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Introduction
After the initial research and planning process undertaken by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), multiple Northwest air quality partner agencies and PRR – a marketing and public relations consulting firm in Seattle – in the Summer of 2003, Ecology and PRR moved into a pilot implementation phase in the Fall of 2003. The pilot phase closely followed the plan and was launched at selected locations in Seattle, Cheney and Battle Ground in order to collect and compare data from urban, rural and suburban areas respectively. At each location, the program targeted parents through mailings sent home with students, and delivery drivers through front office staff giving these drivers similar program materials. Idling time measurements were conducted during morning drop off and afternoon pick up times from October 23-29, 2003. The total budget for this pilot was $35,000. The following is a brief summary of the various phases of the pilot including recruiting schools and sponsors, preparing materials, measuring idling times, data analysis and results. After this executive summary you will find more detailed information on the pilot.

Recruiting pilot/control locations
To collect data for a number of community types across the state, Ecology and PRR worked to recruit schools located in urban, suburban and rural communities around the state. Phone calls with transportation supervisors and other administrators from the initial research and planning phase of the campaign provided the team with a good snapshot of how certain districts and schools felt about idling. Based on this information, the team began calling elementary schools that were most likely to be interested in serving as a pilot location. Middle and high schools were not a priority for this phase of the program because of the small number of parent drop offs and pick ups in the higher grades.

Recruitment was made through phone conversations with elementary school principals, followed up by written correspondence that clearly outlined the purpose of the program and what participation would mean for school faculty and staff workloads. PRR initially secured four pilot schools; however, due to staff turnover in the summer months, one location chose to discontinue its role as a pilot. After the pilots were selected, PRR worked with the pilot principal to identify another school within the district that was best suited to serve as a control – a site where no anti-idling material would be distributed, but where idling times would be measured for comparison against idling times at the pilot school. When evaluating potential control locations, variables such as similar physical layout, neighborhood conditions, student body makeup and hours of operation were taken into account. Once the most appropriate site was chosen, the pilot principal and PRR would contact the prospective control school’s principal, explain the program and answer any questions. No barriers were encountered in recruiting control schools.

Recruiting program sponsors
For the pilot phase of the program, Ecology and PRR targeted two tiers of sponsors: the first was an overall sponsor for the entire state that would receive recognition on program key tags and signage and in written materials; the second were local sponsors who would receive recognition on the Ecology website and in program materials within their communities. Both were expected to provide either monetary or in-kind support for the program.
Targets for the statewide sponsor included Car Toys, AAA of Washington and the Better World Club. All of these groups gave the offer serious consideration; however, they each ultimately decided to not support the program based mostly upon the relatively high cost per person reached in the pilot communities. Several did express an interest in reconsidering the opportunity once it would reach a larger audience (more than three communities in the state).

For local sponsors, Ecology and PRR searched for similar program sponsors in each of the pilot communities that could provide attractive incentives for both the parents and the classrooms involved. At the end of the search, the team decided to target pizza delivery restaurants and hockey teams. Initial contacts were made via telephone and were followed up by written correspondence explaining the program and detailing what each sponsor would receive in return for providing program support. In each case, pizza restaurants agreed to provide pizza parties for all classrooms that returned more than 80% of their anti-idling pledge forms (down from the 100% goal outlined in the initial plan, based on interviews with principals) and hockey teams agreed to provide one free youth pass to every student returning an anti-idling pledge form, along with two free adult passes for every teacher whose classroom met the 80% goal.

**Preparing materials for implementation**

Keep it as simple as possible for the faculty and staff. Keep it easy for parents to understand and act. Those were the two primary concerns for our team when preparing program materials for implementation. Letters to teachers, staff and parents were intentionally concise, trimming every sentence as much as possible in order to save teachers and parents precious time.

Each school received a box of materials that was pre-sorted into pouches labeled with the teacher or staff person’s name. Inside each pouch was a simple cover letter explaining the program and outlining what steps the teacher or staff person needed to take. The packets also included pre-stuffed parent letters and pledge forms and pre-stuffed thank you notes and incentives for each teacher or staff person to give to each person (students for teachers and delivery drivers for front office staff) who returned a pledge form. The pouch also contained a tally form for each teacher to calculate his or her classroom’s participation level and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the teacher to return all signed pledge forms and unused incentives to PRR.

Although a few teachers did not return any materials at all, the vast majority did return signed pledge forms and unused incentives. No teachers included any recommendations on how to make these materials more user friendly.

