



DEPARTMENT OF
ECOLOGY
State of Washington

Work Group Recommendations Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program

*Report to the Legislature
Pursuant to ESSB 6106, §106 (2018)*

October 2018

Publication 18-04-033

Publication and Contact Information

This document is available on the Department of Ecology's website at:
<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1804033.html>

For more information contact:

Kimberly Goetz
HWTR Legislative Coordinator
Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Program
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
Phone: 360-407-6754
Kimberly.Goetz@ecy.wa.gov

Washington State Department of Ecology – www.ecology.wa.gov

- Headquarters, Olympia 360-407-6000
- Northwest Regional Office, Bellevue 425-649-7000
- Southwest Regional Office, Olympia 360-407-6300
- Central Regional Office, Union Gap 509-575-2490
- Eastern Regional Office, Spokane 509-329-3400

To request ADA accommodation including materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-6700 or visit <https://ecology.wa.gov/accessibility>. People with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. People with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.

**Work Group Recommendations
Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program**

*Report to the Legislature
Pursuant to ESSB 6106, §106 (2018)*

Kimberly Goetz

Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Program

Washington State Department of Ecology

Olympia, Washington

This page is purposely left blank

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	1
Report Requirement	2
Summary of Work Group Recommendations.....	3
Don't Drip and Drive Program	6
Program Development	6
Local Government Participation.....	7
Program Phases and Accomplishments	7
Program Focus	9
Funding to Date.....	9
Previous Recommendations for Future Funding	11
Current Program Status.....	11
Work Group	12
Work Group Members	12
Work Group Meetings	13
Legislative Directive to Work Group	14
Principles for a Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program.....	15
Legislative Directive.....	15
Options Considered.....	15
Recommended Program Mission Statement and Guiding Principles	18
Program Scope	19
Legislative Directive.....	19
Options Considered.....	19
Program Scope Recommendations	21
Program Partners.....	22
Legislative Directive	22
Options Considered.....	22
Recommended Program Partners.....	24
Budget Requirements.....	25
Legislative Directive.....	25

Options Considered.....	25
Recommended Budget Approach	26
Funding and Payment	28
Legislative Directive.....	28
Options Considered.....	28
Funding and Payment Recommendations.....	30
Program Oversight	31
Legislative Directive.....	31
Options Considered.....	31
Program Oversight Recommendations	33
Performance Measures.....	35
Legislative Directive.....	35
Options Considered.....	35
Performance Measures Recommendations.....	38
Ecology Comment	40
Ecology Representation, Concurrence, and Next Steps.....	40
Ecology Perspective on Don't Drip and Drive as a Stormwater Protection Program	40
Conclusion	41
Appendices.....	42
Appendix A. Participating Jurisdictions	42
Appendix B. Budget Proviso	43
Appendix C. House Bill 2899 (2018)	45
Appendix D. Substitute House Bill 2899 (2018)	49
Appendix E. Program Principles Options Discussion Paper	53
Appendix F. Program Scope and Partners Options Discussion Paper.....	55
Appendix G. Possible Budget Projections Discussion Paper	58
Appendix H. Funding and Payments Options Discussion Paper.....	65
Appendix I. Program Oversight Options Discussion Paper.....	69
Appendix J. Performance Measures Options Discussion Paper	73

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: Possible Principles Statements Considered	15
Table 2: Possible Guiding Elements/Principles Considered.....	16
Table 3: Possible Program Scope Considered	19
Table 4: Expansion Options Considered.....	20
Table 5: Potential Public Agency Partners Considered	22
Table 6: Potential Private Sector Partners Considered	22
Table 7: Potential Nonprofit Partners Considered	23
Table 8: Potential Budget Extrapolation Methods Considered.....	25
Table 9: Potential Program Budget Size Considered.....	26
Table 10: Possible Funding Options Considered.....	28
Table 11: Possible Funding Sources Considered.....	29
Table 12: Possible Payment Methods Considered.....	30
Table 13: Potential Program Administration Considered	31
Table 14: Potential Managing Entity	32
Table 15: Possible Leak Detection/Repair Performance Measure Outputs.....	35
Table 16: Possible Public Participation Performance Measure Outputs	36
Table 17: Possible Program Services Performance Measure Outputs.....	36
Table 18: Possible Performance Measure Outcomes.....	37
Table 19: Performance Measures Priorities	38



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

PO Box 47600 • Olympia, WA 98504-7600 • 360-407-6000

711 for Washington Relay Service • Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341

Dear Legislators:

On behalf of the Department of Ecology and the Don't Drip and Drive work group, we are pleased to introduce the attached Report to the Legislature. It presents the consensus recommendations and conclusions of the work group, of which Ecology was a member.

Stormwater contamination is one of the most serious threats facing Washington's environment. Polluted runoff carries toxic chemicals into our lakes, rivers, and Puget Sound. These chemicals can threaten our at-risk salmon and orcas, contribute to toxic chemicals in the food chain, and contaminate drinking water supplies. While there are significant data gaps as to the extent of runoff contamination from motor vehicle leaks, we know these leaks contribute to this contamination.

The Washington Stormwater Center is highly regarded for its leadership on stormwater research, as well as its work providing training, education, and assistance to local governments on reducing stormwater impacts. We agree with the work group's recommendation that the Washington Stormwater Center add the Don't Drip and Drive Program to its portfolio, and we are confident in the Stormwater Center's ability to advance efforts to reduce stormwater contamination from vehicle leaks.

We are supportive of a range of efforts to prevent pollution, especially in stormwater. Ecology aims to align its resources to achieve the highest return on investment. This includes reducing stormwater runoff from the largest sources of contamination, such as industrial facilities, construction sites, boatyards, agriculture, and forest practices. Our ultimate goal is to prevent harmful chemicals from entering our waters in the first place – including our work to support safer alternatives to the toxics in consumer products we use every day.

Thank you for providing the opportunity to assist in analyzing how the current Don't Drip and Drive Program could be expanded statewide, and to support the Legislature's efforts to reduce stormwater pollution.

Sincerely,

Heather Bartlett, Program Manager
Water Quality Program

Darin Rice, Program Manager
Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction

Executive Summary

The Don't Drip and Drive Program was developed as an educational program to inform vehicle owners about leaks from their cars. The program encourages drivers to check for and repair leaks which helps prevent stormwater contamination. Although there are significant data gaps as to the extent of runoff contamination from motor vehicle leaks, we know these leaks contribute to this contamination.

As directed by section 106 of the state's 2018 Transportation Budget (Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6106), the Department of Ecology convened and provided staffing support for a work group to consider issues related to the possible statewide expansion of the Don't Drip and Drive Program. The members of the work group represented local governments, state agencies, industry representatives, and non-profit organizations.

The work group considered a large variety of options on a number of topics, including program principles, identifying a program managing entity, potential program partners, potential scope of an expanded statewide program, funding requirements, and possible funding sources. As directed by the proviso, the work group developed a number of recommendations related to each of those topic areas. The work group also made additional recommendations related to possible performance measures for a future expanded program.

The main recommendation from the work group is that the Washington Stormwater Center should take the lead as managing entity for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program, working closely with ASA Northwest¹ to implement the program. Their work should be overseen by a robust steering committee comprised of state agencies, local jurisdictions, and non-profit organizations. As a first step in launching an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program, the Washington Stormwater Center should hire a full-time employee to begin outreach to local jurisdictions and other potential partners not previously associated with earlier phases of the program. This employee should also work with local jurisdictions to further refine the scope of an expanded program, develop a marketing and outreach plan for an expanded program, and develop a detailed budget proposal for the program going forward. This employee should also use information and reports from Ecology and other outside sources to identify available data about the scope of the vehicle leak problem.

As the program expands, the work group recommends that all areas of Washington State should have the opportunity to participate in the program but that local governments should not be required to participate. Funding for an expanded program should come from one or more transportation funds and, if possible, be tied to automobiles as the source of the problem.

The work group also recommends that while the expanded program is being more fully developed, that the Legislature appropriate funding to keep the existing program running, thus helping to ensure continued participation by existing partners and local jurisdictions. The work group estimates a budget of \$300,000 for this work. The existing program's steering committee should also continue and members should be added to that committee as necessary.

¹ ASA Northwest is the DBA name of the Automotive Service Association of Washington, a 501(c)(6) nonprofit association of automotive service businesses.

Report Requirement

This report is required by section 106 of Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6106, as follows:

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

Motor Vehicle Account—State Appropriation \$30,000

The appropriation in this section is subject to the following conditions and limitations: \$30,000 of the motor vehicle account—state appropriation is provided solely for the department to convene a work group to establish principles, review options, and develop recommendations regarding the establishment of a statewide program with a purpose of reducing fluid leakage from motor vehicles.

(1) The work group must be comprised of public, private, and nonprofit stakeholders and must include at least the Washington stormwater center, stormwater outreach for regional municipalities, the association of Washington cities, and the Washington state association of counties.

(2) The work group shall use the statewide don't drip and drive program established by the department as a model for creating this new program. The work group shall establish principles, review options, and develop recommendations regarding the new program. Recommendations made by the work group shall include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Identifying an entity to manage the program;
- (b) Potential public, private, and nonprofit partners;
- (c) The potential scope of the program; and
- (d) Funding requirements and potential funding sources for the program.

(3) The work group shall submit a report with its findings and recommendations to the transportation committees of the legislature by November 1, 2018.

A copy of the relevant page of the bill is attached as Appendix B.

Summary of Work Group Recommendations

The work group makes the following recommendations:

Program Mission Statement

The mission of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to use behavior change strategies to prevent stormwater pollution from leaking motor vehicles, help drivers properly maintain vehicles, and help local jurisdictions meet National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements.

Program Guiding Principles

- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should partner with local jurisdictions and other public, private, and nonprofit businesses and organizations, including tribal and regional organizations as appropriate, to promote the voluntary program and assist with program implementation.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should use messaging that is specifically designed to resonate with vehicle owners (both individuals and businesses) and motivate them to identify and repair leaks in their vehicles.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should make use of financial and other incentives as needed to ensure success.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should specifically consider and take steps to address environmental justice and equity issues, such as outreach to vehicle owners who are low income, speak languages other than English, and those who may not be available to participate in the program during normal business hours.

Program Scope

- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be expanded to all areas of Washington State.
- All local jurisdictions should have the opportunity to participate in the Don't Drip and Drive Program, but should not be required to do so.
- The program materials and toolkits should be available and generalized enough to be adaptable to any jurisdiction.
- A statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program should provide local jurisdictions with instructions and mentoring as needed or requested to assist them in developing partnerships, offering workshops, and promoting the program.
- A statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program should ensure increased marketing and advertising, adequate public events and workshops, and expanded partnerships with commercial and nonprofit organizations.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should include outreach to businesses and owners of fleet vehicles.

- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should expand into new media types and should offer expanded language/ESL and accessible outreach.
- Most importantly, a statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program must ensure that implementation in new areas of the state is not based solely on the experiences of existing participants. Local jurisdictions in eastern or central Washington may have different needs than those in the Puget Sound region. These differences must be accounted for and incorporated into any expanded statewide program.

Program Partners

- The Washington Stormwater Center and ASA Northwest should both be primary/lead partners in any expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program.
- Potential partners that want to participate should have the opportunity to do so.

Budget Approach

- A specific budget proposal for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program should not be finalized at this time, as more fully explained in this report.
- The Legislature should allocate funds during the 2019–2021 biennium to the program managing entity for hiring a full-time employee to further develop a statewide program.
- The Legislature should allocate \$300,000 for the 2019–2021 biennium to the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program so local jurisdictions can continue to provide services and maintain partnerships. These funds should be appropriated to the managing entity and passed through to participating local jurisdictions. These funds are in addition to the costs associated with hiring a new employee as noted above.

Funding and Payment

- Funding for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program should come from one or more transportation funds.
- If possible, funding for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program should be tied to automobiles as the source of the problem.
- Funding should be passed through to local jurisdictions and partners (as needed) through contracts, ensuring appropriate accountability.

Program Oversight

- The Washington Stormwater Center should be the managing entity for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program if the Legislature can limit the indirect rate taken by WSU (or otherwise account for those funds that would no longer be available for program services).
- The Washington Stormwater Center should work closely with ASA Northwest to implement the expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program.

- If the Legislature cannot limit the WSU indirect rate or otherwise ensure full funding to program services, the work group recommends that Department of Commerce be the lead agency and that it pass funding through to ASA Northwest and the coalition of participating local jurisdictions.
- The managing entity should work closely with a robust statewide steering committee.

Performance Measures

- An expanded statewide program and its managing entity should consider time constraints when making requests for data collection related to the Don't Drip and Drive Program, especially from repair/quick lube shop partners.
- The managing entity should continue to track data points such as web site hits, number of participating repair shops, advertising metrics, and related program performance indicators.
- An expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program and its managing entity should focus on tracking behavior change indicators instead of trying to extrapolate environmental changes attributable to the program. The most important metric to track is number of leaks repaired due to the program.

Don't Drip and Drive Program

The Don't Drip and Drive Program was created to address a significant source of pollution in the Puget Sound region: fluids that leak from vehicles can cause significant water quality problems. When it rains, stormwater picks up and carries these toxic chemicals into storm drains where they can travel into streams, lakes, and Puget Sound. Although there are significant data gaps as to the extent of runoff contamination from motor vehicle leaks, we know these leaks contribute to this contamination.

The Don't Drip and Drive Program was developed as an educational program to inform vehicle owners about leaks from their cars. The program encourages drivers to check for and repair leaks which helps prevent stormwater contamination. This educational program also helps participating local governments meet the requirements of their Phase 1 or Phase 2 Municipal Stormwater Permit.

Ecology has a number of efforts underway to help identify sources of stormwater pollution. One of those current efforts also deals with issues related to vehicle leaks: the "Puget Sound Clean Cars Stormwater Partnership" (PSCCSP). PSCCSP is a technical and research project funded by the Puget Sound Partnership through the National Estuary Program at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. PSCCSP is a collaborative effort between Ecology and the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE International) to examine issues related to environmental and health impacts associated with automotive fluid leaks, including vehicle leak data, potential technological solutions for vehicle leaks, and safer chemical alternatives for vehicle fluids. Ecology anticipates that PSCCSP's work may be able to help inform future expansion of the Don't Drip and Drive Program.

Program Development

In 2010, Ecology and a group of local government partners formed a vehicle leaks reduction committee. This group held workshops with experts from multiple disciplines to better understand factors leading to vehicle leaks and to identify strategies that could be used to encourage leak prevention and repair.

The vehicle leaks reduction committee made eight recommendations:

1. Create a program to encourage vehicle owners to identify and fix leaks voluntarily.
2. Engage the auto industry to develop innovative solutions to minimize the type, frequency and impact of leaks on water quality and road safety.
3. Research and develop alternative, non-toxic solutions to petrochemicals to minimize impacts to water quality.
4. Strengthen regulation and enforcement to decrease the impact of leaking vehicles on water quality and road safety.
5. Research solutions and install stormwater management strategies that improve water quality.
6. Create a cash for clunkers program to remove older, leak-prone vehicles from the fleet.
7. Evaluate leak-prevention incentives for vehicle owners through insurance coverage.
8. Leak inspection requirements at vehicle registration.

The Don't Drip and Drive Program is a result of this work. The focus of the program is to be a behavior change and educational campaign. The program is designed to increase vehicle owners' awareness of leaks and motivate them to fix leaks. The long-term goal is to change social norms so that people value finding and fixing vehicle leaks.

Local Government Participation

Local governments can use participation in the Don't Drip and Drive Program to meet the "Public Education and Outreach" requirements in their Phase I or Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit. These permits are Washington's method of meeting the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements under the federal Clean Water Act. The permits require:

The SWMP [stormwater municipal permit] shall include an education and outreach program designed to reduce or eliminate behaviors and practices that cause or contribute to adverse stormwater impacts and encourage the public to participate in stewardship activities. The education program may be developed and implemented locally or regionally.

