14 Alternative RUC transition scenarios for legislative consideration in 2020 should be developed that specifically consider:

- Participants' preferences for implementation time frame and vehicles subject to RUC;
- Advent of electric vehicles, their effects on revenue, and current programs to incentivize adoption;
- The need for continued development and testing of a RUC system before wide-scale implementation;
- *Forward Drive* project timing, which is aimed at reducing the cost of collections for RUC;
- Availability of public fleet vehicles as part of an Initial start-up stage for RUC;

FD7 The *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal will (among other things) develop a RUC implementation plan for Washington.

COMPILED LISTS: ACTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, *FORWARD*
DRIVE PROJECT ELEMENTS

WSTC Actions contained in *Forward Drive* project proposal (7):

FD1 - *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal would measure equity impacts, develop potential mitigation measures, and if warranted, test mitigation measures in a limited-scale RUC test.

FD2 - The *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal will undertake a series of intense work sessions (“scrum”) with other RUC-implementing states to identify ways to reduce the cost of collections for RUC.

FD3 – Continue development of smartphone-based mileage reporting (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant).

FD4 - Explore new, simpler methods of mileage reporting, such as in-person mileage verification services (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant).

FD5 - *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal: test new-and-improved MRMs that are more effective for reporting RUC mileage for frequent cross-border travelers.

FD6 - As part of the *Forward Drive* federal project, specifically consider the WA RUC Interoperability HUB (or similar) in collaboration with other states as part of the Reducing RUC Cost-of-Collections workshops.

FD7 - The *Forward Drive* federal grant-funded project will develop a RUC implementation plan for Washington.

Possible WSTC Actions (7):

- A1** - Per legislative direction, WSTC will develop a plan for assessing potential equity impacts of RUC on communities of color, low-income households, vulnerable populations, and displaced communities.
- A2** - Develop an illustrative scenario to show how RUC rates could vary based on vehicle weights and/or emissions ratings.
- A3** - Develop example scenario(s) to illustrate how RUC could be tailored to reflect additional public policy goals, such as heavy vehicle impacts to pavement, emissions by vehicle type, rate differentials for low-income or other populations, etc.
- A4** - Provide analysis to the Legislature on the fiscal, legal and policy implications of reducing or repealing the state's gas tax and replacing it with RUC.
- A5** - Provide the Legislature with various options for how RUC could be designed and implemented in a manner that places the revenue under Amendment 18 provisions of the Washington State Constitution.
- A6** - Develop specific RUC transition options for legislative consideration that reflect the three scenarios most favored by pilot test drivers.
- A7** - Of the scenarios developed, identify the most promising option(s) and the parameters for transitioning to RUC for legislative consideration.

Possible WSTC Recommendations (14):

- R1** - Recommend implementation options that allow RUC to gradually scale up, offering drivers an opportunity to try the system and recommend further improvements while RUC is still in an early-implementation stage.
- R2** – Recommend that additional research be conducted (alone or in collaboration with other states) on differential RUC rates based on driver, vehicle, or infrastructure characteristics.
- R3** – Recommend research be conducted in collaboration with other states that are implementing RUC to better understand compliance gaps and potential enforcement measures.
- R4** - Recommend additional time and appropriate testing grounds (i.e., limited number of vehicles) to improve RUC before pursuing any wider statewide implementation.
- R5** – Recommend that in an Initial start-up stage of RUC, compliance and enforcement mechanisms must be tested and developed.
- R6** – Recommend that existing delivery mechanisms (e.g., public-private partnerships) be considered to most efficiently develop a RUC system that reduces the cost of collections.
- R7** – Recommend that cost reduction strategies be tested on a limited set of vehicles in an Initial start-up stage of RUC.
- R8** – Recommend that border-area testing be conducted in an Initial start-up stage of RUC.
- R9** - Recommend that ODOT’s OReGO program be engaged to further explore bi-state RUC solutions for frequent WA-OR travelers.