**Measuring idling time**

In the planning phase of this campaign, Ecology and PRR focused on using volunteers to measure idling times. In order to do this, PRR contacted local high school principals and ecology club advisors; this met with mixed results. In Cheney the ecology club was able to turn out volunteers, but not for the full window of time requested to measure idling times each morning and afternoon. In Seattle, a high school near the pilot and control locations was interested in providing volunteers for the program, but the advisors ultimately decided the transportation and scheduling challenges were too great given the number of students in the club. PRR made numerous attempts to get in contact with the appropriate person in Battle Ground but could not break through. On the morning idling measurement was scheduled to begin PRR received an e-mail from Battle Ground High School apologizing for the delay in their response and stating their students would not be available to act as program volunteers.
Several days before implementation was scheduled, PRR began a two-pronged effort to find other ways to measure idling time. One prong focused on local college students – calls were placed to sociology, environmental science and communications faculty. While all faculty expressed support and interest in turning out students for this task, time was simply too short to recruit enough students. The second prong was to hire temp workers. In the end, temp workers were used to measure idling time at both control and pilot locations in Battle Ground and Seattle, while ecology club volunteers were used in Cheney. Fortunately, the same temps were available to measure idling time throughout the implementation period, improving consistency in data gathering.

Compiling and analyzing data
After anti-idling pledge forms were signed and returned to teachers and staff, the majority used the self-addressed, stamped envelopes on the date we requested they return these forms and unused incentives. A few faculty returned their materials within the next week. The remainder of the faculty returned their materials over the course of the next several weeks after PRR requested the pilot principals contact these teachers. Idling time data was promptly returned by the front office staff at the pilot and control locations in Battle Ground and Seattle (where temp workers collected this data) and the same data came in shortly thereafter from the ecology club advisor in Cheney (where student volunteers timed idling vehicles).

Once PRR had all the data in house, our team began entering the raw data in spreadsheets. PRR also collected supplemental data (weather conditions and temperatures) via the Internet. Once this was completed, PRR’s research team analyzed the data using the SPSS software package (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) to sort and categorize the data and conduct regression analyses.

Results
Based on the results, we can say the program was successful. “Dare to Care About the Air” received overwhelming response in two of the pilot schools and a respectable response in the third and idling times at each of the pilot schools were significantly lower than those at the pilot locations.

Parent participation levels spanned a wide range with some classrooms not reporting any participation and two classrooms attaining 100% participation. Chief Umtuch Primary in Battle Ground had a response of 298 students (42.58%). Lowell Elementary in Seattle had 295 students respond (79.55%). Betz Elementary in Cheney received responses from 293 students (78.34%). These results translated into four Chief Umtuch classrooms (16% of classrooms), ten Lowell classes (59%) and 12 Betz classes (70%) earning pizza parties with 80%+ participation.

Overall, the difference in idling time between drivers at the pilot and control locations showed a statistically significant difference with pilot drivers idling 56.6 fewer seconds than control school drivers. Data also validated the team’s assumption that drivers would idle longer in the afternoons (when picking up students) than in mornings (when dropping off); overall drivers are more likely to idle an average of 128.2 seconds longer in the afternoons. Based on regression analysis, the data show that time of day and number of people in the car influence idling behaviors, with people idling longer in the afternoon and drivers with more passengers also idling longer.

Upcoming implementation
Ecology has been awarded US EPA grant funding for a second round of implementation. The particulars of this phase have yet to take shape, but Ecology has determined future
iterations of this program will use the “It All Adds Up to Cleaner Air” name, rather than “Dare to Care About the Air.” This decision was made based on national recognition and momentum built by other communities using the “It All Adds Up to Cleaner Air” name. In addition to the name change, Ecology and its team will draw from the “Lessons learned” section of this recap report as appropriate in order to better focus its energies for a more efficient implementation.

**Contacts**

For questions about either the planning or implementation phases of “Dare to Care About the Air,” contact:

Leslie Thorpe  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
PO Box 47600  
Lacey, WA 98504-7600  
360.407.6848  
leth461@ecy.wa.gov

Mike Rosen  
PRR, Inc.  
1109 First Avenue, Suite 300  
Seattle, WA 98101  
206.623.0230 x206  
mrosen@prrbiz.com
Revised graphics

After presenting initial plan and creative concepts to the Northwest Air Quality Communicators, several individuals offered input on creative changes for incorporation before implementing the program pilot. These recommendations were taken into consideration and program collateral (a key tag at 1.5” x 2” and a sign at 18” x 24”) were re-designed.
NO-IDLE ZONE
Dare to Care About the Air
Pilot study results

Idling time results summary
Following is a complete data analysis based on the information collected during the “Dare to Care About the Air” pilot program. These data came predominantly in the form of completed idle time tracking sheets, filled in by student volunteers in Cheney and temp workers in Seattle and Battle Ground. Data regarding weather conditions at pilot locations was gathered via the Internet and by on-site volunteers and temps.

Overall, the difference in idling time between drivers at the pilot and control locations is statistically significant with pilot school drivers idling 56.6 fewer seconds than control school drivers on the average across all cities. This means drivers at pilot schools (where program was implemented) were less likely to idle as long as those drivers at control schools (where no information was distributed). The data collected also validated the assumption that drivers are more likely to idle an average of 128.2 seconds longer across all cities when picking up in the afternoon than while dropping off in the morning.