To date, 81 local government entities,² as part of the Stormwater Outreach for Regional Municipalities (STORM) coalition, have been active participants in the Don't Drip and Drive Program. STORM also provides steering and program oversight for participating jurisdictions. In addition, seven technical colleges and high schools have also participated, as has Washington State University's Snohomish County Extension Office. The program is currently expanding to Clark County and Spokane County.

Program Phases and Accomplishments

The Don't Drip and Drive Program has been a pilot program in three phases:

In Phase I (2011–2013), the primary focus was to conduct the initial formative research on target audience, barriers to and motivators for fixing leaks, and key strategies and messages likely to bring about behavior change. The research showed that vehicle owners failed to address leaks due to three primary barriers:

- Cost concerns.³
- Lack of knowledge.
- Distrust of mechanics.

At the same time, Phase I piloted a variety of strategies to attract vehicle owners to identify and repair leaks, including:

² See Appendix A for a list of jurisdictions participating during the first three phases of the program.

³ Different types of leaks have different repair costs ranging from less than \$100 to more than \$2,000. The cost of repairing a leak can sometimes exceed the value of the vehicle.

- Established a partnership with Automotive Services Association and their related non-profit organization ASA Northwest. This resulted in 85 member auto repair shops agreeing to participate in the pilot program.
- Launched an inspection program where participating repair shops agreed to provide free visual inspections to vehicle owners, valued at up to \$80. Participating shops also agreed to honor a \$50 off coupon for leak repairs.⁴ As a result of this agreement, the program inspected 4,002 vehicles and participating repair shops performed 709 repairs.
- Volunteer organizations and local governments conducted “Vehicle Leaks Blitz” events that included parking lot leak checks for 2,961 vehicles. Outreach materials were provided to each vehicle owner.
- Technical and community colleges piloted workshops for vehicle owners and conducted 40 free half-day workshop sessions, most occurring on weekends.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program promoted free workshops and vehicle inspections through both paid and free media sources.

In Phase II (2014–2015), the primary focus was to better understand certain elements of the campaign and begin to develop best practices that could lead to a model program. During this phase, program elements were expanded and further refined, including:

- Refined Phase I program messaging to help owners recognize that vehicle leaks are a problem and seek assistance or other resources to fix those leaks.
- Developed a toolkit for partner organizations to promote the campaign.
- Continued promotional outreach and added a user-friendly, informative website.
- Evaluated the Don't Drip and Drive Program's influence on owners to get their leaks repaired.

As a result of these expanded efforts, the program directly engaged with 28,325 vehicle owners. Phase II also achieved the following results:

- Auto shop participation expanded to 102 repair shops.
- Technical colleges gave an additional 55 free workshops, bringing total the total number of vehicle owners attending a workshop in Phase I or II to 1,120.
- Volunteers conducted 34 further parking lot leak check events that motivated leak repairs on an estimated 1,669 vehicles.

In Phase III (2016–2017), the program continued to expand and develop new tools:

- Repair shop participation expanded to 273 shops statewide with the addition of shops affiliated with AAA Washington. Shops continued to offer free visual leak inspections and honor discount coupons for up to \$50 on repairs.
- Started pilot partnership with five quick lube shops. Participating franchisee shops in Western Washington conducted free leak inspections during routine oil changes, then informed their customers and encouraged them to fix the leaks by providing campaign materials. An estimated 2,880 vehicle owners with leaks were reached during this pilot phase.

⁴ Participating repair shops were not compensated for the inspections or coupons. Instead, each shop absorbed the cost associated with performing the visual inspection and honoring the coupon.

- Expanded campaign promotion through various advertising and outreach channels and upgraded website information to include Spanish language content.
- Conducted 80 additional free auto leaks inspection workshops, including two piloted in Spanish, reaching 456 attendees.
- Conducted leak check attractions at fairs. Vehicle owners learned about leaks, received free mechanic consultations from credible third party mechanics, and learned about the importance of fixing leaks.
- Conducted car care clinic that were freestanding versions of the fair attractions.
- Improved Spanish language outreach. Researched and piloted strategies to effectively service Spanish-speaking vehicles owners.
- An estimated 2,271 vehicle leaks were repaired because of program outreach.

Program Focus

As a result of the work to date, the Don't Drip and Drive Program focuses on encouraging behavior change through social marketing techniques. In the first three phases, the program was active in jurisdictions accounting for 3.8–4.7 million residents, or approximately 54 percent of the state's population.⁵ The program's target audience is vehicle owners who are:

- Over 25 years old.
- Own a vehicle that is more than two years old.
- Are aware that their vehicle has leaks and want to get the vehicle repaired.
- Have an income of \$40,000 or more.

It is important to note that the Don't Drip and Drive Program was not designed to address the issue of “clunker” vehicles where the cost of repairing the vehicle exceeds the car's value. It was also not designed to address the needs of lower income vehicle owners who cannot readily afford to fix a leak. The vehicle leak committee identified both these issues as being important to address; the current Don't Drip and Drive Program was designed to encourage inspections.

Funding to Date

To date, the Don't Drip and Drive Program has been largely funded by grants passed through from Ecology to local lead agencies who, in turn, established inter-local agreements with other local government entities to spend the grant funds and perform the required work. The funding sources have included Ecology's Grants of Regional or Statewide Significance (GROSS) and National Estuary Program (NEP) grants, issued via the Puget Sound Partnership through Ecology with funding provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

⁵ See U.S. Census Bureau “Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas Population Totals: 2010-2017” available at <https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/PEP/2017/GCTPEPANNR.US24PR> (metro area) and <https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/PEP/2017/GCTPEPANNR.US41PR> (combined area) and “Estimates of the Total Resident Population and Resident Population Age 18 Years and Older for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico: July 1, 2017” available at <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/tables/2010-2017/state/detail/SCPRC-EST2017-18+POP-RES.xlsx>.

In Phase I (2011–2013), King County applied for and received a GROSS grant of \$300,000. King County served as the lead agency for the regional campaign in this phase and coordinated the efforts of all the participating local jurisdictions.

In addition to the GROSS grant from Ecology, Seattle Public Utilities applied for and received an additional \$200,000 NEP grant. These funds were used for developing and conducting the first round of vehicle leak check workshops.

In addition to grant funding, the participating jurisdictions also contributed in-kind funding in the form of employee staff time, media purchases, printing, promotion, and conducting events. The value of these in-kind contributions is estimated at approximately \$174,100. This does not include the value of the work done by ASA Northwest and the participating repair shops in providing additional promotion, free leak inspections, and discounts on vehicle repairs.

During Phase I, a steering committee with representatives from Ecology, King County, Pierce County, Seattle Public Utilities, the city of Burien, and Futurewise provided guidance and oversight for the new program. This core team managed day-to-day planning and campaign oversight.

In Phase II (2014–2015), Pierce County assumed lead agency responsibility, applying for and receiving a \$300,000 GROSS grant from Ecology. Puget Sound Partnership also provided another \$40,000 of funding that was managed by Futurewise on behalf of King County ECO Net. ECO Net also provided an additional \$3,000 grant. Just as in Phase I, in-kind contributions from local jurisdictions and other partners made up a large portion of the program support. Phase II in-kind contributions were estimated at approximately \$351,000. The combined budget for Phase II was approximately \$690,000.

During Phase II, the steering committee continued to provide guidance and oversight for day-to-day planning and campaign management. The steering committee also consulted with a larger Advisory Committee, which involved more than 30 region-wide partners.

In Phase III (2016–2017), the Don't Drip and Drive further emerged with a more fully rounded set of programs, activities, and incentives. King County acted a lead agency with a \$300,000 GROSS grant from Ecology. An additional \$50,000 in NEP funds was awarded to WSU Extension Snohomish County to coordinate auto leaks workshops. As before, in-kind contributions were also significant with an estimated \$481,000 of contributions from local jurisdictions, nonprofit organizations, community and technical colleges, and private businesses. Total program expenditures in Phase III were approximately \$781,000.

Phase III grant funding ended June 30, 2017. The Don't Drip and Drive Program did not apply for any additional grant funding from Ecology for the 2017–2019 biennium. However, in 2016, King County submitted a “Near Term Action” proposal to the Puget Sound Partnership, and a number of local jurisdictions are continuing to provide in-kind contributions to keep the program going in a limited fashion. Some cities, including Burien, Seattle, and Bellingham, have independently funded additional workshops and leak check events for their residents.

Previous Recommendations for Future Funding

At the end of Phase III, the Don't Drip and Drive Program Steering Committee made a number of recommendations for next steps in program expansion and priorities for future funding.⁶ These recommendations included:

- Continue and expand on previously successful elements, such as workshops, advertising, website, repair shop partnerships, and leak check events. Building on the momentum of the existing program was viewed as a good investment for future funding. The program to date has provided a strong foundation to target vehicle leaks, but long-term behavioral changes require consistent and repeated workshops and campaigns.
- Test financial incentives. Higher discounts or rebates on repair costs could affect decisions about whether or not to make repairs. Many participants in the existing program viewed this as an area to explore.
- Continue to gather data. Establishing baseline data about vehicle owner behaviors, particularly the likelihood of repairs once a vehicle is at a repair shop, would help the program refine the target audience and identify strategies that will influence different groups of vehicle owners.
- Try new things. Continuing the innovative aspect of the existing program is important to continuous improvement. Piloting new strategies that may have success based on lessons learned so far could maximize program effectiveness.

Current Program Status

As noted above, Phase III grant funding ended June 30, 2017. A number of local jurisdictions are currently continuing to provide in-kind contributions to keep the program going in a limited fashion. Some cities, including Burien, Seattle, and Bellingham, have independently funded additional workshops and leak check events for their residents. Spokane County and Clark County have launched their own versions of the Don't Drip and Drive Program, both based on the program to date.

The existing Don't Drip and Drive Program framework is still in place. Should the Legislature or another entity make funds available for the program, participating local jurisdictions could ramp up the program without significant delay. Expanding the existing program into new jurisdictions would take more effort.

⁶ See "Don't Drip and Drive: A Social Marketing Program to Address Vehicle Leaks" Phase 3 final report dated June 30, 2017.

Work Group

The Don't Drip and Drive work group was convened by Ecology in accordance with the budget proviso found in section 106 of the state's 2018 Transportation Budget (Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6106). The proviso directed:

- (1) The work group must be comprised of public, private, and nonprofit stakeholders and must include at least the Washington stormwater center, stormwater outreach for regional municipalities, the association of Washington cities, and the Washington state association of counties.

To facilitate the work group, Ecology designated an experienced staff member as the work group coordinator. The coordinator acted as a neutral organizer and facilitator for the group's work and did not represent Ecology or advocate for Ecology's preferred options. The coordinator identified and invited potential work group members, trying to ensure a wide variety of stakeholders had at least one invited work group member representing their point of view. The coordinator also developed an assortment of options for the work group to consider and wrote briefing papers on each topic identified in the proviso.⁷

Work Group Members

The work group was a robust group comprised of representatives from state government, local government, environmental advocates, and automotive-related organizations, each representing a unique perspective. All of the mandatory members identified in the budget proviso were represented on the work group. The members of the work group were:

Paige Dechambeau, Washington State Association of Counties
Andy Gregory, Puget Soundkeeper Alliance
Eric Lambert, Clark County
Jeff Lovell, ASA Northwest
Bill Malatinsky, City of Seattle
Shannon McClelland, Association of Washington Cities
Jason Norberg, Washington State Department of Ecology
Jeff Parsons, Puget Sound Partnership
Elsa Pond, Washington State Department of Transportation
Mary Rabourn, King County and STORM
Lisa Rozmyn, Washington Stormwater Center
Daniel Selke, Mercedes Benz USA
Michael Smith, Clover Park Technical College
Carlton Stinson, Seattle Public Utilities and STORM
Heather Trim, Zero Waste Washington
Tom Tucker, Auto Care Association
Amy Waterman, Futurewise

⁷ Copies of the briefing papers are attached as appendices to this report.

In addition to the work group members, a number of other individuals also listened in to work group meetings, contributed ideas, presented information to the work group, or otherwise participated to at least some degree. These people included:

Justine Asohmbom, Washington State Department of Ecology
Susan Hazen, Global Automakers, Inc.
Stef Frenzl, King County
Laurie Holmes, Motor Equipment Manufacturers Association
Rachel McCrea, Washington State Department of Ecology
Tiffany Odell, Pierce County
Sunrise O'Mahoney, Watershed Alliance
Chris Sidney, FCA US, LLC (Fiat Chrysler)
Stacy Tatman, Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers
Brenda Wolslegel, ASA Northwest

In addition, a variety of legislative and Ecology staff members were also present for at least some of the work group meetings where they took notes, listened to work group discussions, answered questions, or otherwise assisted with the meetings.

Work Group Meetings

At the work group's first meeting on June 12, 2018, the work group members were briefed on the requirements of the budget proviso as well as an initial list of possible options to consider. The primary focus of the first meeting was small group work where members discussed various options and priorities and then reported those discussions out to a larger group.

Based on the comments, questions, and discussions at the first meeting, the work group coordinator developed a SurveyMonkey survey that was sent to each work group member. Each member was asked to answer the questions on the survey on behalf of their organization to help prioritize which options were the most promising. Just over half of work group members (ten out of 17) responded to the survey.

The work group then met for a second time on July 16, 2018. At the second meeting, the work group members were briefed on the survey results and again broke into small groups to discuss options. The work group then came back together as a whole to share the results of their small group work and discuss areas where each of the groups achieved consensus. The entire group then discussed recommendations and agreed to a plan going forward. The recommendations in this report reflect those discussions and agreement.

Legislative Directive to Work Group

In ESSB 6106, the Legislature directed the work group as follows:

- (2) The work group shall use the statewide don't drip and drive program established by the department as a model for creating this new program. The work group shall establish principles, review options, and develop recommendations regarding the new program. Recommendations made by the work group shall include, but are not limited to:
- (a) Identifying an entity to manage the program;
 - (b) Potential public, private, and nonprofit partners;
 - (c) The potential scope of the program; and
 - (d) Funding requirements and potential funding sources for the program.

To assist the work group members, the coordinator developed briefing papers on each of these topics, including a summary of what was required by the proviso and a variety of possible options for each subject. Copies of the briefing papers, which provide detailed information about each option considered, are attached as appendices to this report.

In addition to considering options related to the items identified in the proviso, the work group also reviewed a number of options related to possible performance measures. The coordinator made it clear during the work group's deliberations that any topic members felt should be discussed was appropriate. By and large, the work group limited their discussions to the matters outlined in the proviso and possible performance measures.

Principles for a Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program

Legislative Directive

The Legislature directed that the work group “establish principles” for an expanded statewide program, but did not specify what form those principles were to take or how specific or general they should be.

Options Considered

As part of the follow-up to the first work group meeting, members were sent a survey and asked to rank how strongly they agreed or disagreed with various options. These options were based on the briefing papers prepared by the work group coordinator as well as discussions by the work group members during the June 12th meeting. The members of the work group gave the following survey responses, with zero meaning “absolutely disagree” and 100 meaning “absolutely agree”:

Table 1: Possible Principles Statements Considered

Possible Principles Statement – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Responses Range
The work group should recommend that the Don't Drip and Drive Program principles be a combination of 3–5 statements covering both general mission and specific implementation guidance.	89.00	96.00	18.47	38–100
The work group should recommend that the Don't Drip and Drive Program principles ONLY be a general mission statement (e.g., “The mission of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to prevent pollution...”).	40.67	40.00	31.56	0–96
The work group should recommend that the Don't Drip and Drive Program principles ONLY be specific statements guiding program implementation (e.g., “The Don't Drip and Drive Program should focus on encouraging behavior change...”).	53.56	55.00	27.99	1–94
The Don't Drip and Drive Program principles should specifically call out petroleum products as the main source of pollution from leaking vehicles.	42.89	26.00	39.73	0–100

The only statement option that received overwhelming support from the work group respondents was the shaded entry. When the work group met in July to discuss the survey results, there was

consensus that they should recommend an overall mission statement and three to five specific statements about program implementation.