Possible WSTC Recommendations (14):

- R10** - Recommend specific changes in Washington statutes that protect personal privacy in a RUC program.
- R11** – Recommend testing of new personal privacy protections during an Initial start-up stage of RUC.
- R12** - Recommend that state agency vehicles be utilized as test subjects for privacy protection testing.
- R13** - Recommend that during a transitional period while the gas tax remains in place, the same policy-setting and oversight roles between the Legislature, WSTC, and other agencies and the private sector should be retained.
- R14** – Recommend alternative RUC transition scenarios for legislative consideration in 2020 that specifically consider:
- Participants’ preferences for implementation time frame and vehicles subject to RUC;
 - Advent of electric and high MPG vehicles, their effects on revenue, and current programs to incentivize adoption;
 - The need for continued development and testing of a RUC system before any wide-scale implementation;
 - *Forward Drive* project timing, which is aimed at reducing the cost of collections for RUC; and
 - The availability of state fleet vehicles as part of an Initial start-up stage for RUC.
- Added: R15** – Expenditures of RUC revenue should be made subject to Amendment 18 (restricted to highway purposes).

TRANSITION SCENARIOS

Travis Dunn
D'Artagnan Consulting

APPROACH

Today:

- **Review and agree upon baseline assumptions** across all Scenarios.
- **Review and agree upon different variations** to reflect in the Scenarios to provide a plausible range of options for Legislative consideration.
- **Identify any additional information or analysis** that must be provided to enable WSTC to recommend one or more Transition Scenarios to be included in WSTC's WA RUC Final Report.

December 17, 2019 WSTC Meeting:

- **Consider all information provided**, including any additional public comments or letters received.
- **Modify (if warranted) and adopt WSTC's WA RUC Final Report** to the Governor, Legislature and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), subject to any final decisions made at the WSTC December 2019 meeting.

ASSUMPTIONS THAT APPLY TO ALL SCENARIOS

ALL TRANSITION SCENARIOS: PHASE-IN PERIODS

Transition period:

- **Initial start-up phase:** make continued RUC system improvements and continue testing while deploying RUC on a limited scale.

Why:

- 61% of test drivers: implement RUC for all vehicles immediately or phased in over a 5 to 10-year period [A6]
- Allows time to address known issues through further system development during a limited deployment phase [R1 through R11]
- Initial start-up phase aligns with recognized forecasts (ranging from 2022 to 2026) for price parity between Plug-in Electric Vehicles (PEVs) and conventional gas vehicles. [WSTC presentation, June 2019]
- Legislative funding to incentivize clean vehicle technology adoption is effective through June 2025.
- *Forward Drive* project (if funded) will occur in Initial start-up phase, allowing development and testing of RUC enhancements.

ALL TRANSITION SCENARIOS: TYPE OF VEHICLES REQUIRED TO PAY RUC

Vehicles subject to RUC:

- **Plug-in Electric Vehicles:** included in RUC initial start-up phase of all RUC transition scenarios
- **Public agency fleet vehicles:** included in RUC initial start-up phase of all RUC transition scenarios
- **All others:** continue to pay the state gas tax only

Why:

- Plug-in electric vehicles (PEVs) are already subject to flat annual fees; RUC represents usage-based fee in lieu of ownership-based fees
- Government-owned vehicles have an established track record as important early-adoption vehicles for new technologies and public policies
- Vehicles owned by public agencies are already subject to mileage reporting
- Public fleet vehicles from border areas (e.g., Clark County) can play an important role in testing new approaches to multi-state RUC
- Testing technical systems with public vehicles has greater tolerance for error and experimentation than with privately-owned vehicles

ALL TRANSITION SCENARIOS: PER-MILE RATES

Applicable per-mile RUC rates:

- **Price relationship with the state gas tax:** the per-mile rate must bear some rational relation to the state gas tax rate (gross or net revenue-neutral for the state, or for the average driver, etc.) and should in no case be greater than the average at the time of implementation (approximately 2.4 cents per mile at present).

Why:

- Parity between gas tax rates and RUC may be required since out-of-state drivers would continue to pay Washington's gas tax [Ch 9]
- Focuses only on maintaining steady revenue levels by capturing lost gas tax revenue resulting from high MPG and alternative fuel vehicles during a transition period
- Keeps the question of increasing roadway funding (e.g., via increases in tax rates) as a separate policy issue and legislative decision

ALL TRANSITION SCENARIOS: METHOD OF COLLECTION

Minimum mileage reporting methods offered to drivers:

- **Time permit:** flat annual fee to drive unlimited miles. For PEVs and hybrids, the existing registration surcharge serves this purpose.
- **Odometer reporting:** periodically pay for miles traveled during the selected period subject to odometer verification.
- **Optional automated mileage reporting with plug-in device (PID):** plug-in device (with GPS or without GPS) automatically reports vehicle mileage. GPS-enabled version automatically deducts out-of-state miles.