Based on regression analysis, the following influence a driver’s idling behaviors:
- Time of day
- Whether or not they are at a control or pilot location
- Number of people in the car

Parent/classroom participation results summary
Participation from classrooms and by parents was measured by the number of anti-idling pledge forms completed by parents and collected and returned by classroom teachers. Each teacher received a self-addressed stamped envelope and was given dates to send home pledge forms and the deadline for mailing back students’ pledge forms.

Participation spanned the gamut with some classrooms not returning any pledge forms and two attaining 100% participation. Average participation was as follows:
- Chief Umtuch Primary, 298 students, or 42.58%
- Lowell Elementary, 295 students, or 79.55%
- Betz Elementary, 293 students, or 78.34%

After executive interviews with school principals, PRR and Ecology decided to lower the goal to earn a pizza party from 100% classroom participation to 80% participation. Only two classrooms across the three pilot locations attained 100% participation, but many more met or exceeded the 80% mark. The number of classrooms earning pizza parties included:
- Chief Umtuch Primary, four classrooms, or 16% of classrooms
- Lowell Elementary, ten classrooms, or 59% of classrooms
- Betz Elementary, 12 classrooms, or 70% of classrooms

Notes on research
- Temps were used to collect idling time data in Battle Ground and Seattle, high school ecology club volunteers were used in Cheney.
- Data were not consistently collected for the same length of time per day across the three cities.
- There were early-release days in both Seattle and Battle Ground.
- The sample size in Battle Ground is considerably larger than Cheney or Seattle.
Parent response was measured by signed pledge cards collected and returned by classroom teachers.

**Anti-idling pilot study results, 12.23.03**

**Overall**
36.9% in pilot study  
63.1% in control group

67% incidents are in the morning  
33% are in the afternoon

71.8% are female  
28.1% are male

2.4 people is the average per car

Top 3 Vehicles:  
38.8% are cars  
19.6% are SUVs  
19.2% are minivans

37.1% Idling on sunny day  
31.4% idling on cloudy/sprinkley/windy day  
19.8% idling on rainy day  
9.6% on partly cloudy day  
2.1% on sunny but cold day

The effect of weather on idling is very small and the effect could be due to the large sample size. People are slightly less likely to idle on partly cloudy or rainy days compared to sunny days. With an average difference in idling time of 36.3 seconds less on partly cloudy days and 22.8 seconds less on rainy days (about ½ a minute less).

The data represent a positive and significant relationship with outdoor temperature and how long someone will idle; meaning as it gets warmer later in the day people are idling more. However the analysis on the whole suggests whether or not someone will idle is more influenced by the time of day they more than the temperature.

### Idling times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Idling Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>86.6 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Group</td>
<td>50.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>107.5 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the AM</td>
<td>44.4 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the PM</td>
<td>172.6 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny day</td>
<td>98.1 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Condition</td>
<td>Average Idle Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny but cold</td>
<td>44.9 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Cloudy</td>
<td>61.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy/sprinkley/windy</td>
<td>90.6 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>75.3 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in idling time between the pilot group and the control group is statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 56.6 seconds across all cities. In other words those in the pilot group are less likely to idle as long as those in the control group.

The difference in idling time between those dropping off their kids in the morning and those picking them up in the afternoon is also statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 128.2 seconds across all cities. So, people are more likely to idle longer in the afternoon.

Determinants of whether someone will idle or not (in order of most influential), based on regression analysis:

1. Time of day (more likely to idle in the afternoon, with avg. difference of 128 seconds)
2. Whether or not in pilot study or not (more likely to idle if in control group, avg. difference of 56.6 seconds)
3. Number of people in the car (the more people in the car the more likely to idle)
4. Gender (females more likely to idle, however they are also more likely to take kids to school).
Cheney
53.2% in pilot study
46.8% in control group

52% incidents are in the morning
48% are in the afternoon

69.3% are female
30.7% are male

2 people is the average per car

Top 3 cars used:
35.1% are in cars
21.2% are in SUVs
16.9% are in minivans

43.6% idling on sunny day
29.9% on partly cloudy day
17.7% idling on cloudy/sprinkley/windy day
6.1% on sunny but cold day

**Note:** No effect of weather on idling in Cheney.

**Idling times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Idling Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny but cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Cloudy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy/sprinkley/windy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in idling time between the pilot group and the control group is statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 47 seconds. In other words, those in the pilot group are less likely to idle as long as those in the control group.