The work group members were also surveyed about their support for possible specific statements about program implementation. Again, the options in the survey came from the briefing papers and work group comments during the June meeting. Responses ranged from one meaning “Should absolutely NOT be a recommendation” to five meaning “Should absolutely be included in work group’s recommendations.” The results were as follows:

Table 2: Possible Guiding Elements/Principles Considered

Possible Guiding Elements/Principles – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be included in work group’s recommendations”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should collaborate with local jurisdictions and other public, private, and nonprofit businesses and organizations to promote the program and assist with program implementation.	4.88	5.00	0.33
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be established with a reliable, steady funding source.	4.88	5.00	0.33
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should use messaging that is specifically designed to resonate with vehicle owners and motivate them to identify and repair leaks in their vehicles.	4.87	5.00	0.67
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should target all vehicle owners, both individuals and businesses.	4.75	5.00	0.43
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should make use of financial and other incentives as needed to ensure success.	4.56	5.00	0.68
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should focus partnership efforts on entities that can help carry out program elements and those that are trusted and respected by the target audience.	4.50	5.00	0.71
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should encourage and maximize voluntary participation.	4.50	4.50	0.50
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should focus on encouraging behavior change, not simply awareness building.	4.44	5.00	0.83
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should track and report results, including audience reached, leaks repaired, and estimated environmental impacts achieved.	4.38	4.50	0.70
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be available to all communities in Washington, but involvement should not be mandatory for any local jurisdiction.	4.38	5.00	1.32
The Don't Drip and Drive Program is founded on the principles of reducing pollution and encouraging proper vehicle maintenance.	4.33	5.00	1.25

Possible Guiding Elements/Principles – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be included in work group’s recommendations”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should design marketing materials that meet the needs of a variety of audiences in a variety of locations, paying special attention to cultural and language differences.	4.33	4.00	0.67
An expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program should primarily be implemented by organizations located in the communities being served while still maintaining a regional approach to addressing the sources of pollution.	4.25	5.00	0.97
The Don't Drip and Drive Program promotes efforts to avoid, eliminate, and reduce pollution generated by leaking or improperly maintained motor vehicles.	4.22	4.00	0.79
Incentives in the Don't Drip and Drive Program should be designed to target participants who are least likely to repair vehicle leaks unless an incentive is provided.	4.22	4.00	0.63
Messaging for the Don't Drip and Drive Program should emphasize the benefits of making vehicle repairs.	4.11	5.00	1.29
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should specifically consider and take steps to address environmental justice and equity issues, including outreach to vehicle owners who are low income, speak languages other than English, and those who may not be available to participate during normal business hours.	4.00	4.00	1.25
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should design messaging techniques to reach a broad variety of audiences, especially those who own or lease vehicles that might leak petroleum products.	3.89	4.00	1.29
The mission of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to prevent pollution from leaking motor vehicles.	3.78	4.00	1.23
Educational and outreach materials for the Don't Drip and Drive Program should encourage regular maintenance and proper repair of all types of motor vehicles, and focus on issues faced by owners of older vehicles that are more prone to leaks.	3.67	4.00	1.25
The purpose of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to assist local governments reduce sources of stormwater pollution from leaking motor vehicles.	3.44	4.00	1.57
The primary purpose of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to reduce the environmental impacts from vehicles leaking petroleum products.	3.11	4.00	1.37
The mission of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to prevent petroleum pollution from leaking motor vehicles.	2.67	3.00	1.25
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should specifically target fleet vehicles.	2.50	2.50	1.12

Possible Guiding Elements/Principles – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be included in work group’s recommendations”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should target vehicle owners who are individuals instead of businesses.	2.22	2.00	0.92
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should target vehicle owners who are businesses instead of individuals.	2.00	2.00	0.71

Many options received good support from the work group respondents, with the shaded entries receiving the most support. When the work group met to discuss the survey results, there was consensus that many of these statements could be included in the final work group recommendations, and that some could be combined to provide guidance for a future statewide program.

Recommended Program Mission Statement and Guiding Principles

The work group achieved consensus and recommends the following as the mission statement of an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program:

The mission of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to use behavior change strategies to prevent stormwater pollution from leaking motor vehicles, help drivers properly maintain vehicles, and help local jurisdictions meet National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements.

The work group also achieved consensus and recommends the following guiding principles for an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program:

- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should partner with local jurisdictions and other public, private, and nonprofit businesses and organizations, including tribal and regional organizations as appropriate, to promote the voluntary program and assist with program implementation.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should use messaging that is specifically designed to resonate with vehicle owners (both individuals and businesses) and motivate them to identify and repair leaks in their vehicles.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should make use of financial and other incentives as needed to ensure success.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should specifically consider and take steps to address environmental justice and equity issues, such as outreach to vehicle owners who are low income, speak languages other than English, and those who may not be available to participate in the program during normal business hours.

Program Scope

Legislative Directive

The budget proviso was specific in its requirements that the work group address “the establishment of a statewide program” based on the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program. Given that the proviso specifically mentions a “statewide” program, the work group interprets the directive to consider “scope” to mean more than just geographic location. In addition to location, the work group considered “scope” to cover issues such as program options offered, types of assistance provided, mentoring, and the form of services or options provided.

Options Considered

The work group considered the program scope as entailing not just physical location, but extent of services provided. Some of the general options considered included:

- The program could be implemented as direct services to Washington residents.
- The program could be implemented as a service to local jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and other partners.
- The program could be made available as a pre-designed “toolkit” to all local jurisdictions, or could be limited based on criteria to be determined.
- Program activities could be maintained, expanded, or reduced.
- Program advertising could be maintained, expanded, or reduced.
- The program could be expanded to encompass new strategies, such as direct financial incentives.
- The program could be reduced to be a series of public service announcements, broadcast on TV and radio throughout the state.
- The program could be less expansive and not be “expanded” or “statewide.”

Work group members considered specific options based on the briefing papers prepared by the work group coordinator as well as discussions by the work group members during the June 12th meeting. The members of the work group gave the following survey responses, with zero meaning “absolutely disagree” and 100 meaning “absolutely agree”:

Table 3: Possible Program Scope Considered

Possible Program Scope – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree” with the statement	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Response Range
Advertising for the Don't Drip and Drive Program should be expanded.	84.00	91.50	19.23	50–100
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be made available as a pre-designed “toolkit” to all local jurisdictions.	78.88	77.50	11.22	61–100

Possible Program Scope – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree” with the statement	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Response Range
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be reduced to ONLY a series of Public Service Announcements, broadcast on TV and radio throughout the state.	17.00	14.50	16.57	0–50
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be implemented as a service to local jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and other partners.	62.75	63.50	27.93	5–100
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be expanded statewide and the current program offerings should be expanded.	61.75	60.50	29.30	1–96
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be expanded in its current form across the entire state.	53.25	52.50	35.28	1–100
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be expanded statewide and the current program offerings should be maintained.	50.00	50.00	30.93	1–97
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be made available as a pre-designed “toolkit” to some local jurisdictions based on criteria to be determined.	40.38	42.00	30.36	1–100
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be implemented by a single entity as a direct service to Washington residents.	37.25	41.00	21.94	1–75
The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be expanded statewide but the current program offerings should be reduced.	31.50	21.00	31.24	0–99

Only two options received good support from the work group respondents, with one additional option being generally disapproved. These line items are shaded in the table above. When the work group met to discuss the survey results, there was consensus among all members that these results could be included in the final work group recommendations.

The members of the work group were also surveyed about specific options related to program expansion:

Table 4: Expansion Options Considered

Expansion Option – Should an expanded program include this option?	Percent Yes
New areas of the state	75.00%
Special outreach for fleet vehicles	75.00%
New media types not previously used	62.50%
New/expanded language/ESL offerings (ads in multiple languages for program accessibility)	62.50%
New options for targeting "clunkers"	62.50%
Expand on existing media types (same techniques, just more ads)	37.50%
New elements in toolkits	37.50%

While the survey results show general agreement with each of the options shaded above, none of these options received any opposition when discussed at the July meeting. Instead, work group members generally agreed with each of the shaded options, but varied in their prioritization of which were the most important.

Program Scope Recommendations

The work group achieved consensus and recommends the following program scope elements for an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program:

- The program should be expanded to all areas of Washington State, potentially on a phased-in basis.
- Expansion of the program should be accompanied by good evaluation of program success using applicable performance measures. Continuous improvement and assessment could help inform future program needs.
- All local jurisdictions should have the opportunity to participate, but should not be required to do so.
- The program materials and toolkits should be available and generalized enough to be adaptable to any jurisdiction.
- A statewide program should provide local jurisdictions with instructions and mentoring as needed or requested to assist them in developing partnerships, offering workshops, and promoting the program.
- A statewide program should ensure increased marketing and advertising, adequate public events and workshops, and expanded partnerships with commercial and nonprofit organizations.
- The program should include outreach to businesses and owners of fleet vehicles.
- The program should expand into new media types and should offer expanded language/ESL and accessible outreach.
- Most importantly, a statewide program must ensure that implementation in new areas of the state is not based solely on the experiences of existing participants. Local jurisdictions in eastern or central Washington may have different needs than those in the Puget Sound region. These differences must be accounted for and incorporated into any expanded statewide program.

Program Partners

Legislative Directive

The budget proviso directed the work group to make recommendations regarding “Potential public, private, and nonprofit partners” for an expanded statewide program.

Options Considered

The workgroup considered a number of potential program partners. Most of these partners are already involved in the existing Don’t Drip and Drive Program to at least some extent. The members of the work group were surveyed regarding specific organizations⁸ in each category mentioned in the proviso, and gave the following responses:

Table 5: Potential Public Agency Partners Considered

Potential Public Agency Partners – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be a program partner”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Washington Stormwater Center/WSU	4.50	5.00	0.71
Department of Ecology	4.25	5.00	1.09
Department of Transportation	4.00	4.00	0.87
Department of Commerce	3.00	3.00	1.31
Department of Enterprise Services	2.63	2.50	1.22
Puget Sound Partnership	2.63	3.00	1.11
State Transportation Commission	2.57	3.00	1.05
State Traffic Safety Commission	2.57	3.00	1.29
Department of Labor and Industries	2.38	2.50	0.99

The members of the work group supported partnering with Washington Stormwater Center, Ecology, Department of Transportation, and Department of Commerce, with the Stormwater Center ranking the highest of all possibilities.

Table 6: Potential Private Sector Partners Considered

Potential Private Sector Partners – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be a program partner”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
AAA	4.57	5.00	0.49
Automobile repair shops	4.57	4.50	0.83

⁸ The list of possible partners was developed by the work group coordinator. Organizations were included if their mission or activities related to some activity or aspect of the Don’t Drip and Drive Program. Organizations were not consulted before they were added to the list. Inclusion on the list does not indicate an organization’s support for (or even awareness of) the Don’t Drip and Drive Program.

Potential Private Sector Partners – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be a program partner”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Quick lube shops	4.43	4.00	0.49
Auto Care Association	4.38	5.00	0.99
Automobile dealers	4.38	4.50	0.70
Automobile manufacturers	4.25	4.50	0.83
SAE	3.83	4.00	0.69
Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association (MEMA)	3.71	4.00	0.88
Avis, Enterprise, Hertz, and other automobile rental companies	3.57	4.00	0.90
Diamond Parking, Standard Parking, and other paid parking lot providers	3.50	3.50	0.96
Penske, Ryder, U-Haul, and other truck rental companies	3.17	3.50	1.37
US Postal Service, FedEx, UPS, and other delivery services	3.00	3.00	1.07

Work group members thought each of the private sector organizations in the survey would be appropriate partners, although some were more favored than others.

One additional organization, the Car Care Council, was not included in the survey but was suggested by one survey respondent. When discussed at the July meeting, the work group members did not voice any objections to including this organization as a potential partner as well.

Table 7: Potential Nonprofit Partners Considered

Potential Nonprofit Partners – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely should be a program partner”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
ASA Northwest	5.00	5.00	0.00
Washington Environmental Council	4.14	4.00	0.64
Northwest Pollution Prevention Resource Center	4.13	4.00	0.60
Futurewise	3.88	1.00	1.05
Centro de la Raza	3.33	3.50	0.75
Environmental Coalition of South Seattle (ECOSS)	3.33	3.50	0.75
Puget Soundkeeper Alliance	3.29	4.00	1.28
Zero Waste Washington	3.29	3.00	1.03
People for Puget Sound	3.20	3.00	0.75
Toxic-Free Future	3.17	3.50	1.07
AARP	2.83	3.00	1.21
Urban League	2.83	3.00	1.07
Faith Action Network	2.60	3.00	1.02

When considering nonprofit organizations, work group members were generally agreeable to all comers, with some organizations being more heavily favored but none receiving opposition. The work group was unanimous that ASA Northwest should absolutely be a program partner going forward.

Recommended Program Partners

The work group achieved consensus in recommending that the Washington Stormwater Center and ASA Northwest both be primary partners in any expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program. The work group also recommends that each of the potential partners identified above could provide their own unique contribution to the program; potential partners that want to participate should have the opportunity to do so.

Budget Requirements

Legislative Directive

The budget proviso directed the work group to make recommendations regarding “Funding requirements” for an expanded statewide program.

Options Considered

The work group considered a fully developed potential approach to developing a budget for a new statewide program, as well as less developed budgeting options as follows:

- A proposed specific budget based on the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program, adjusted for differences in population served and possible changes in workload.⁹
- A proposed specific budget based on projections from factors other than population.
- A proposed general budget based only on experience of participating jurisdictions to date.
- No proposed budget.

The work group members were surveyed on two different aspects of budgeting: how to extrapolate numbers for an expanded program and generally how big the budget should be for that expanded program.

Table 8: Potential Budget Extrapolation Methods Considered

Potential Methods to Extrapolate a Budget – Expanded program should use this method	Percent Yes
Base an estimate on population served to date and extrapolate for the entire state	28.57%
Develop a budget independent of the previous program based on expected expenses	28.57%
Base an estimate on number of cars served to date and extrapolate for the entire state	14.29%
Other: will depend on the lead agency identified and program elements and performance measures, etc.	14.29%
Other: Base an estimate on vehicle miles traveled and extrapolate for the entire estate, consistent with how Ecology estimate leak amounts	14.29%

Even after discussing the survey results at the July meeting, the members of the work group did not reach consensus on a methodology to develop or estimate a budget for an expanded statewide program. Work group members repeatedly expressed discomfort with the idea of developing a budget for a program that has not been more thoroughly defined. Some also expressed discomfort developing a specific budget proposal when they lacked direct personal experience or expertise with the state budgeting process.

⁹ See Appendix G for the budget briefing paper entitled “Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Possible Budget Projections.”

Table 9: Potential Program Budget Size Considered

Budget Size – Should the budget for an expanded program be...	Percent Agree
Expanded program budget should be slightly higher than the budget to date	71.43%
Expanded program budget should be about the same as the budget to date	14.29%
Expanded program budget should be much higher than the budget to date	14.29%
Expanded program budget should be smaller than the budget to date	0.00%

When asked a more general statement about the budget for an expanded program, the vast majority of work group members believed that the budget going forward would need to be larger than it has been in the past, but not overwhelmingly larger. The need for a larger budget is due to the larger target audience and need to develop additional materials for an expanded program.