Why:

- A small number of drivers may prefer no mileage reporting requirement at all, for ease-of-use [R1] or privacy [R10] reasons
- Odometer-based charging can be implemented at low cost to the state
- Automated mileage reporting with PID is the only option available in Oregon and Utah (states that are implementing RUC systems)

THREE RUC TRANSITION SCENARIOS

ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS FOR TRANSITIONING TO A RUC

	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
Phase-in period	Initial start-up: within 5 years	Initial start-up: within 5 years Partial fleet: 5-10 years	Initial start-up: within 5 years Partial fleet: 5-10 years Fleet-wide: beyond 10 years
Subject vehicles	PEVs, Hybrids, and entire state government fleet	Initial start-up: PEVs, Hybrids, and entire state government fleet Partial fleet: high MPG vehicles	Initial start-up: PEVs, Hybrids, and entire state government fleet Partial fleet: high MPG vehicles Fleet-wide: MY 2030 or later
Per-mile rates	No higher than gas tax for average driver	No higher than gas tax for average driver	Revenue neutral to the state
Mileage reporting options	Time permit, Odometer reporting, Optional automated PID reporting (continue testing other methods)	Time permit, Odometer reporting, Automated PID reporting, Smartphone reporting (continue testing other methods)	Time permit, Odometer reporting, Automated PID reporting, Smartphone reporting, other certified methods

FURTHER VARIATIONS ARE POSSIBLE

Examples of further variables:

Different Phase-in Periods:

- Longer (or shorter) initial start-up, partial fleet or fleet-wide implementation phases

RUC Account Management and Revenue Collection:

- Use only existing state systems (DOL)
- Rely more heavily on private sector for RUC implementation

Per-mile rates:

- Variable based on other characteristics (vehicle weight, emissions rating, etc.)

Applying RUC to different (or additional) categories of vehicles

- Out-of-state vehicles
- TNC, AV, etc.

WSTC FEEDBACK

Questions and discussion:






- *Does WSTC agree with the baseline assumptions across all Scenarios?*
- *Is WSTC comfortable that the three Scenarios reflect a plausible range of RUC transition options to present to the Legislature?*
- *Is there any additional information or analysis that must be provided to enable WSTC to recommend one or more of these Transition Scenarios in WSTC's WA RUC Final Report to the Legislature?*

PUBLIC COMMENT

COMMUNICATIONS UPDATES

Ara Swanson
EnviroIssues

OVERALL COMMUNICATIONS GOALS

-  **Inform and educate the public.**
-  **Recruit participants into the pilot project from across the state.**
-  **Generate broad understanding for the pilot project.**
-  **Cultivate balanced and accurate media coverage.**
-  **Assess public opinion before and throughout the course of the pilot.**

PUBLIC AND PARTICIPANT ENGAGEMENT TO-DATE



3 surveys, 6 focus groups



Over 1,900 emails and phone calls from test drivers (62%) and the public (38%)



5,700+ interest list subscribers receiving regular updates



Video highlighting the participant experience



2,000 test drivers



50+ briefings



Ongoing media engagement

CURRENT COMMUNICATIONS GOALS



Communicate pilot process, driver experience, results and next steps



Leverage media to share results and next steps at milestones

PILOT, FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FEEDBACK OPPOTUNITY



October e-newsletter and comment opportunity:

- Summarize research, participant engagement and public involvement work done so far
- Share draft recommendations from WSTC and WA RUC Steering Committee
- Provide opportunity for feedback before WSTC formalizes recommendations in December

COMMUNICATION OF WSTC RECOMMENDATIONS



December e-newsletter and press release:

- Communicate conclusion of pilot project and submittal of final report to legislature
- Share WSTC recommendations



SCHEDULE

Oct. 24	Distribute e-newsletter with WSTC recommendations and link to comment form to 5,700 subscribers; post link to website(s)
Oct. 24 – Nov. 14	Collect feedback (3 weeks)
Nov. 15	Close feedback window; begin reviewing comments
Dec. 10	WSTC receives summary and compiled full-text comment record
Dec. 17	WSTC meets to discuss and adopt recommendations
Dec. 17 or 18	Press release and e-newsletter are distributed

WSTC's WA RUC ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT: CROSSING THE FINISH LINE

Jeff Doyle
Project Manager
D'Artagnan Consulting