The difference in idling time between those dropping off their kids in the morning and those picking them up in the afternoon is also statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 55.7 seconds across all cities. So, people are more likely to idle longer in the afternoon.
Determinants of whether someone will idle or not (in order of most influential), based on regression analysis:

1. Time of day (more likely to idle in the afternoon, with avg. difference of 55.7 seconds)
2. Whether or not in pilot study or not (more likely to idle if in control group, avg. difference of 47 seconds)

**Note**: Gender and the number of people in the car are not significant in Cheney.
Battle Ground
31.2% in pilot study
68.8% in control group

67.7% incidents are in the morning
32.3% are in the afternoon

76.4% are female
23.6% are male

2.5 people is the average per car

Top 3 cars used:
38 % are in cars
21% are in minivans
20.2% are in SUVs

37% Idling on sunny day
30.8% idling on cloudy/sprinkley/windy day
27.8% idling on rainy day
4.4% on partly cloudy day

The effect of weather on idling is very small and the effect could be due to the large sample size. People are slightly less likely to idle on rainy days compared to sunny days. With an average difference in idling time of 42.6 seconds less on rainy days.

There is a positive and significant relationship with the temperature and how long someone will idle. As it gets warmer throughout the day people are idling more. However, based on this analysis, it seems whether or not someone will idle is more likely due to the time of day they are idling more than what the temperature is outside.

**Idling times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Idling Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>98.3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Group</td>
<td>52.9 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>118.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the AM</td>
<td>44.9 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the PM</td>
<td>210.2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny day</td>
<td>116.2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny but cold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Cloudy</td>
<td>90.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy/sprinkley/windy</td>
<td>100 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>73.6 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference in idling time between the pilot group and the control group is statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 65.9 seconds. In others words those in the pilot group are less likely to idle as long as those in the control group.
The difference in idling time between those dropping off their kids in the morning and those picking them up in the afternoon is also statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 165.3 seconds across all cities. So, people are more likely to idle longer in the afternoon.

Determinants of whether someone will idle or not (in order of most influential), based on regression analysis:

1. Time of day (more likely to idle in the afternoon, with avg. difference of 165.3 seconds)
2. Whether or not in pilot study or not (more likely to idle if in control group, avg. difference of 65.9 seconds)

Note: Gender and the number of people in the car are not significant in Battle Ground.
Seattle
44.1% in pilot study
55.9% in control group

73.4% incidents are in the morning
26.6% are in the afternoon

59.7% are female
40.3% are male

2.2 people is the average per car

Top 3 cars used:
43.5% are in cars
16.7% are in suvs
15% are in minivans

40.4% idling on cloudy/sprinkley/windy day
32.3% idling on sunny day
13.2% on partly cloudy day
8.1% on rainy day
6.0% on sunny but cold day

There is a positive and significant relationship with the temperature and how long someone will idle (very small positive effect). As it gets warmer out throughout the day people are idling more. However, based on this analysis, it seems whether or not someone will idle is more likely due to the time of day they are idling more than what the temperature is outside.

Note: When temperature is added to the model there are no significant determinants of whether or not someone will idle or not in Seattle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idling times</th>
<th>Average Idling Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>63.7 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Group</td>
<td>49.6 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>74.9 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the AM</td>
<td>44.1 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the PM</td>
<td>118.3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny day</td>
<td>66.4 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunny but cold</td>
<td>47.8 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Cloudy</td>
<td>39.9 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloudy/sprinkley/windy</td>
<td>66.3 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy</td>
<td>90.9 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference in idling time between the pilot group and the control group is statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 25.3 seconds. Even though a smaller difference than the other cities, those in the pilot group are still less likely to idle as long as those in the control group.

The difference in idling time between those dropping off their kids in the morning and those picking them up in the afternoon is also statistically significant, with an average difference in idling of 74.2 seconds across all cities. So, people are more likely to idle longer in the afternoon.

Determinants of whether someone will idle or not (in order of most influential), based on regression analysis:

1. Time of day (more likely to idle in the afternoon, with avg. difference of 74.2 seconds)

**Note:** Being in the pilot study or not, gender, and the number of people in the car are not significant in Seattle. Even though being in the pilot study alone is statistically significant, when controlling for the time of day, the time of day becomes the main determinant of idling time.

**Sample notes**

Because the results were consistent across the three cities of study and between pilot and control groups we can feel fairly confident that the results presented are valid. However, these sample issues should be noted when reviewing these results:

- Temps were used in Battle Ground and Seattle, and students were used in Cheney to collect data.
- Data was not consistently collected for the same length of time per day across the three cities.
- There were in-service days in Battle Ground and so students went home earlier for a few days of the study. There was also an in-service day in Seattle.
- The sample size in Battle Ground is considerably larger than in the other cities.

However, because of these sample concerns we are not confident conducting analysis that would compare differences between the cities, thus no such results are provided. Even though there may be some apparent differences in results between the cities, these results cannot be assumed as statistically significant.
Sponsorship solicitation and other correspondence examples

As the pilot took shape, the program team focused on two common sponsors present in each of the pilot areas which were felt to provide incentives to participants: pizza delivery restaurants and hockey teams. Following are example correspondence used as part of the sponsorship solicitation process. Both of these examples are of e-mails sent following initial phone contact that briefly explained the program and assessed the prospective sponsors’ interest.