Although there was general agreement that the budget would need to be slightly higher for an expanded program, the work group was extremely hesitant to develop a detailed budget proposal at this time. As noted above, the members of the work group were concerned about the scope of the new program and firmly believed a statewide program must ensure that implementation in new areas of the state is not based solely on the experiences of existing participants.

The work group believes it is necessary to first consult with local jurisdictions in other parts of the state before finalizing an expanded program. This work could not be completed before this report is due. Instead, the work group recommends that an employee be hired to perform this work, finalize the scope of the expanded program, and develop the appropriate budget accordingly. The work group felt it was not appropriate to attempt to develop a detailed budget until the program scope is more clearly defined to incorporate the needs of non-Puget Sound participants.

Recommended Budget Approach

The work group achieved consensus in making the following recommendations regarding budget and funding requirements:

- A specific budget proposal for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program should not be finalized at this time.
- The funding requirements for an expanded program will be higher than previous budget allocations.
- The funding requirements for an expanded program should be customized based on the scope of an expanded program.
- The Legislature should instead allocate funds during the 2019–2021 biennium to the program managing entity to hire a full-time employee to further refine the scope and budget of a statewide program, based on input from new areas of the state. That employee would perform the following work:
 - Work with existing program and assist as needed or requested.
 - Work closely with ASA Northwest.
 - Work closely with the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program's steering committee and work on establishing connections for an expanded program's steering committee.

- Contact and work with local jurisdictions in parts of the state not currently participating in the Don't Drip and Drive Program to determine their needs and wants regarding an expanded program.
- Refine potential partners in new areas of the state for an expanded statewide program.
- Develop marketing and outreach plans for an expanded statewide program.
- Refine the scope of an expanded statewide program based on work with local jurisdictions. This should include accounting for changes in the marketplace and a move to electric vehicles may that change the need for the Don't Drip and Drive Program. Work group members believed that while electric cars may not require the same engine fluids, they still produce wastes like brake and tire dust, waste tires, and lubricants for non-engine components. These are elements that should be included in any further development and refinement of program scope.
- Use information and reports from Ecology and other outside sources, including the Puget Sound Clean Cars Stormwater Partnership, to identify available data about the scope of the vehicle leak problem.
- Develop program elements to address the needs of lower income individuals.
- Develop budget proposal for expanded statewide program based on work with local jurisdictions.
- Work with partners to refine possible performance measures.
- Manage pass-through funds to local jurisdictions.
- Develop a report to the Legislature for delivery by August 2020 with a finalized budget request covering recommended program elements.
- In addition, the Legislature should allocate \$300,000¹⁰ for the 2019–2021 biennium to the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program so local jurisdictions can continue to provide services and maintain partnerships. These funds should be appropriated to the managing entity and passed through to participating local jurisdictions.

¹⁰ This is the same amount as each of the GROSS grants provided for each of the first three phases of the program.

Funding and Payment

Legislative Directive

The budget proviso directed the work group to make recommendations regarding “potential funding sources for the program” for an expanded statewide program. The work group interpreted this to mean specific possible funding sources, not just a general statement such as “an appropriation by the Legislature.”

Options Considered

Many of the work group members expressed discomfort in considering detailed budget recommendations due to their lack of familiarity with the state budgeting process (and for some, budgeting in general). However, the work group considered a number of funding source options as directed, including:

- General Fund.
- One or more Transportation funds.
- One or more Natural Resources funds (specifically including MTCA).
- Grant funds.
- Fees.

To assist the work group in narrowing the options, the survey asked more general questions about funding purposes – a topic some members were more comfortable with – in addition to asking about specific funding sources.

Table 10: Possible Funding Options Considered

Possible Funding Options – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Range
The program budget should include funding for additional marketing and outreach	89.43	99.00	16.93	51–100
The program budget should include dedicated funding for staff	88.71	100.00	17.19	80–100
The program should be funded by a method that is directly linked to cars as the source of pollution	81.00	95.00	22.14	45–100
The program should not be funded by one or more transportation sources	29.00	19.50	18.83	12–60
The program budget should include funding for continued leak check workshops	74.57	81.00	32.02	1–100
The program budget should include funding for additional leak check workshops beyond previous levels	66.57	70.00	32.75	1–100
The program should be funded by a method that is directly linked to petroleum as the source of pollution	64.43	80.00	26.66	20–80

Possible Funding Options – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Range
The program budget should include funding for additional activities not previously part of the Don't Drip and Drive Program	64.43	51.00	27.11	20–100
The program should be funded by a product stewardship fee	62.71	50.00	25.34	26–100
The program should be funded by one or more transportation sources	60.17	59.50	9.26	50–77
The program budget should include funding for continued leak check events	58.86	80.00	36.67	1–100
The program should absolutely not be funded by MTCA because it is too unreliable	55.00	50.50	12.73	39–80
The program should not be funded by a new fee	54.14	50.00	31.25	1–100
The program should absolutely not be funded by the General Fund because it is too unreliable	53.00	45.00	24.06	20–88
The program budget should include funding for additional leak check events beyond previous levels	53.00	50.00	34.72	1–100
The program should be funded by MTCA	52.50	57.50	18.43	20–75
The program should absolutely be funded by the General Fund because it is the most appropriate source	50.67	55.00	24.72	13–80

The areas of strong agreement are shaded in blue. There were three items of strong consensus on the positive side: that funding should be provided for marketing and outreach, that funding should be provided for staff, and that funding should be tied to cars as the source of pollution.

There was also consensus that the work group *disagreed* with the proposition that funding should *not* come from a transportation fund. However, the reverse statement – that funding should come from a transportation fund – was supported but not to the same level.

When asked more limited questions about funding sources only, the work group responded as follows:

Table 11: Possible Funding Sources Considered

Possible Funding Sources – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” source identified should be used to fund the program	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Some method that is directly related to automobiles as the source of the problem	4.57	5.00	0.49
Legislative appropriation from one or more Transportation funds	4.50	5.00	0.76
Legislative appropriation from one or more Natural Resources funds	4.17	4.50	0.90
Legislative appropriation from the General Fund	3.67	3.50	1.11
In-kind donations	3.33	3.00	0.75

Possible Funding Sources – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” source identified should be used to fund the program	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Other sources	3.00	3.00	0.00
Grant funding	2.71	3.00	1.28
Fees	2.67	2.50	1.25
The work group should not make a recommendation about a specific fund source	2.17	2.00	1.21

The results of those questions show the work group members are most supportive of using a transportation fund source, as the two questions with the most support and least variation in responses both relate to transportation. There was weaker support with more variation among work group responses for using either a natural resources fund (such as MTCA or a water fund) or the General Fund.

The work group also considered a variety of options on how to distribute program funds, including:

Table 12: Possible Payment Methods Considered

Possible Payment Methods – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” the method should be used to distribute payments	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Contracts with providers/locals	4.00	4.00	0.93
Direct payments to service providers	3.17	3.00	1.21
Non-competitive grant program (all applicants get at least some funding)	2.83	2.50	1.34
Non-competitive grant program with matching requirement	2.86	3.00	1.46
Competitive grant program (potential for some applicants to not get funding)	2.33	2.50	1.11
Competitive grant program with matching requirement	2.43	2.00	1.18

There was very little deviation among the work group that contracts are the preferred method of distributing funding to partners.

Funding and Payment Recommendations

The work group achieved consensus on the following recommendations regarding funding:

- Funding for an expanded statewide Don’t Drip and Drive Program should come from one or more transportation funds.
- If possible, funding for an expanded statewide Don’t Drip and Drive Program should be tied to automobiles as the source of the problem.
- Funding should be passed through to local jurisdictions and partners (as needed) through contracts, ensuring appropriate accountability.

Program Oversight

Legislative Directive

The budget proviso directed the work group to make recommendations regarding “Identifying an entity to manage the program.” The work group interpreted this to mean an entity that could actually manage the program as well as an entity that was directly accountable to the Legislature.

Options Considered

The work group considered many organizations as possible managing entities. The work group eventually limited consideration to organizations that could be directly accountable to the Legislature and that could receive a state budget appropriation. This limited the list of possibilities to state agencies.

Program management includes items such as:

- Budget management and oversight.
- Performance evaluation and tracking.
- Developing and refining marketing and outreach plans.
- Developing and refining new or expanded program activities.
- Working with program partners.
- Developing new program partnerships.
- Reporting to the Legislature, as required.
- Other related activities.

The work group acknowledged that the state agencies on the list may or may not actually be good managers of the program. Therefore, the state agencies below should be considered as both possible actual managing entities as well as possible funding managers that would pass money through to a local government or non-government managing entity.

Table 13: Potential Program Administration Considered

Potential Program Administration – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” agency could serve as managing entity	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Washington Stormwater Center/WSU	4.83	5.00	0.37
Department of Ecology	4.43	5.00	0.73
Department of Transportation	4.00	5.00	1.53
State Transportation Commission	3.60	3.00	0.80
Department of Commerce	3.50	3.00	0.76
Department of Enterprise Services	3.00	3.00	0.00
State Traffic Safety Commission	3.00	3.00	1.10
Puget Sound Partnership	2.40	2.00	1.02
Department of Labor and Industries	2.20	2.00	0.75

As noted in the shaded entries, the Washington Stormwater Center had the most support, both in terms of overall mean score as well as in lack of variance in voting. When work group members were asked to rank possible managing entities in order of preference, the results were consistent:

Table 14: Potential Managing Entity

Potential Managing Entity – Ranking Vote	First place votes	Second place votes	Third place votes	Average Score
Washington Stormwater Center/WSU	4	0	2	7.33
Department of Ecology	2	2	1	5.67
Department of Transportation	0	3	1	3.33
Department of Commerce	1	0	2	2.33
Puget Sound Partnership	0	1	0	1.00
Other: career and technical colleges	0	1	0	1.00
Department of Enterprise Services	0	0	0	0.00
Department of Labor and Industries	0	0	0	0.00
State Transportation Commission	0	0	0	0.00
State Traffic Safety Commission	0	0	0	0.00

Again, Washington Stormwater Center ranked the highest with the highest number of first place votes and the highest overall average score.

The Washington Stormwater Center provides stormwater leadership through research, training, and education. They have often been called on to educate elected officials, municipalities, and the public about the dangers of stormwater runoff to Coho salmon, as well as the solutions the Center has helped uncover. They are a central resource for research, information and new, innovative, and emerging technologies. RCW 90.48.545 outlines the following activities for the Stormwater Center:

- (a) Review and evaluate emerging stormwater technologies;
- (b) Research and develop innovative and cost-effective technical solutions to remove pollutants from runoff and to reduce or eliminate stormwater discharges;
- (c) Conduct pilot projects to test technical solutions;
- (d) Serve as a clearinghouse and outreach center for information on stormwater technology;
- (e) Assist in the development of stormwater control methods to better protect water quality, including source control, product substitution, pollution prevention, and stormwater treatment;
- (f) Coordinate with federal, state, and local agencies and private organizations in administering programs related to stormwater control measures; and
- (g) Collaborate with existing stormwater outreach programs.

The work group members agreed that having Washington Stormwater Center serve as managing entity would be consistent with the Center’s mission and purpose. They are uniquely qualified to help local jurisdictions identify and address sources of stormwater pollution, whether they are from leaking vehicles, tire dust, roofs, paints, or other sources.

There was one significant concern about selecting the Washington Stormwater Center as managing entity for an expanded statewide program. Because it is associated with Washington State University, the work group is concerned that WSU will take a significant indirect reimbursement rate off the top of any funds appropriated to the Washington Stormwater Center (potentially in the neighborhood of 50 percent or more). The work group understands that the Legislature can address this concern in any budget appropriation and has included a recommendation about this concern.

If the Legislature does not wish to limit the indirect reimbursement rate or take other steps to ensure sufficient funds are available for program services, the work group instead recommends that the Department of Commerce take the lead to manage the program and pass funds through to ASA Northwest to manage the day-to-day aspect of the expanded program. The work group selected Commerce as the second choice even though the pre-discussion survey results ranked them fourth behind Ecology and WSDOT. Although the work group also considered (and would likely support) either Ecology or WSDOT as possible program managers, work group discussions highlighted Commerce's experience in managing programs that pass money through to locals and other organizations. Because of this experience and the work group's discussions about the various other options for managing entity, the work group achieved consensus on recommending Commerce as the second choice behind Washington Stormwater Center for managing entity.

In discussions, the work group members made it very clear that whichever entity is chosen to lead an expanded statewide program, it is very important that ASA Northwest maintain an active role in both overall program oversight as well as day-to-day operations.

Both the Washington Stormwater Center and Commerce concur with the work group recommendations. Commerce agrees that the Washington Stormwater Center is the entity best positioned to coordinate a statewide expansion of the Don't Drip and Drive Program. If the Legislature instead designates Commerce as the lead entity, the agency notes it would be able to competently pass funds through to a nonprofit or other entity who would serve as the program manager overseeing day-to-day aspects of an expanded program. Commerce does not anticipate that it would actively engage with the statewide steering committee or otherwise participate beyond managing the funds passed through to local governments or other organizations such as ASA Northwest.

Program Oversight Recommendations

The work group achieved consensus that Washington Stormwater Center should be the managing entity for an expanded statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program if the Legislature can limit the indirect rate taken by WSU (or otherwise account for those funds that would no longer be available for program services). Washington Stormwater Center should work closely with ASA Northwest to implement the program.

Ecology agrees with the recommendation for the program to move to the Center as it has the expertise and the focused priority to expand and progress the program.

If the Legislature cannot limit the WSU indirect rate or otherwise ensure full funding to program services, the work group recommends that Department of Commerce be the lead agency and that it pass funding through to ASA Northwest and the coalition of participating local jurisdictions.

The work group also recommends that the managing entity work closely with a robust statewide steering committee with representatives from:¹¹

- Department of Commerce
- Department of Ecology
- Department of Transportation
- ASA Northwest
- An environmental non-governmental organization
- A non-governmental organization focused on environmental justice issues
- Eastern Washington STORM
- Western Washington STORM
- Tribes and other regional partnerships, as appropriate (*e.g.*, Oregon, Idaho, and British Columbia)
- Trade schools/community colleges
- A Phase 1 Municipal Stormwater permittee/local jurisdiction
- A Phase 2 Municipal Stormwater Permittee/local jurisdiction

¹¹ Representatives from auto manufacturers expressed the desire to be included on the steering committee as well. This possibility was not considered by the work group. As the work group did not reach a consensus about including auto manufacturers on the steering committee, this report does not present that possibility as a recommendation. However, it is important to note that the work group did not reject the idea; it simply was not discussed as an option.

Performance Measures

Legislative Directive

The budget proviso did not make any reference to performance measures or how an expanded statewide program would report on its effects. However, the associated policy bill (HB 2899) would have required that a new program submit an evaluation to the Governor and the Legislature every four years reporting:

...The evaluation must consider the behavioral response to the program and impacts to the environment, the economy, and vehicle performance and reliability.

Given this previous interest in program performance, the work group felt it was appropriate to discuss possible performance measures for an expanded statewide program.

Options Considered

The work group considered a variety of both outputs (counts of items such as tasks performed or customers served) and outcomes (actual effects or results achieved). The work group considered both because each of these line items were mentioned in the original underlying policy bill. Work group members were surveyed on a variety of possible choices, broken down into groups by topic, as follows:

Table 15: Possible Leak Detection/Repair Performance Measure Outputs

Possible Leak Detection/Repair Performance Measure Outputs – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” measure should be used	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Number of leaks repaired as a result of program inspection	4.86	5.00	0.35
Number of repairs by leak type	4.43	5.00	0.73
Number of cars inspected at partner quick lube and auto repair shops	4.29	5.00	0.88
Number of cars inspected at events and workshops	4.14	5.00	1.46
Number of leaks found but NOT repaired	4.14	4.00	0.83
Average repair costs	4.00	4.00	0.93
Model year or average age of vehicles being repaired	3.71	4.00	1.16
Model year or average age of vehicles being inspected	3.29	4.00	1.48
Number of personal vehicles vs. commercial vehicles inspected	3.14	3.00	1.12

Work group members agreed that number of leaks repaired, type of leak repaired, and number of cars inspected are the most important measurements to track.

Table 16: Possible Public Participation Performance Measure Outputs

Possible Public Participation Performance Measure Outputs – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” measure should be used	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Referral sources -- how participant learned about the program	4.71	5.00	0.45
Participant motivation -- why participant brought vehicle into partner quick lube or auto repair shop	4.57	5.00	0.73
Number of participating vehicle owners at educational workshops	4.14	5.00	1.46
Number of participating vehicle owners at leak check events	4.14	5.00	1.46
Participant motivation -- why participant attended workshop or leak check event	4.00	5.00	1.41
Participant workshop survey results (what they liked best, what to improve, etc.)	3.57	4.00	1.50
Demographics of participants at workshops and leak check events	3.29	4.00	1.48
Demographics of participants at partner quick lube and auto repair shops	3.15	4.00	1.36

Work group members agreed that understanding how vehicle owners learned about the program and what motivated them to have their vehicle checked for leaks were both very important data points to track. Demographic information, while important, was a lower priority.

Table 17: Possible Program Services Performance Measure Outputs

Possible Program Services Performance Measure Outputs – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” measure should be used	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Number of quick lube shops and other auto repair business partners joining/continuing with expanded program	4.71	5.00	0.45
Number of local jurisdictions and other NGO partners joining/continuing with expanded program	4.57	5.00	0.49
Number of educational workshops conducted (and by which entity/organization, if applicable)	4.14	5.00	1.36
Number of leak check events conducted (and by which entity/organization, if applicable)	4.14	5.00	1.36
Number of website visits	4.00	4.00	1.07
Number of website downloads of educational materials	4.00	4.00	0.82
Number of advertisements run (and by format, e.g., TV, radio, print, etc., if applicable)	4.00	4.00	0.93

Possible Program Services Performance Measure Outputs – Range 1–5 where 5 is “absolutely agree” measure should be used	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation
Number of publications/materials made available to communities not previously reached (e.g., in other languages, in accessible formats, etc.)	3.86	4.00	0.83

When considering performance measures related to program management, work group members believed all the choices given were high priorities.

Table 18: Possible Performance Measure Outcomes

Possible Performance Measure Outcomes – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Range
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of reported behavior change (e.g., participants reporting they will check for leaks, change how they maintain vehicle, etc.) as a result of program financial incentives?	85.43	90.00	17.00	51–100
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of reported behavior change (e.g., participants reporting they will check for leaks, change how they maintain vehicle, etc.) as a result of program participation?	66.50	70.00	26.86	19–99
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of "estimated petroleum contamination avoided due to leaks prevented and repaired attributable to the program"?	54.29	75.00	37.32	1–100
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of "estimated reduction in air emissions from leaks prevented and repaired or improved vehicle maintenance attributable to the program"?	28.43	20.00	33.18	0–100
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of "estimated economic impact from fewer vehicle breakdowns as a result of improved vehicle maintenance attributable to the program"?	38.86	32.00	30.33	1–86
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of "estimated economic impact from repair expenses avoided due to early detection as a result of improved vehicle maintenance attributable to the program"?	35.14	32.00	26.91	1–85

Possible Performance Measure Outcomes – Range 0–100 where 100 is “absolutely agree”	Mean Score	Median Score	Standard Deviation	Range
Should an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program use a performance measure of "estimated economic impact and financial savings from improved fuel economy as a result of improved vehicle maintenance attributable to the program"?	47.43	60.00	34.37	1–90

Although environmental effects attributable to the program were of interest, the work group members only agreed that behavior change among vehicle owners was a topic that should be a focus for program performance measures. Side comments provided by work group members reflected discomfort with the work needed to develop defensible models for predicting overall environmental, economic, or vehicle reliability effects from repaired or avoided leaks.

Table 19: Performance Measures Priorities

Performance Measures Priorities – Ranking Vote	First place votes	Second place votes	Third place votes
Number of leaks repaired as a result of program inspection	5	0	1
Average repair costs	1	1	1
Model year or average age of vehicles being inspected	0	2	0
Number of leaks found but NOT repaired	0	1	2
Number of cars inspected at partner quick lube and auto repair shops	0	1	0
Number of repairs by leak type	0	1	0
Number of cars inspected at events and workshops	0	0	2
Number of personal vehicles vs. commercial vehicles inspected	0	0	0
Model year or average age of vehicles being repaired	0	0	0

When asked to prioritize which performance measure data points were the most important, work group members favored tracking number of leaks repaired as a result of the program. Other data points were important but less so.

Performance Measures Recommendations

The work group reached consensus on a number of items:

- First, the work group was concerned about trying to collect too many data points, especially by repair/quick lube shop partners. The work group acknowledged the time constraints these partners are under and recommends an expanded statewide program and its managing entity consider these constraints when making requests for data collection related to the program.

- Second, as the work group has recommended that an expanded statewide program has dedicated staffing, the work group recommends that the managing entity continue to track data points such as web site hits, number of participating repair shops, advertising metrics, and related program performance indicators.
- Third, the work group was concerned about the time and resources needed to track behavior change among program participants as a measure of the program's outcomes. Performance measures should balance the need for reliable information and the burden created for participating repair shops to collect that information. The work group recommends that an expanded statewide program and its managing entity focus on tracking behavior change indicators instead of trying to extrapolate environmental and economic effects attributable to the program. The most important metric to track is number of leaks repaired due to the program.

Ecology Comment

Ecology Representation, Concurrence, and Next Steps

As noted above, Ecology was represented on the work group and actively participated in all work group discussions. Ecology concurs with all of the work group recommendations and supports all conclusions.

The work group did not make any recommendations for future work to be performed by Ecology. Instead, the agency will support and assist Washington Stormwater Center in performing assigned work as needed or requested.

Ecology Perspective on Don't Drip and Drive as a Stormwater Protection Program

The Don't Drip and Drive Program has been a successful example of community based social marketing. The public value of the program is that local governments can use it to illustrate how poorly maintained vehicles cause stormwater contamination and how each of us can do our part to prevent pollution. Beyond the education and outreach benefits of the program (*e.g.*, actual leak repairs made), Ecology found a very low return on investment when the program was funded under our Grants of Regional or Statewide Significance program. From 2012–2017, Ecology and grant recipients spent over \$1.5 million on the program, but the program resulted in repairs to approximately 0.01 percent of the estimated leaking vehicles in our state.

In contrast, Ecology's focus on stormwater instead centers on developing stormwater permits that prevent and address municipal and other large sources of stormwater pollution (such as from industrial facilities). The agency's focus is to provide financial assistance to municipalities for activities and infrastructure that address stormwater pollution. Technical assistance and engineering support are principle areas of expertise for Ecology's Water Quality Program. Ecology's expertise in outreach and education programs like Don't Drip and Drive is less well-developed.

Ecology's municipal stormwater permits require local governments to implement outreach campaigns, measure their effectiveness at changing behavior, and adapt as needed. Many municipalities use the Don't Drip and Drive Program to fulfill this requirement, and Ecology supports making the program available to other jurisdictions around the state. We believe local governments are best positioned to determine the needs and priorities for their residents and can best determine the most effective outreach campaigns for their communities.

The Washington Stormwater Center's mission is to support local governments and help them implement their stormwater permits. The Don't Drip and Drive Program provides an opportunity for local governments to meet the education and outreach requirement of a municipal stormwater permit. It seems a natural fit that a statewide expansion of the Don't Drip and Drive Program be coordinated by the Washington Stormwater Center.

Conclusion

The work group believes in the Don't Drip and Drive Program and its potential to be a motivator for behavior change. Expanding the program statewide so additional Washington residents can have access received strong support among the work group members. However, the work group members also expressed concern about making assumptions about potential new participants and locations: program elements that work in urban areas may not be the best or most successful program elements for other areas of the state. This guideline must be part of an expanded statewide program if it is to be successful.

Because of this guideline, the work group is generally hesitant to make specific recommendations regarding budget needs or program scope beyond those noted above. The work group instead believes it would be better to hire an employee to work for the managing entity to coordinate with new jurisdictions, identify their needs and wants from an expanded program, and then finalize specifics related to scope and budget. The employee and managing entity should then provide recommendations to the Legislature for the 2021 biennium that expand on those detailed in this report. Sufficient, steady funding is needed to ensure the continued success of the Don't Drip and Drive Program.

At this time, the work group believes the Washington Stormwater Center is the best choice for a managing entity, working in conjunction with ASA Northwest. The program relates well to the Center's mission and provides them an additional opportunity to serve local government entities. While other state agencies, like Ecology or Commerce, could also be managing entities, their involvement would likely be more limited than the active participation envisioned for the Washington Stormwater Center.¹² As noted above, the work group makes this recommendation with the expectation that WSU indirect costs can be limited. If an agency such as Commerce or Ecology is selected as the managing entity, the work group would still recommend hiring an employee of that agency to perform the work noted above.

To ensure effective oversight of an expanded program, the work group also strongly recommends a robust oversight committee representing a variety of stakeholders. Program oversight should not be limited to just the program's managing entity but should also include other state agencies, participating local jurisdictions, and non-governmental entities.

While the Don't Drip and Drive Program is just a small part of Washington State's efforts to protect our environment, the work group believes it is a worthwhile part of those efforts. The work group encourages the state Legislature to fund and support this program going forward.

¹² Some members of the work group strongly supported having a state agency like Commerce, WSDOT, or Ecology be the managing entity. There was not consensus among the entire work group for these agencies as the recommended managing entity and each agency expressed concerns about taking on that role in an expanded program.

Appendices

Appendix A. Participating Jurisdictions

The following are the local jurisdictions that have participated in the Don't Drip and Drive Program during at least part of the first three phases:

Algona	Fircrest	Orting
Anacortes	Gig Harbor	Pierce County
Arlington	Granite Falls	Port Angeles
Auburn	Issaquah	Port Orchard
Bainbridge Island	Kenmore	Poulsbo
Bellevue	Kent	Puyallup
Bellingham	King County	Redmond
Black Diamond	Kirkland	Renton
Bonney Lake	Kitsap County	Sammamish
Bothell	Lacey	SeaTac
Bremerton	Lake Forest Park	Seattle (SPU)
Brier	Lake Stevens	Sedro Woolley
Buckley	Lakewood	Shoreline
Burien	Lynnwood	Skagit County
Burlington	Maple Valley	Snohomish
Clyde Hill	Marysville	Snohomish County
Covington	Medina	Snoqualmie
Des Moines	Mercer Island	Steilacoom
Dupont	Mill Creek	Sultan
Duvall	Milton	Sumner
Edgewood	Monroe	Tacoma
Edmonds	Mountlake Terrace	Thurston County
Enumclaw	Mukilteo	Tukwila
Everett	Newcastle	Tumwater
Federal Way	Normandy Park	University Place
Ferndale	Oak Harbor	Whatcom County
Fife	Olympia	Woodinville

Appendix B. Budget Proviso

CERTIFICATION OF ENROLLMENT
ENGROSSED SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 6106

65th Legislature
2018 Regular Session

Passed by the Senate March 8, 2018
Yeas 47 Nays 1

President of the Senate

Passed by the House March 7, 2018
Yeas 96 Nays 1

Speaker of the House of Representatives
Approved

Governor of the State of Washington

CERTIFICATE

I, Brad Hendrickson, Secretary of the Senate of the State of Washington, do hereby certify that the attached is ENGROSSED SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 6106 as passed by Senate and the House of Representatives on the dates hereon set forth.

Secretary

FILED

Secretary of State
State of Washington

1 (3) Assessing a self-insurance premium surcharge of sixteen
2 dollars per pilotage assignment on vessels requiring pilotage in the
3 Puget Sound pilotage district.

4 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 106.** A new section is added to 2017 c 313
5 (uncodified) to read as follows:

6 **FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY**

7 Motor Vehicle Account—State Appropriation \$30,000

8 The appropriation in this section is subject to the following
9 conditions and limitations: \$30,000 of the motor vehicle account—
10 state appropriation is provided solely for the department to convene
11 a work group to establish principles, review options, and develop
12 recommendations regarding the establishment of a statewide program
13 with a purpose of reducing fluid leakage from motor vehicles.

14 (1) The work group must be comprised of public, private, and
15 nonprofit stakeholders and must include at least the Washington
16 stormwater center, stormwater outreach for regional municipalities,
17 the association of Washington cities, and the Washington state
18 association of counties.

19 (2) The work group shall use the statewide don't drip and drive
20 program established by the department as a model for creating this
21 new program. The work group shall establish principles, review
22 options, and develop recommendations regarding the new program.
23 Recommendations made by the work group shall include, but are not
24 limited to:

- 25 (a) Identifying an entity to manage the program;
- 26 (b) Potential public, private, and nonprofit partners;
- 27 (c) The potential scope of the program; and
- 28 (d) Funding requirements and potential funding sources for the
29 program.

30 (3) The work group shall submit a report with its findings and
31 recommendations to the transportation committees of the legislature
32 by November 1, 2018.

33 **Sec. 107.** 2017 c 313 s 102 (uncodified) is amended to read as
34 follows:

35 **FOR THE UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

36 Grade Crossing Protective Account—State Appropriation . . \$1,604,000

37 Pilotage Account—State Appropriation \$50,000

Appendix C. House Bill 2899 (2018)

H-4036.2

HOUSE BILL 2899

State of Washington 65th Legislature 2018 Regular Session
By Representatives Gregerson, Doglio, Jenkins, and Peterson
Read first time 01/22/18. Referred to Committee on Transportation.

1 AN ACT Relating to establishing a vehicle maintenance improvement
2 program; adding a new chapter to Title 46 RCW; making an
3 appropriation; and providing an effective date.

4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

5 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 1.** (1)(a) The legislature finds, regarding
6 the don't drip and drive program undertaken by the department of
7 ecology between 2011 and 2017, that the program:

8 (i) Was designed to improve vehicle owners' awareness of vehicle
9 leaks and to motivate the owners of leaking vehicles to fix the
10 leaks;

11 (ii) Has achieved progress in addressing a significant source of
12 water pollution in the Puget Sound region: Vehicles that leak fluids
13 that cause significant water quality impairments;

14 (iii) Was developed in partnership with an extensive coalition of
15 municipalities and other partners in the Puget Sound region;

16 (iv) Was founded on extensive research and a well-developed
17 educational campaign;

18 (v) Has been funded by a series of one-time grants; and

19 (vi) Has resulted in the reduction of the source of water
20 pollution from vehicle fluids, as well as a number of ancillary
21 benefits, including improved vehicle fuel economy for vehicle owners,

1 better air quality, the delayed need for vehicle repairs, improved
2 reliability in vehicle operation, and others;

3 (b) The legislature further finds that the results of the program
4 demonstrate benefits that could be realized: More comprehensively,
5 were the scope of the program to emphasize all benefits of proper
6 vehicle maintenance; more broadly, were the program to be expanded
7 statewide; and continuously, were the program to be funded with a
8 permanent revenue source;

9 (c) The legislature further finds that the benefits of proper
10 vehicle maintenance are more pronounced in older vehicles; and

11 (d) The legislature also recognizes the value of partnerships
12 with local governments and private sector stakeholders in ensuring
13 the development and establishment of a robust and enduring program.

14 (2) Therefore, the legislature intends to create an ongoing and
15 statewide vehicle maintenance improvement program, led by the
16 department of ecology, in collaboration with the department of
17 commerce, and in concert with local government partners, using the
18 don't drip and drive program initiated by the department of ecology
19 as a model, for the purpose of: Raising awareness of the importance
20 of routine vehicle maintenance, particularly for older vehicles; and
21 achieving actual environmental, economic, vehicle performance and
22 reliability, and other benefits of proper vehicle maintenance.