Also included are several example thank you notes sent at the program’s conclusion to key players in the program including:

- Pizza restaurant owners and corporate contacts
- Hockey marketing/PR contacts and organization leaders
- School district superintendents
- Pilot and control school principals
Prospective pizza sponsor pitch

Thanks for the time on the phone today. Here is a recap and details on the program.

My company, PRR, is working on behalf of the Washington State Department of Ecology. We have put together an anti-idling program for the fall of 2003 called “Dare To Care About the Air.” The objective of the program is to transform behavior, by getting people to stop idling their cars so much.

The enclosed documents demonstrate the problems caused by excessive idling. One of the places where excessive idling occurs the most is at our schools. Parents dropping off and picking up their children frequently create mini-pollution zones by excessive idling.

We have set up three pilot programs in Washington State - Betz Elementary in Cheney; Chief Umtuch in Battle Ground; and Lowell Elementary in Seattle. The program will have students take home “anti-idling pledge forms” to their parents and/or guardian. If 80% of the parents/guardians sign the pledge form in a class, then that class will receive a party and the teacher will receive an incentive. Please note - Domino’s in Battle Ground is already on board with this program. I set up the agreement with Troy Hamilton.

We are asking Domino's to be the party provider partner for this program in Seattle and Cheney. Lowell in Seattle has 478 students in 24 classes and Betz in Cheney has 380 students in 19 classes.

In exchange for this donation, Domino's will receive:
1) Name inclusion in the letter sent to the teachers;
2) Inclusion in any and all public relations efforts put forth by the WA State Dept. Of Ecology regarding the program;
3) Recognition on the WA State Department of Ecology website as a participant in the program for a period of 60 days.
4) Rights to publicize your company’s involvement in the “Dare To Care About the Air” program.

Additional benefits to Domino's include:
1) Supporting of a great cause reducing pollution and improving air quality;
2) Solidifying your company's commitment to the community;
3) Secondary influence on the parents for the next time they order pizza;
4) Helping create brand loyalty;

Furthermore, when the student brings back in the signed pledge form, they will be given an envelope containing a special “anti-idling key tag”. The key tag will be in a packet which will contain incentives (coupons) from participating partners. School district bus drivers as well as service providers (UPS drivers, USPS workers, delivery people) who make deliveries to the school will also receive key tags and incentive packets when they sign the pledge forms.

We are asking Domino’s to place an incentive offer, i.e. - $1.00 off a TBD order or other, in the form of a coupon in every parent and service provider packet. We estimate no more than 2,000 coupons/incentives will be needed.

You determine the offer and can certainly utilize an existing coupon and/or offer. PRR would handle distribution of the offer.

The “Dare To Care About the Air” pilot program will kick off in early October. Please call me at 206.623.0232 x217 to discuss this opportunity. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Attachments: Anti-idling fact sheet; example letters showing partner mention
Prospective hockey sponsor pitch

Thanks for the call back. Here are the details of what's going on. I hope you can help out. It's a great way to do some direct marketing to the Vancouver, WA area.

My company, PRR, is working on behalf of the Washington State Department of Ecology on its "Dare To Care About the Air" initiative. This program, which will launch in Fall 2003 is focused on behavior transformation, specifically getting people to not idle their vehicles as much. A starting point for the program will involve three public schools in the state as we attempt to get parents who drop off and pick up their kids to reduce their idling time significantly.

Enclosed is the following:
1) General Information sheets; including statistics on air quality, emissions and idling
2) Sample pledge forms which will be sent to parents and teachers

*Chief Umtuch School* in Battle Ground is one of the three pilot schools in the program. Chief Umtuch Elementary has 730 students and 24 teachers.

In each class, teachers will send home parent/guardian anti-idling pledge forms with the students. If 80% of the students bring back a signed pledge form, then the kids will earn a pizza party and the teacher will earn an incentive prize as well.

We are asking the Portland Winterhawks to provide 24 vouchers good for 2 tickets as *teacher incentives*. The vouchers can be for any game you chose and exclude the home opener, etc. In exchange for this donation, the Portland Winterhawks to receive:
1) Name inclusion in the letter sent to the teachers;
2) Inclusion in any and all public relations efforts put forth by the WA State Dept. Of Ecology regarding the program;
3) Recognition on the WA State Dept. of Ecology website as a participant in the program for a period of 60 days.
4) Rights to publicize your company’s involvement in the "Dare To Care About the Air” program.

Additional benefits to the Portland Winterhawks include:
1) Supporting of a great cause reducing pollution and improving air quality;
2) Solidifying your company's commitment to the community;
3) Driving ancillary sales by having the teachers attending the Portland Winterhawks games;
4) Helping create brand loyalty;

Furthermore, when the student brings back the signed pledge form, they will be given an envelope containing a special “anti-idling key tag”. The key tag will be in a packet which will contain incentives (coupons) from participating partners. School district bus drivers as well as service providers (UPS drivers, USPS workers, milk delivery people) who make deliveries to the school will also receive key chains and incentive packets when they sign the anti-idling pledge forms.