23 NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. (1) The department of ecology, in
24 collaboration with the department of commerce, and in concert with
25 municipal partners around the state, must establish an ongoing
26 vehicle maintenance improvement program with the goals of:

27 (a) Improving vehicle owners' awareness of the importance of
28 proper and regular vehicle maintenance, particularly with older
29 vehicles;

30 (b) Motivating vehicle owners to conduct routine and proper
31 vehicle maintenance; and

32 (c) Yielding outcomes that provide improvements to the
33 environment, reliability of vehicle travel, and personal economy.

34 (2) The state's role in the vehicle maintenance improvement
35 program, through the department of ecology, in collaboration with the
36 department of commerce, is to:

37 (a) Coordinate public outreach and education efforts to promote
38 proper and routine vehicle maintenance;

1 (b) Provide grant oversight and technical assistance to local
2 government partners;

3 (c) Develop educational materials in different languages and for
4 different media to engage a broad spectrum of the public;

5 (d) Develop vehicle maintenance workshops and other events for
6 the purpose of identifying symptoms of vehicle wear, correctable by
7 routine maintenance, thus providing the public with learning
8 opportunities and potential trust building experiences with car
9 mechanics;

10 (e) Establish an advisory group of public, private, and nonprofit
11 stakeholders for the purposes of guiding the program development;

12 (f) Develop strategies to reduce costs or perceptions of costs
13 associated with vehicle maintenance, in part through working with
14 private sector stakeholders and associations, in order to motivate
15 vehicle owners to conduct proper vehicle maintenance; and

16 (g) Measure the behavioral response to the program, as well as
17 environmental, vehicle performance, and other outcomes.

18 (3) Local governments are authorized to participate in the
19 vehicle maintenance improvement program through:

20 (a) Disseminating program materials through online advertising,
21 social media, and other localized media channels;

22 (b) Holding vehicle maintenance workshops and other related
23 events to identify and promote the correction of deficiencies
24 attributable to normal vehicle wear;

25 (c) Applying to the state for matching grants from the department
26 of ecology or department of commerce;

27 (d) Engaging nonprofit organizations and other interested parties
28 as a stakeholder advisory committee for the purpose of guiding the
29 local government to implement the program strategically; and

30 (e) Partnering with participating vehicle maintenance facilities
31 and repair shops to promote vehicle maintenance and discount
32 necessary repairs.

33 (4) The departments of ecology and commerce may adopt rules to
34 implement this section.

35 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 3.** The vehicle maintenance improvement
36 account is created in the state treasury. All receipts from local
37 governments and private sector stakeholder contributions related to
38 the vehicle maintenance improvement program must be deposited into
39 the account. Moneys in the account may be spent only after

1 appropriation. Expenditures from the account may be used only for the
2 purposes of the vehicle maintenance improvement program established
3 in section 2 of this act, including grants to local governments for
4 the purposes of the program. Any grants must be matched by local
5 contributions.

6 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 4.** By December 31, 2020, and every four years
7 thereafter, the departments of ecology and commerce shall evaluate
8 the vehicle maintenance improvement program established in section 2
9 of this act and shall report to the governor and the environmental
10 and transportation committees of the legislature on the results of
11 the program to date. The evaluation must consider the behavioral
12 response to the program and impacts to the environment, the economy,
13 and vehicle performance and reliability.

14 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 5.** The sum of six hundred thousand dollars,
15 or as much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated for the
16 fiscal biennium ending June 30, 2019, from the motor vehicle account
17 to the department of ecology for the purposes of the vehicle
18 maintenance improvement program established in section 2 of this act.

19 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 6.** Sections 1 through 4 and 7 of this act
20 constitute a new chapter in Title 46 RCW.

21 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 7.** This act takes effect July 1, 2018.

--- END ---

H-4634.1

SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL 2899

State of Washington 65th Legislature 2018 Regular Session

**By House Transportation (originally sponsored by Representatives
Gregerson, Doglio, Jenkins, and Peterson)**

READ FIRST TIME 02/06/18.

1 AN ACT Relating to establishing a vehicle maintenance improvement
2 program; adding a new chapter to Title 46 RCW; and providing an
3 effective date.

4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

5 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 1.** (1)(a) The legislature finds, regarding
6 the don't drip and drive program undertaken by the department of
7 ecology between 2011 and 2017, that the program:

8 (i) Was designed to improve vehicle owners' awareness of vehicle
9 leaks and to motivate the owners of leaking vehicles to fix the
10 leaks;

11 (ii) Has achieved progress in addressing a significant source of
12 water pollution in the Puget Sound region: Vehicles that leak fluids
13 that cause significant water quality impairments;

14 (iii) Was developed in partnership with an extensive coalition of
15 municipalities and other partners in the Puget Sound region;

16 (iv) Was founded on extensive research and a well-developed
17 educational campaign;

18 (v) Has been funded by a series of one-time grants; and

19 (vi) Has resulted in the reduction of the source of water
20 pollution from vehicle fluids, as well as a number of ancillary
21 benefits, including improved vehicle fuel economy for vehicle owners,

1 better air quality, the delayed need for vehicle repairs, improved
2 reliability in vehicle operation, and others;

3 (b) The legislature further finds that the results of the program
4 demonstrate benefits that could be realized: More comprehensively,
5 were the scope of the program to emphasize all benefits of proper
6 vehicle maintenance; more broadly, were the program to be expanded
7 statewide; and continuously, were the program to be funded with a
8 permanent revenue source;

9 (c) The legislature further finds that the benefits of proper
10 vehicle maintenance are more pronounced in older vehicles; and

11 (d) The legislature also recognizes the value of partnerships
12 with local governments and private sector stakeholders in ensuring
13 the development and establishment of a robust and enduring program.

14 (2) Therefore, the legislature intends to create an ongoing and
15 statewide vehicle maintenance improvement program, led by the
16 department of ecology, in collaboration with the department of
17 commerce, and in concert with local government partners, using the
18 don't drip and drive program initiated by the department of ecology
19 as a model, for the purpose of: Raising awareness of the importance
20 of routine vehicle maintenance, particularly for older vehicles; and
21 achieving actual environmental, economic, vehicle performance and
22 reliability, and other benefits of proper vehicle maintenance.

23 NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. (1) The department of ecology, in
24 collaboration with the department of commerce, and in concert with
25 municipal partners around the state, must establish an ongoing
26 vehicle maintenance improvement program with the goals of:

27 (a) Improving vehicle owners' awareness of the importance of
28 proper and regular vehicle maintenance, particularly with older
29 vehicles;

30 (b) Motivating vehicle owners to conduct routine and proper
31 vehicle maintenance; and

32 (c) Yielding outcomes that provide improvements to the
33 environment, reliability of vehicle travel, and personal economy.

34 (2) The state's role in the vehicle maintenance improvement
35 program, through the department of ecology, in collaboration with the
36 department of commerce, is to:

37 (a) Coordinate public outreach and education efforts to promote
38 proper and routine vehicle maintenance;

1 (b) Provide grant oversight and technical assistance to local
2 government partners;

3 (c) Develop educational materials in different languages and for
4 different media to engage a broad spectrum of the public;

5 (d) Develop vehicle maintenance workshops and other events for
6 the purpose of identifying symptoms of vehicle wear, correctable by
7 routine maintenance, thus providing the public with learning
8 opportunities and potential trust building experiences with car
9 mechanics;

10 (e) Establish an advisory group of public, private, and nonprofit
11 stakeholders for the purposes of guiding the program development;

12 (f) Develop strategies to reduce costs or perceptions of costs
13 associated with vehicle maintenance, in part through working with
14 private sector stakeholders and associations, in order to motivate
15 vehicle owners to conduct proper vehicle maintenance; and

16 (g) Measure the behavioral response to the program, as well as
17 environmental, vehicle performance, and other outcomes.

18 (3) Local governments are authorized to participate in the
19 vehicle maintenance improvement program through:

20 (a) Disseminating program materials through online advertising,
21 social media, and other localized media channels;

22 (b) Holding vehicle maintenance workshops and other related
23 events to identify and promote the correction of deficiencies
24 attributable to normal vehicle wear;

25 (c) Applying to the state for matching grants from the department
26 of ecology or department of commerce;

27 (d) Engaging nonprofit organizations and other interested parties
28 as a stakeholder advisory committee for the purpose of guiding the
29 local government to implement the program strategically; and

30 (e) Partnering with participating vehicle maintenance facilities
31 and repair shops to promote vehicle maintenance and discount
32 necessary repairs.

33 (4) The departments of ecology and commerce may adopt rules to
34 implement this section.

35 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 3.** The vehicle maintenance improvement
36 account is created in the state treasury. All receipts from local
37 governments and private sector stakeholder contributions related to
38 the vehicle maintenance improvement program must be deposited into
39 the account. Moneys in the account may be spent only after

1 appropriation. Expenditures from the account may be used only for the
2 purposes of the vehicle maintenance improvement program established
3 in section 2 of this act, including grants to local governments for
4 the purposes of the program. Any grants must be matched by local
5 contributions.

6 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 4.** By December 31, 2020, and every four years
7 thereafter, the departments of ecology and commerce shall evaluate
8 the vehicle maintenance improvement program established in section 2
9 of this act and shall report to the governor and the environmental
10 and transportation committees of the legislature on the results of
11 the program to date. The evaluation must consider the behavioral
12 response to the program and impacts to the environment, the economy,
13 and vehicle performance and reliability.

14 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 5.** Sections 1 through 4 and 6 of this act
15 constitute a new chapter in Title 46 RCW.

16 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 6.** This act takes effect July 1, 2018.

--- END ---

Appendix E. Program Principles Options Discussion Paper

Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Program Principles Options

PROGRAM PRINCIPLES

The directive from the Legislature instructs the work group to develop "program principles" but does not define what this means. The work group will need to determine how detailed the program principles should be. Options that the work group could consider include:

General Mission Statement

A general statement of the program's mission might be sufficient to meet the Legislative directive. A general statement could include language such as:

- The mission of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to prevent petroleum pollution from leaking motor vehicles.
- The purpose of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to assist local governments reduce sources of stormwater pollution from leaking motor vehicles.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program is founded on the principles of reducing pollution and encouraging proper vehicle maintenance.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program promotes efforts to avoid, eliminate, and reduce pollution generated by leaking or improperly maintained motor vehicles.

Specific Statements of Principle

Instead of or in addition to a general mission statement, the work group could choose to identify specific statements of principle. These statements would define and/or guide operations of an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program. These statements could be broad statements or detailed, tailored, guiding instructions. Examples of more specific statements are:

- The primary purpose of the Don't Drip and Drive Program is to reduce the environmental impacts from vehicles leaking petroleum products.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should focus on encouraging behavior change, not simply awareness building.
- Messaging for the Don't Drip and Drive Program should emphasize the benefits of making vehicle repairs.
- Educational and outreach materials for the Don't Drip and Drive Program should encourage regular maintenance and proper repair of all types of motor vehicles, and focus on issues faced by owners of older vehicles that are more prone to leaks.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should use messaging that is specifically designed to resonate with vehicle owners and motivate them to identify and repair leaks in their vehicles.

- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should design messaging techniques to reach a broad variety of audiences, especially those who own or lease vehicles that might leak petroleum products.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should design marketing materials that meet the needs of a variety of audiences in a variety of locations, paying special attention to cultural and language differences.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should specifically consider and take steps to address environmental justice and equity issues, including outreach to vehicle owners who are low income, speak languages other than English, and those who may not be available to participate during normal business hours.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should make use of financial and other incentives as needed to ensure success.
- Incentives in the Don't Drip and Drive Program should be designed to target participants who are least likely to repair vehicle leaks unless an incentive is provided.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should target vehicle owners who are individuals instead of businesses.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should collaborate with local jurisdictions and other public, private, and nonprofit businesses and organizations to promote the program and assist with program implementation.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should focus partnership efforts on entities that can help carry out program elements and those that are trusted and respected by the target audience.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should track and report results, including audience reached, leaks repaired, and estimated environmental impacts achieved.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be established with a reliable, steady funding source.
- An expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program should primarily be implemented by organizations located in the communities being served while still maintaining a regional approach to addressing the sources of pollution.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should encourage and maximize voluntary participation.
- The Don't Drip and Drive Program should be available to all communities in Washington, but involvement should not be mandatory for any local jurisdiction.

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature directed that the “work group shall establish principles, review options, and develop recommendations regarding” an expanded Don't Drive and Drive Program. The work group's report to the Legislature should include at least one guiding principle for an expanded program.

NEXT STEPS

Work group members should review the above information and determine whether the principle(s) should be a general mission statement, a list of specific guidance, or both. After making that determination, the work group should decide which of the above principles, if any, they would like to include in the report to the Legislature. If there are other principles not listed above that the work group wants to recommend, please let Kimberly know so she can include them in future options documents and the draft report.

Discussion Paper: Program Principles Options
June 12, 2018
Page 2

Appendix F. Program Scope and Partners Options Discussion Paper

Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Program Scope Options and Potential Program Partners

SCOPE OF AN EXPANDED PROGRAM

To date, the Don't Drip and Drive Program has focused primarily in the Puget Sound region. The program has recently launched in Clark and Spokane counties as well.

Because the Legislature charged the work group with making recommendations about the scope of an "expanded, statewide program," it is logical to assume that "scope" does not refer to physical location. Therefore, "scope" could entail a variety of options:

- The program could be implemented as direct services to Washington residents.
- The program could be implemented as a service to local jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and other partners.
- The program could be made available as a pre-designed "toolkit" to all local jurisdictions, or could be limited based on criteria to be determined.
- Program activities could be maintained, expanded, or reduced.
- Program advertising could be maintained, expanded, or reduced.
- The program could be expanded to encompass new strategies, such as direct financial incentives.
- The program could be reduced to be a series of public service announcements, broadcast on TV and radio throughout the state.

The work group could recommend any or none of the options above. The work group could even recommend that the Legislature reconsider the "expanded" or "statewide" elements of the program.

POTENTIAL PROGRAM PARTNERS

There are a number of categories of potential program partners:

State agencies

A variety of state agencies are potential program partners, including:

- Department of Ecology
- Department of Commerce
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Enterprise Services
- Department of Labor and Industries
- State Transportation Commission

Discussion Paper: Program Scope Options and Potential Program Partners
June 12, 2018
Page 1

- State Traffic Safety Commission
- Puget Sound Partnership
- Washington Stormwater Center (WSU)

Local government entities

All local government entities are potential program partners. This includes all cities and counties, especially those covered by municipal stormwater permits. There could also be a tie-in with the EnviroStars programs in many local jurisdictions.

Non-profit entities

Non-profit entities that have been involved with the existing program, similar or related programs, or that could be involved in an expanded program include:

- AAA
- AARP
- Adopt-A-Stream Foundation
- Car clubs (e.g., Mustang Club, Horseless Carriage Club, Classic Car Club of America, etc.)
- Centro de la Raza
- Consumers Union
- Earthshare Washington
- Environmental Coalition of South Seattle
- Environmental Education Association of Washington
- Faith Action Network
- Futurewise
- Northwest Pollution Prevention Resource Center
- People for Puget Sound
- Puget Soundkeeper Alliance
- Toxic-Free Future
- Urban League
- Washington Environmental Council
- Zero Waste Washington

Private sector entities

A number of private-sector businesses and groups have contributed to the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program, and new groups could also participate, such as:

- ASA Northwest
- Auto Care Association
- Automobile manufacturers
- Automobile dealers
- Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association (MEMA)
- Quick lube shops
- SAE
- Repair Shops

Discussion Paper: Program Scope Options and Potential Program Partners

June 12, 2018

Page 2

Other potential partners

In addition to the above groups, there may be more potential program partners not listed.

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature directed the work group to make recommendations regarding "... potential public, private, and nonprofit partners" as well as "the potential scope of the program..." There are no restrictions stated.

The work group could recommend any, all, or none of the above partners and program limits as being the preferred options for an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program. The work group could also recommend options or partners not identified in this document.

NEXT STEPS

Work group members should review the above information and determine what recommendations they would like to include in the report to the Legislature. If there are additional options to be considered, please let Kimberly know so she can include them in future options documents and the draft report.

Appendix G. Possible Budget Projections Discussion Paper

Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Possible Budget Projections

NECESSARY FUNDING

Based on the existing program, an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program would need significant funding. An ultimate budget will depend on various factors, including management structure and program scope. The various options and range of costs are addressed below.

PROGRAM TO DATE

Program tasks to date include:

- Program administration/management
- Marketing plan and audience research
- Campaign advertising and implementation partnerships
- Organizational, business, and corporate partnerships
- Leak check events and toolkit
- Program evaluation and long-term funding strategy

During the second phase of the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program (2013-2015), the budget¹ for these tasks was:

Task	Ecology grant	PSP Grant	In-kind Contributions	Total
Program administration/management	\$18,003	\$3,124	\$45,922	\$67,049
Marketing plan and audience research	\$6,434	\$11,011	\$11,800	\$29,245
Campaign advertising and implementation partnerships	\$78,926	\$1,275	\$7,595	\$87,796
Organizational, business and corporate partnerships	\$19,890	\$0	\$247,280	\$267,170
Leak Check events and toolkit	\$109,741	\$17,211	\$33,266	\$160,218
Program evaluation and long-term funding strategy	\$63,683	\$10,379	\$4,930	\$78,992
Grand Total	\$296,677	\$43,000	\$350,793	\$690,470

BUDGET NEEDS FOR AN EXPANDED PROGRAM

While these figures are a good place to start an estimate for an expanded program, a direct extrapolation is not possible. The budget noted above was for a program focused more on researching the nature of the problem and less on pure service delivery. An expanded program might spend more on

some items and less on others. An expanded program may also require new elements that were not in earlier phases and have no accompanying budget line items above. The budget projections below show a range of estimates to attempt to account for this variability.

Population Served

Although there are other possible methodologies for developing a projected budget, the extrapolations below are based on population served. The previous phases of the Don't Drip and Drive Program have been focused on the greater Puget Sound region. Estimates of the population in this region of the state range from 3.8-4.7 million residents¹ (depending on how much of the area is included). Using an estimate of 4 million² audience members and the state's 2017 population of approximately 7.4 million³, the existing program reaches approximately 54 percent of the state's population. A proportional increase would add an additional 46 percent to the budget to account for the remainder of the state's population.

Adjustments to Previous Budget Categories

The budget projections for an expanded program are noted below.

Program administration and management costs

In an expanded program, the scope of administrative and management work needed will likely increase over and above a simple adjustment for population alone. Line items in this category include:

- Coordinating activities of program partners to avoid duplication of efforts.
- Establishing statewide program partnerships.
- Facilitating periodic meetings of program partners.
- Managing statewide program budget and any grants/contracts with subrecipients.

The program to date has focused on the most densely populated areas of the state. As the program expands to new areas, newly participating local jurisdictions and other partners will tend to serve fewer residents each. **To account for this variation, the projected budget accounts for a variance of up to 50 percent over and above a proportional extrapolation.** These funds would need to be expended primarily by the managing entity, but local jurisdictions and other partners will incur administration and management expenses as well. The figures below are inclusive of both funds for the managing entity as well as funds that would be paid or passed through (in some fashion) to local jurisdiction and other partners.

The projected budget below also includes an additional line item for new employees. If a managing entity needs to hire new staff and cannot reassign existing staff to perform the needed work, it will be necessary to include this additional funding. **The projected budget accounts for zero to two new employees for the managing entity.**

Marketing plan and audience research

Like program administration, costs in this category may need to be modified to reflect additional work. Line items in this category include:

- Developing and maintaining statewide marketing and communications plan.
- Conducting statewide audience research.

Discussion Paper: Possible Budget Projections

June 12, 2018

Page 2

- Developing, updating, and maintaining program marketing materials and web site.

Expenses in this area are expected to increase relative proportionately to the population served. Population density has little to do with costs associated with market research. Previous expenses in this category were focused on developing new marketing materials. Those materials will need to be maintained and updated. In addition, new materials will be needed for populations that have not targeted in efforts to date, including non-English speaking populations. **To account for this new work, the projected budget accounts for a variance of up to 10 percent over and above a proportional extrapolation.** The majority of these expenses will be incurred primarily by the managing entity or agency. It will be important for the managing entity to work with local jurisdictions and other partners to find the most cost effective way to engage in public involvement activities with repair shops, quick lube shops, and other potential private-sector partners. Partnerships could be established with both statewide (large chain) providers as well as stand-alone repair shops. Local jurisdictions and other partners could choose to incur additional expenses to customize some materials or develop jurisdiction-specific offerings. These expenses could either be covered by the program or be borne by the jurisdiction (and potentially counted as an in-kind or matching contribution).

Campaign advertising and implementation

Because this line item will now specifically include outreach to minority, non-English speaking, low income, disabled, rural, and other underserved groups not previously targeted, these expenses could increase disproportionately to the populations being served by an expanded program. Advertisements in lower density areas, such as billboards and radio ads, reach fewer residents each; while the cost of each ad may be relatively low, more ads are necessary to reach the same audience. A disproportionate number of implementation partnerships may need to be developed to adequately cover rural areas. In higher density areas, more advertisements and outreach materials will need to be purchased for non-English speaking populations. The communications plan will need to account for different forms of advertising (television, radio, print, mail, and web) and different markets (with different pricing structures). **To account for all this variation, the projected budget includes a range of up to 50 percent over and above a proportional extrapolation.** The majority of these expenses will be incurred by the managing entity, although local jurisdictions and partners could expect to contribute local knowledge and expertise.

Partnership development and outreach

An expanded program will need to continue to develop new partnerships with auto repair businesses, advocacy groups, nonprofits, educational institutions, and others. Some of these partnerships can be developed statewide and others will need to be developed locally. These expenses are expected to increase relatively proportionately to population served. **To account for the possible variation, the projected budget is based on a range 10 percent lower to 10 percent higher over and above a proportional extrapolation.** The majority of these expenses will be incurred primarily by the managing entity or agency. Local jurisdictions and other partners could choose to incur additional expenses to develop jurisdiction-specific partnerships and outreach materials. These expenses could either be covered by the program or be borne by the jurisdiction (and potentially counted as an in-kind or matching contribution).

Leak check events and toolkits

Leak check events at shopping malls and other public locations reached a cross-section of the community because they did not target specific populations. Going forward, the cost per event may be lower than in previous phases because the materials are already developed. However, as the program expands, more events may be needed to account for disproportionate populations in rural areas. In addition, new materials will need to be developed for non-English speaking populations. **To account for the possible variation, the projected budget includes a range of 10 percent lower to 25 percent higher over and above a proportional extrapolation.** The majority of expenses related to leak check events would be incurred by local jurisdictions or other partners sponsoring the events. The costs associated with creating toolkits would likely be borne by the managing entity to ensure uniformity across the state.

New and expanded instructional workshops and materials

During earlier phases, instructional leak check workshops (separate from the short-term leak check events) were a successful way to reach vehicle owners to encourage behavior change. For an extrapolated budget, we have separated these activities out under their own line item. Workshops costs approximate \$500 each for hiring an instructor (4 hours), obtaining a location, and providing take-home materials for vehicle owners and other participants. **A budget projection is based on a range of 25 to 250 workshops conducted per biennium.** Allocation of these expenses could either be to the managing entity, local jurisdictions and partners, or a combination of both. The managing entity could enter into direct contracts with workshop instructors and providers (such as local technical colleges) and handle all expenses directly. Local jurisdictions and partners could also arrange for workshop spaces and instructors.

Program evaluation

Given the importance of tracking and demonstrating program success and the variety of possible data points and performance measures identified, **the projected budget includes a range of up to 10 percent over and above a proportional extrapolation.** These expenses would be incurred by the managing entity, although local jurisdictions and partners may have an additional workload to ensure applicable data are collected and assembled for analysis.

New and expanded program activities

An additional line item for new and expanded program activities not currently under consideration is also included. **The range in the projected budget is no new activities on the low end up to three new activities each costing \$50,000.**

New financial incentives

An additional line item for new financial incentives is also included. The Legislature might not want to direct funds to this area, or could direct substantial funds to providing incentives for vehicle owners to fix their leaks. **A range of zero up to \$500,000 is included, which would provide \$500 incentives for up to 1,000 residents.**

Expanded program budget range

If the work group wants to use population as the basis for a projected budget combined with the ranges noted above in **bold**, an expanded program could have a budget somewhere in the following range:

Extrapolated budget

Task	Phase II budget (5-4% of state population)	Proportional increase (100% of population)	Low range adjustment percentage	Possible budget – low range	High range adjustment percentage	Possible budget – high
Program administration	\$67,049	\$124,165	No additional cost	\$124,165	Additional 50%	\$186,248
Hire new FTEs to run program	N/A	N/A	No additional employees	\$0	2 additional FTEs	\$200,000
Marketing plan and audience research	\$29,245	\$54,157	No additional cost	\$54,157	Additional 10%	\$59,573
Campaign advertising and outreach	\$87,796	\$162,585	No additional cost	\$162,585	Additional 50%	\$243,878
Partnership development and outreach	\$267,170	\$494,759	10% Reduction	\$445,283	Additional 10%	\$544,235
Leak Check events and toolkit	\$160,218	\$296,700	10% Reduction	\$267,030	Additional 25%	\$370,875
Leak Check workshops and materials	N/A	N/A	25 Workshops	\$12,500	250 Workshops	\$125,000
Program evaluation and performance measure reporting	\$78,992	\$146,281	No additional cost	\$146,281	Additional 10%	\$160,909
New and expanded program activities	N/A	N/A	No additional activities	\$0	3 new \$50,000 activities	\$150,000
Possible financial incentive	N/A	N/A	No incentives provided	\$0	1,000 \$500 incentives	\$500,000
Grand Total	\$690,470	\$1,278,648		\$1,212,001		\$2,540,718

Discussion Paper: Possible Budget Projections
June 12, 2018

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Other items to consider when developing a budget for an expanded program include:

Environmental Justice

To date, the program has not had a significant focus on environmental justice issues. Phase 3 of the existing program expanded to include Spanish-language outreach, but other languages, ethnic groups, and other underserved populations have yet to be targeted by the program. As the program expands into new areas of the state, it is likely that greater attention to environmental justice issues will be required.

Plan for the Long Term

Other successful outreach and social marketing programs across the U.S. have durations of greater than five years, in many cases for 20 years. It may be beneficial to have a committed long-term coordinator position for an expanded program. This position could be in addition to any new staff hired by a managing entity or local jurisdiction or partner.

Capitalize on Partnerships

Leveraging partnerships allows for greater funding and ways to fund program components, which can maximize program reach. Partnerships with other state or federal agencies, businesses, academic institutions, and non-governmental organizations with similar goals can maximize the program's return on investment. There are opportunities to partner with air quality and transportation agencies as well as quick lube shops and other auto-related businesses. These partnerships could provide creative, alternative means of financial support for an expanded program.

Advertising and Promotion

Other similar programs that include a strong marketing and outreach component have shown the most success in driving participation numbers and program awareness. While programs that have a regulatory requirement (*i.e.*, required in order to register vehicle) may not need significant marketing, voluntary programs will need to spend a larger percentage of their budget on advertising and promotion of the program and its mission. A budget for an expanded program must account for this

Incorporate Targeted Events

An expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program could add a component of advertised events specifically for vehicle owners who know or suspect that they have a leak. A targeted approach like this might require the use of vouchers or coupons that offset all or a significant portion of the cost of the repair provided. The program could use other targeted approaches as the scope and audience expand.

Work Group Recommendations

The Legislature directed the work group to develop recommendations regarding "funding requirements" for an expanded Don't Drive and Drive Program. The work group's report to the Legislature should include at least one recommendation regarding funding for an expanded program. There is no limitation in the proviso about how many budget recommendations the work group can make. There is also no limitation on the scope of budget recommendations. The work group could make very general

Discussion Paper: Possible Budget Projections

June 12, 2018

Page 6

recommendations about an overall budget or could make specific recommendations about individual line items.

Next Steps

Work group members should review the above information and determine whether the budgeting methodology based on population is the preferred method for projecting the budget for an expanded program. If so, the work group members should then look carefully at each line item and determine whether the cost range presented is appropriate or whether it should be adjusted.

If the work group determines that a different budgeting methodology should instead be used, work group members should determine what methodology should be used instead.

Work group members should also determine what other recommendations, if any, they would like to include in the report to the Legislature. If there are other budget items not listed above that the work group wants to recommend, please let Kimberly know so she can include them in future options documents and the draft report.

¹ At the time this document was prepared, the Phase 3 budget was only available by grand total and not by line item. As a result, this budget projection is based on the Phase 2 budget instead.

² According to the U.S. Census Bureau "Metropolitan and Micropolitan Statistical Areas Population Totals: 2010-2017" available at <https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/PEP/2017/GCTPEPANNR.US24PR> (metropolitan area) and <https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/PEP/2017/GCTPEPANNR.US41PR> (combined area).

³ Reached in 2017, per https://kingcounty.gov/~media/depts/executive/performance-strategy-budget/regional-planning/GrowthManagement/GMPCMeeting033016/Growth_presentation_KC_GMPC_3-30-2016.ashx?la=en.

⁴ According to the U.S. Census Bureau "Estimates of the Total Resident Population and Resident Population Age 18 Years and Older for the United States, States, and Puerto Rico: July 1, 2017" available at <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/tables/2010-2017/state/detail/SCPRC-EST2017-18+POP-RES.xlsx>.

Appendix H. Funding and Payments Options Discussion Paper

Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Funding and Payments Options

FUNDING OF AN EXPANDED PROGRAM

To be successful, an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program would need a stable funding source and structure for ensuring payments to local jurisdictions, other program partners, and/or service providers. A variety of funding source options and payment mechanisms are addressed below.

AVAILABLE STATE FUNDING SOURCES

There are a variety of funding sources¹ available, all of which have advantages and disadvantages. We have identified the following state funds as those that have a purpose that could legitimately encompass an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program. There may or may not be other funds that would also be appropriate funding source.

State General Fund

This is the principal state fund supporting the operation of state government. The State and Local Improvements Revolving Account and the General Fund Basic Account are associated with this fund.

Motor Vehicle Fund

This fund is intended for the use of the state and (through state agencies) for the use of counties, cities, and towns for proper road, street and highway purposes, including facilities for pedestrians, equestrians, or bicyclists. The Motor Vehicle Account, Transportation Partnership Account, and Transportation Improvement Account are all associated with this fund.

Multimodal Transportation Fund

This fund pays for activities relating to drivers' licensing; driver improvement and financial responsibility; maintenance of driving records; charges for transportation services; and other highway and non-highway operations and capital improvements. Limited to transportation activities only. The Multimodal Transportation Account comes from this fund.

Wildlife and Natural Resources Fund

This fund covers the protection, management, and remediation programs of the state's wildlife, habitats, and natural resources, including forests, water, and parks. The Local Toxics Control Account (part of MTCA) and the Water Pollution Control Revolving Account are associated with this fund.

OTHER FUNDING OPTIONS

Grant Funding

It is possible there will be grant funds available in the future, similar to the grant sources that have provided funding for the program to date. These sources may be from the federal government, private sector entities, or even charitable foundations. While grant sources may not typically be considered a reliable source of funding year-to-year, they could be a source of funds that could enhance or further expand the program. Not all organizations are eligible to receive all types of grants, so this could affect recommendations about choosing a managing entity.