We are asking the Portland Winterhawks to provide an incentive offer, i.e. - Buy 1 ticket Get 1 Free for a specified game or games, in the form of a coupon in every parent and service provider packet. We estimate no more than 850 coupons/incentives will be needed.

You determine the offer and can certainly utilize an existing coupon and/or offer. PRR would handle distribution of the offer.

The “Dare To Care About the Air” pilot program will kick off in late September/early October. Please call me at 206.623.0232 x217 to discuss this opportunity. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

*Attachments: Anti-idling fact sheet; example letters showing partner mention*
Pizza restaurant owners thank you

Dear Mr. Hamilton,

First of all, I want to say thank you for your support of the Department of Ecology’s “Dare to Care About the Air” anti-idling pilot program. Without your support we would not have been able to offer the students, parents and teachers such a fantastic incentive package.

Based on the responses we have received so far, about 280 families with children at Chief Umtuch Primary received your special coupons. We hope your participation in “Dare to Care About the Air” proves to be truly beneficial for both your business and your profile in the community.

We will be back in touch with you soon regarding which classrooms met or exceeded the 80% participation goal to earn their pizza parties. In the meantime, be sure to remind your delivery drivers and staff to not unnecessarily idle their vehicles. We have enclosed some program key tags.

Again, thank you for your support of “Dare to Care About the Air.”

Regards,
Pizza corporate contact thank you

Dear Mr. Wright,

I want to let you know what a great experience our team has had working with Will Marshall at your Capitol Hill location in Seattle. As part of our “Dare to Care About the Air” pilot program at a nearby elementary school encouraging parents to not unnecessarily idle their cars, Will stepped up to the plate and helped us put together a great incentive package.

Based on the responses we have received so far, we can say information about your participation in the program was delivered directly to more than 224 families with children at Lowell Elementary. Each of the families that pledged not to idle received a Jet City Pizza menu with several standard coupons. Additionally, each classroom that reached the 80% participation goal will have a pizza party later this year.

Will was a pleasure for our team to work with. He always made himself available for phone calls and helped us craft a program that would benefit both the giver and the receiver, in spite of the direct costs he will incur by participating. I just wanted to take a moment out of your day to tell you what a positive and rewarding experience it has been to work with Will. We hope to be able to expand this program in the near future and, if we target schools near a Jet City Pizza location, we hope it will be possible to partner again.

Regards,
Dear Mr. Thomsen,

First of all, I want to say thank you for your support of the Department of Ecology’s “Dare to Care About the Air” anti-idling pilot program. Without your support we would not have been able to offer the students, parents, teachers, bus drivers and service providers such a fantastic incentive to help reduce idling.

Based on the responses we have received so far, about 295 families with children at Lowell Elementary received vouchers from your organization. We also were able to influence bus drivers and service providers about the importance of not idling their vehicles whenever possible. We hope you will soon see these families and teachers at a game!

Again, thank you for your support of “Dare to Care About the Air.”

Regards,
Dear Mr. Farwell,

I want to take just a moment out of your day to thank you for participating in the Washington State Department of Ecology’s anti-idling pilot program “Dare to Care About the Air.” Thanks to the help of several staff – especially Jason Thomsen – we were able to put together a fantastic package to encourage parents not to unnecessarily idle their cars. This is significant because a single vehicle dropping off and picking up kids at one school puts three pounds of pollution into the air per month.

Without the assistance of your organization, this program would not have reached its current level of success. Based on responses we have received to date, about 295 families with children at Lowell Elementary pledged to not unnecessarily idle, earning a voucher to attend an upcoming Thunderbirds game.

I wanted to personally thank you for the great work your organization did in connection with this program. I hope we will be able to expand this program in the future and include your organization for the second round of implementation.

Regards,
Dear Mr. Manhas,

I want to take just a moment out of your day to thank you for participating in the Department of Ecology’s anti-idling pilot program “Dare to Care About the Air.” As a direct result of the help from several staff and faculty, we were able to gain valuable insight into how to encourage people to not unnecessarily idle their vehicles. I need to particularly commend Hal Kimball and the faculty and office staff at Lowell Elementary and Clara Scott and the office staff at TOPS. Lowell Elementary served as our pilot school and TOPS was our control for measuring idling times.

Without the assistance of these people, this program simply could not have happened. Based on responses we have received to date, about 867 families in three pilot districts have pledged to not idle their cars unnecessarily – especially when dropping off or picking up their children from school (295 families with children at Lowell Elementary in Seattle). This is significant because a single vehicle dropping off and picking up kids at school puts about three pounds of pollution into the air in just one month. (Check out the attached fact sheet for a few other facts about idling.)

As part of this program, parents who signed pledge cards received a free children’s ticket to attend a Thunderbirds game this season, a key tag to help them remember not to unnecessarily idle their car and special coupons for use at the local Jet City Pizza. Classrooms that met or exceeded the 80% participation goal will receive a free pizza party this year from Jet City Pizza and participating teachers will also receive a free pair of tickets to a Thunderbirds game.

I wanted to make sure you were aware of the great work your staff and faculty did in connection with this program. I hope we will be able to expand this program in the future and include your district for the second round of implementation.

If you have observations that you feel would be helpful, we would be grateful to hear from you. Please forward them to Dale Hammond at dhammond@prrbiz.com.

Regards,
Dear Mr. Kimball,

First of all, thank you for helping us pilot the Department of Ecology’s “Dare to Care About the Air” program to discourage unnecessary vehicle idling! Without assistance from you, your faculty and your office staff, we simply would not have been able to implement this program.

Based on responses we have received to date, about 867 families at three pilot locations have pledged to not idle their cars unnecessarily – especially when dropping off or picking up their children from school (279 families with children at Chief Umtuch Primary in Battle Ground, 295 families with children at Lowell Elementary, 293 families with children at Betz Elementary in Cheney). This is significant because a single vehicle dropping off and picking up a child at school puts about three pounds of pollution into the air in just one month.

Many of your classrooms met or surpassed the 80% participation goal – this means they will be receiving free pizza parties from your local Jet City Pizza and participating teachers have already received a pair of free tickets to a Thunderbirds hockey game. We will soon be contacting the pizza party sponsor to make arrangements and will be back in touch with you regarding those details.

Please extend our sincere thanks to your faculty and staff. We are truly grateful for their assistance in piloting this program. Because of your help, we have gained fantastic insight into how we can improve this program for future implementation.

If you have observations that you feel would be helpful, we would be grateful to hear from you. Please forward them to Dale Hammond at dhammond@prrbiz.com.

Best wishes to you all as the holiday season draws near!

Regards,
Control school principal thank you

Dear Ms. Scott,

First of all, thank you for helping us pilot the Department of Ecology’s “Dare to Care About the Air” program to discourage unnecessary vehicle idling! Without assistance from you and your office staff, we simply would not have been able to implement this program.

Your flexibility and hospitality enabled us to measure drop-off and pick-up idling times in a “control” setting where anti-idling materials were not distributed. We will now take the information we gathered at your school, compare it to similar information collected at the pilot school in your district and measure the effect our outreach program materials had on parents.

Please extend our sincere appreciation to your staff. We are truly grateful for you and your team’s assistance in piloting this program. Because of your help, we will gain critical insight into how we can improve air quality for children in Washington State through programs such as this.

If you have observations that you feel would be helpful, we would be grateful to hear from you. Please forward them to Dale Hammond at dhammond@prrbiz.com.

Best wishes to you all as the holiday season draws near!

Regards,
Sponsor-supplied incentives
PRR and Ecology worked with local pizza delivery restaurants and hockey teams in each of the pilot areas to create a mutually beneficial sponsorship package. These sponsorship negotiations resulted in the following:

- **Pledging parents received:**
  - Special coupons from the local pizza sponsor
  - A free child’s voucher valid for entry to any regular season hockey game
  - A key tag reminding the parent to not unnecessarily idle

- **Teachers whose classrooms achieved 80% participation received:**
  - A pair adult of vouchers valid for entry to any regular season hockey game
  - A pizza party for their class

- **Sponsoring pizza delivery restaurants received:**
  - Direct delivery of promotional/special coupons to all pledging parents
  - Mention in letters sent home soliciting parent participation
  - Mention on the Department of Ecology website

- **Sponsoring hockey teams received:**
  - Direct delivery of promotional/season schedules to all pledging parents
  - Direct delivery of youth ticket vouchers to all pledging parents
  - Mention in letters sent home soliciting parent participation
  - Mention on the Department of Ecology website
Lessons learned during pilot and recommendations for future programs

This pilot anti-idling program was based on the plan PRR presented to the Washington State Department of Ecology in June 2003 and the “Pilot Program Recommendation” section included therein. The end results of this pilot implementation show the initial recommendations for the program were – on the whole – sound and fruitful. However, as with implementing any program, the program team learned lessons along the way. This section is meant to help teams executing future iterations of this anti-idling program achieve great results with less effort.

**Situation**: Recruiting title sponsor for key tag

**Lesson learned**: The companies contacted (Car Toys, AAA of Washington and Better World Club) had similar feedback. The cost of sponsoring the key tags compared to the exposure they would receive did not have a favorable ratio, i.e., the cost to reach each program participant was prohibitively high. They also felt the reach was minimal in a pilot scenario and would rather spend $15,000 to reach the entire state versus $5,000 to reach three or four school districts.