The Legislature needs to authorize state entities to accept grant funds. If the work group wants to consider this as a recommendation, language such as the following would likely fulfill the requirement:

"The program/entity/Director of an entity/etc. may apply for grants from public and private entities, and receive and administer any grant funding received for the purpose and intent of this chapter/this program/etc."

Fees

New funding could be established through a fee, either specifically related to the Don't Drip and Drive Program or a fee for another purpose, which could also be used for program funding. Fees related to transportation, vehicles, or toxic substances could theoretically all be used to fund an expanded, statewide program if they were created.

Other Sources

The possible funding sources are not limited to the options above. There may be other options the work group wants to consider and/or recommend.

PAYMENT OPTIONS

Presuming that funding for an expanded program will be provided through a budget appropriation from the Legislature to the managing entity, a variety of options are available for then reimbursing or forwarding funds to program partners, including:

Grants to Partners

A managing entity would administer a grant program, providing pass-thru funds to participating partners in accordance with an approved grant application.

Advantages: common arrangement; familiar to all potential participants; structures in place to administer

Disadvantages: requires significant oversight from managing entity; documentation requirements can be substantial; holding underperformers accountable can be challenging

Grants to Partners with a Matching Requirement

A managing entity would administer a grant program, providing pass-thru funds to participating partners in accordance with an approved grant application. Grant recipients would need to match grant funds up to a designated percentage.

Advantages: common arrangement; familiar to all potential partners; structures in place to administer, maximizes use of funds

Disadvantages: requires significant oversight from managing entity; documentation requirements can be substantial; holding underperformers accountable can be challenging; matching requirement may deter some applicants

Contracts with Partners

A managing entity would enter into contracts with partners and would process payments as contract milestones are completed (e.g., a certain number of leak check events held). Standard contracting procedures would apply, including performance measures for contract milestones, nondiscrimination requirements, etc.

Advantages: similar structures exist as a model; maximizes accountability for participating partners

Disadvantages: requires significant oversight from managing entity; may require data management investment to ensure proper program oversight

Direct Payments to Service Providers

In this version, the program would not require partners to provide assistance. Instead, the managing entity would run the entire program and pay all expenses directly to repair shops, advertisers, and the like.

Advantages: simplifies structure; reduces overhead

Disadvantages: requires significant oversight from managing entity; no ability to leverage existing partnerships or partner knowledge; would require development of significant infrastructure to be able to manage; might alienate existing program participants

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature directed the work group to make recommendations regarding "... potential funding sources for the program..." There are no restrictions stated.

The work group could recommend (among other options):

- That the Legislature use one of the above options to fund a new or expanded program.
- That the Legislature use multiple sources to fund a new or expanded program.
- That the Legislature *not* use any of the above options and instead look to other sources of funding for a new or expanded program.
- That the Legislature not fund a new or expanded program.
- That the Legislature use one or more of the above options *and* authorize the managing entity to apply for and receive grants.

In addition to the funding sources, the work group can additionally make recommendations about how funding should be managed and passed through to service providers. Those recommendations might include:

Discussion Paper: Funding and Payments Options
June 12, 2018
Page 3

- That the managing entity give grants to local jurisdictions and other program partners.
- That the managing entity give grants to local jurisdictions and other program partners but have a matching requirement.
- That the managing entity use standard contracting procedures to establish enforceable agreements with local jurisdictions and other program partners to perform program tasks and produce deliverables.
- That an expanded program be managed entirely by the managing entity, who would perform all the substantive work and use funding to pay staff and directly pay service providers (e.g., printers, advertisers, repair shops, etc.)

NEXT STEPS

Work group members should review the above information and determine what recommendations they would like to include in the report to the Legislature. If there are additional funding sources or payment options to consider, please let Kimberly know so she can include them in future options documents and the draft report.

¹ State funds were identified using the Washington State Office of Financial Management's "Fund Reference Manual," available at <https://www.ofm.wa.gov/accounting/fund-reference-manual>.

Appendix I. Program Oversight Options Discussion Paper

Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Program Oversight Options

OVERSIGHT OF AN EXPANDED PROGRAM

Management and oversight of an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program could be assigned to any one of a variety of entities. Oversight duties for this entity could include lead responsibility for:

- Developing and maintaining statewide marketing and communications plan
- Conducting statewide audience research
- Developing, updating, and maintaining program marketing materials and web site
- Assisting program partners with outreach to minority, ESL, and other underserved groups
- Coordinating activities of program partners to avoid duplication of efforts
- Establishing statewide program partnerships
- Facilitating periodic meetings of program partners
- Managing statewide program budget and any grants/contracts with subrecipients
- Tracking and reporting program performance measures

One or more employees (aka "FTEs") would likely be needed to perform this work, depending on the final program scope. The details below presume that all FTEs associated with the program would be housed in the managing/oversight entity and that work performed by partner entities would be accounted for separately.

OVERSIGHT BY STATE AGENCY

There are a number of state agencies that could potentially provide oversight of an expanded or statewide program:

Department of Ecology

Coordination and oversight of the current Don't Drip and Drive Program is currently handled by staff at Ecology's Northwest Regional Office. In the original policy proposal considered by the Legislature (HB 2899), Ecology was mentioned as a co-manager of the program with Commerce.

Advantages: familiarity with the program; has similar types of grants/contracts for other programs and organizations; could handle either grant system or contract system

Disadvantages: Ecology has expressed concern that the agency lacks capacity to be able to handle oversight of an expanded program; would require restructuring in the agency if project oversight were assigned to Ecology; program may be example of "mission creep"; as

enforcement agency, presents a potential conflict as program is BMP to help Phase 1 and Phase 2 municipal stormwater permittees

Department of Commerce

Commerce has a Local Government Division that administers grants for local government entities. In the original policy proposal considered by the Legislature (HB 2899), Commerce was mentioned as a co-manager of the program with Ecology.

Advantages: has similar types of grants/contracts for other programs and organizations; could handle either grant system or contract system

Disadvantages: lack of familiarity with the program; unclear whether the agency has sufficient capacity to be able to handle oversight of an expanded program

Department of Transportation

Although WSDOT is not a participant in the current program, the original policy proposal considered by the Legislature (HB 2899) used Transportation dollars to fund the program. As vehicle leaks can damage roadways and state-owned parking lots (such as in freeway rest areas), WSDOT potentially has a vested interest in helping to reduce these leaks.

Advantages: has similar types of grants/contracts for other programs and organizations; could handle either grant system or contract system

Disadvantages: lack of familiarity with the program; unclear whether the agency has sufficient capacity to be able to handle oversight of an expanded program; may not be eligible for some types of grant funding

Puget Sound Partnership

The current Don't Drip and Drive Program is focused in the Puget Sound region. They have provided grant funding for the program.

Advantages: has previously supported the program and provided grant funding, has a complementary mission

Disadvantages: by definition, is focused on the Puget Sound region and not the state as a whole; agency likely does not have sufficient capacity to be able to handle oversight of an expanded program beyond merely providing grant funds

Washington Stormwater Center (WSU)

The Stormwater Center was created by legislation directing Ecology to create "a storm water technical resource center in partnership with a university, nonprofit organization, or other public or private entity to provide tools for storm water management."

Advantages: very familiar with program and background; works with municipalities from around the state, so gives good basis for expanding program to new areas; could be recipient of funds from Legislature; has a complementary mission

Disadvantages: may not bring fresh perspective to program; may not be sufficiently in tune with the needs of new areas; associated state universities may take significant portion of any funds appropriated for overhead unless Legislature mandates otherwise (which may or may not be possible)

Another, Unspecified State Agency

Department of Enterprise Services, Department of Labor and Industries, the State Transportation Commission, the state Traffic Safety Commission, or some other state agency could also administer an expanded statewide program. Each possible agency would bring their own unique strengths and weaknesses to the program and its management. However, none of these agencies has any direct connection to the existing Don't Drip and Drive Program. We have not approached any of these agencies about their willingness or capability to serve in this role and presume at least some (if not all) would be reluctant to participate.

OVERSIGHT BY A LOCAL GOVERNMENT COALITION OR NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

Oversight by a state agency is not the only option. A coalition of participating local governments could coordinate their efforts to ensure the program oversight duties were sufficiently managed. A non-governmental entity could also step in to fulfill this role.

STORM – Stormwater Outreach for Regional Municipalities

As the existing coalition of municipalities participating in the current Don't Drip and Drive Program, STORM could act as the lead coordinating entity for a statewide program.

Advantages: very familiar with program and background; involves municipalities from around the state, so gives good basis for expanding program to new areas

Disadvantages: not a standalone entity; unclear if Legislature could/would appropriate money to a coalition; unclear how one local government could have authority over funding for other locals; jurisdictional boundaries could prove problematic; does not bring fresh perspective to program; may not be sufficiently "in tune" with the needs of new areas coming to an expanded program

Steering Committee

Ultimate management responsibility could rest with a steering committee. Under this scenario, presumably all participating local jurisdictions would have a voice on the committee with some sort of rotating leadership.

Advantages: gives participating entities direct role in program management

Disadvantages: not a standalone entity; unclear if Legislature could/would appropriate money to a steering committee; unclear how one local government could have authority over funding for other locals; jurisdictional boundaries could prove problematic; potential for lack of accountability; may lack mechanism for Legislature to delegate to a non-governmental entity

NW Pollution Prevention Resource Center

PPRC promotes environmental protection through pollution prevention and is currently working on issues related to safer alternatives at auto repair shops and boatyards.

Advantages: new entity with no baggage or biases about program structure or operations; wide breadth of issues addressed by entity might give fresh insight for program

Disadvantages: lack of familiarity with program so far; unable to rely on previous lessons learned; may be preoccupied with other projects; may lack mechanism for Legislature to delegate oversight without a governmental entity involved also

Statewide NGO or Other NGO not Currently Involved

A non-governmental entity not currently involved could step up to manage the expanded program. This could include local governments in areas of the state newly served by the expanded program.

Advantages: neutral entity with no baggage or biases about program structure or operations

Disadvantages: lack of familiarity with program so far; unable to rely on previous lessons learned; unclear if Legislature could/would appropriate money

NGO to be Selected Through an RFP/RFQQ Process

A managing entity would be selected based on proposals and qualifications. The managing entity could change in the future.

Advantages: most fair way to choose an oversight entity; gives new entrants a possibility to participate

Disadvantages: requires state agency to oversee the selection process; requires significant paperwork for selection process; potential for lack of accountability; may lack mechanism for Legislature to delegate to a non-governmental entity

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature directed the work group to make recommendations regarding "... Identifying an entity to manage the program..." There are no restrictions stated.

The work group could recommend any or none of the above entities as being the preferred option for oversight of an expanded Don't Drip and Drive Program. The work group could also recommend that an entity not identified in this document be the managing entity of an expanded program.

NEXT STEPS

Work group members should review the above information and determine what recommendations they would like to include in the report to the Legislature. If there are additional entities to be considered for program oversight, please let Kimberly know so she can include them in future options documents and the draft report.

Appendix J. Performance Measures Options Discussion Paper

Statewide Don't Drip and Drive Discussion Paper: Performance Measures Options

PROGRAM DATA

The directive from the Legislature does not contain instructions to develop or identify performance measures for an expanded, statewide Don't Drip and Drive Program. However, identification of key metrics may help guide development of other recommendations and would be helpful to the staff members responsible for implementing any subsequent expanded program.

Categories of Performance Measures and Key Data Points

Based on the text of the 2018 Don't Drip and Drive policy bill (HB 2899), it is likely an expanded program will be asked to demonstrate performance measures covering behavioral changes, environmental effects, and economic impacts on an annual or biennial basis.

Data Points Previously Collected and/or Readily Obtained

Based on the existing program, a statewide program could likely collect the following data points relatively easily:

Data points about leak identification and repair

Data points in this category include tallies of vehicles and leaks as well as data about vehicle age and cost of repairs. Data to be collected could include:

- Number of cars inspected at events and workshops
- Number of cars inspected at partner quick lube and auto repair shops
- Number of leaks repaired as a result of program inspection
- Number of leaks found but NOT repaired
- Number of repairs by leak type
- Number of personal vehicles vs. commercial vehicles inspected
- Number of personal vehicles
- Average age of vehicles being repaired or model year of vehicles being repaired
- Average repair costs

Collecting and tracking these data points could help the managing entity know which types of vehicles are being checked and repaired. This information could help target messaging and advertising purchases, help quantify the economic impact of vehicle leaks and repairs, and contribute to estimates of pollution impacts from leaking vehicles.

Data points about public participation

Data points in this category include demographics of participating vehicle owners and information about their participation. Data to be collected could include:

- Number of participating vehicle owners at educational workshops
- Number of participating vehicle owners at leak check events
- Demographics of participants at workshops and leak check events (such as age, gender, ethnicity, primary language, education level, and income bracket, as available)
- Referral sources – how participant learned about the program
- Participant motivation – why participant attended workshop or leak check event
- Participant workshop survey results (what they liked best, what to improve, etc.)

Collecting and tracking these data points could help the managing entity know who is participating in the program. This information could help target messaging and advertising purchases, help workshop and leak check organizers schedule events for maximum exposure and participation, and contribute to estimates of behavioral change attributable to the program.

Data points about program services

Data points in this category include materials developed, workshops and events conducted, and partnerships developed. Data points to be collected could include:

- Number of local jurisdictions and other NGO partners joining/continuing with expanded program
- Number of quick lube shops and other auto repair business partners joining/continuing with expanded program
- Number of educational workshops conducted (and by which entity/organization, if applicable)
- Number of leak check events conducted (and by which entity/organization, if applicable)
- Number of website visits
- Number of website downloads of educational materials
- Number of publications/materials made available to communities not previously reached (e.g., in other languages, in accessible formats, etc.)
- Number of advertisements run (and by format, e.g., TV, radio, print, etc., if applicable)

Collecting and tracking these data points could help the managing entity estimate behavioral changes attributable to the program, help the managing entity adjust and tailor outreach materials to potential partner organizations, and provide needed information about whether potential audience members are actually accessing program information.

Possible Performance Measures

Performance measures for an expanded statewide program might include the following:

- Reported behavior change from program participants (e.g., participants reporting they will now check for leaks, change how they maintain vehicle, follow maintenance schedule, etc. as a result of what they learned from the program)
 - Could measure number of participants reporting behavior change due to program

- Could measure percentage of all participants reporting behavior change due to program
 - Could measure both
- Reported behavior change from program participants as a direct result of program's financial incentives (e.g., participants reporting they would not have fixed a leak or would have delayed fixing a leak but for the program discount/free workshop/free leak check from the program)
 - Could measure number of participants fixing a leak due to financial incentive
 - Could measure percentage of participants fixing a leak due to financial incentive
 - Could measure both, or in relation to leaks found only
- Estimated petroleum contamination avoided due to leaks prevented or repaired due to program
- Estimated reduction in air emissions from prevented or repaired vehicle leaks and improved vehicle maintenance
- Estimated economic impact from fewer vehicle breakdowns as a result of improved vehicle maintenance attributable to program
- Estimated economic impact from repair expenses avoided due to early detection as a result of improved vehicle maintenance attributable to program
- Estimated economic impact and financial savings from improved fuel economy as a result of improved vehicle maintenance attributable to program

WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

The Legislature did not require the work group to develop recommendations regarding data collection or performance measures. The work group can decide whether or not to include a section on performance measures in its report to the Legislature.

NEXT STEPS

Work group members should review the above information and determine whether or not to include a report section on performance measures. After making that determination, the work group should decide which of the above data, if any, they would like to include in the report to the Legislature. If there are other data points or performance measures not listed above that the work group wants to recommend, please let Kimberly know so she can include them in future options documents and the draft report.