**Recommendation**: If possible, pitch to the companies early and offer them the widest possible exposure. If the program’s reach is limited, target local businesses and divide the exposure between them to offer a more attractive balance between reach and cost.

**Situation**: Whom to contact when recruiting for participation

**Lesson learned**: In a pilot situation it is most beneficial to begin recruitment at the principal level. Principals have a handle on the physical layout of their site, staff and faculty capacity to take on program work, the amount of time parents idle at drop off and pick up every day, etc. Give them the support and information they need to be your advocate in conversations with district administrators.

**Recommendation**: If possible, begin with the principals. Other “ways in” include obvious options such as the district administration and other less obvious options like high school ecology club advisors.

**Situation**: Everett Middle School, staff turnover leads to dropping pilot in district

**Lesson learned**: While administrators generally stay in one position for years, administrative staff turnover can cause a disconnect and throw implementation plans off track

**Recommendation**: Keep in frequent contact over the summer to track commitment level, intra-district staff transfers, etc. and be ready to brief new administrators on the program from the ground up

**Situation**: Reasons districts gave when declining the invitation to participate

**Lesson learned**: Different districts gave different reasons for not participating. Faculty discontent. Other goals or priorities for the district or school. Lack of time. Overabundance of existing workload.

**Recommendation**: Be sure you’re asking the right person before you solicit participation; an ecology club advisor has a different perspective from the district operations manager. Don’t accept an immediate “no” as the final answer. However, be sensitive to the fact that schools have many, many other priorities and their resources are already stretched.
**Situation**: Don’t overwhelm with information on recruitment call  
**Lesson learned**: Too much detail at the start makes it sound like more work than it really is  
**Recommendation**: Keep it simple in your initial call – it’s about getting drivers to pollute less and giving teachers, students and parents something in return for polluting less. Once the person on the other end of the phone has bought into the vision, then you can get into details.

**Situation**: Face-to-face is preferable  
**Lesson learned**: Running the program over the phone is a barrier that should be avoided when possible  
**Recommendation**: Get out of the office when you can. Meet after your initial call to explain the program, review the site, brief the office staff, etc. If you can give a three-minute presentation at a faculty meeting, do so. Putting a face on the program is a worthwhile investment.

**Situation**: Rules and regulations for posting signage on school property  
**Lesson learned**: Posting signage at some schools may involve city ordinances  
**Recommendation**: When possible, be informed on city regulations regarding signage. This is different in every town, so what is an issue in Seattle may or may not be an issue in Selah.

**Situation**: Different district, different culture  
**Lesson learned**: District and school cultures vary more than expected. This has a direct effect on the amount of effort dedicated to implementing program tasks.  
**Recommendation**: Scan the organizational environment quickly when you begin working with the district or school and plan for interest and effort to differ greatly even within each district and school.

**Situation**: Physical layouts and their effect on idling behaviors  
**Lesson learned**: Certain schools have physical layouts that prevent or make it extremely difficult for drivers to stop. Other schools spill over into residential streets. These schools with limited on premise parking and/or drop off and pick up areas also face an additional challenge when placing signage to influence drivers. Schools with larger parking lots and room for parents to queue on school grounds are often better able to influence drivers with signage and offer drivers spots to park and turn off their vehicles.  
**Recommendation**: Walk the grounds of the school with the principal, transportation officials or other school officials before making your plans. Determine what can and cannot be done both on and off school grounds. Frequently, neighborhoods adjacent to schools have active “watch” groups. Get in touch with these organizations if they exist and enlist them in the program. Adapt the messaging to the physical layout. Find out if local officials, outside of the school district, e.g., the city, need to be involved in posting signage.

**Situation**: Coordinating media outreach with the district  
**Lesson learned**: Each district has preferred methods for dealing with unique concerns including, but not limited to, student privacy  
**Recommendation**: First of all, be mindful of the result media attention can have on idling behaviors. If you are concerned about gathering accurate baseline data, don’t
make a splash before launching the program. Second, work with the district’s public information officer to better secure publicity that is beneficial to all partners.

**Situation**: Full-day staggered Kindergarten vs. full-day every day Kindergarten vs. half-day Kindergarten

**Lesson learned**: Kindergartens often offer a variety of schedules, even within a single district. Common schedules include: all-day every day; half-day every day; and all-day every other day with alternating Fridays.

**Recommendation**: Find out what Kindergarten schedules are offered in the district(s) you are working with and be sure to allow the schedule to inform the amount of time you give teachers to distribute and return pledge forms.

**Situation**: Considering contracted food vendors as partners

**Lesson learned**: Sometimes your first choice as a prospective party sponsor may not be the most logical choice. While current contract holders may be happy to sponsor parties, competitors may also be interested in attracting some positive attention within the district in preparation for the next round of bids.

**Recommendation**: Check with the district first to see who their outside vendors are for services, such as food and beverage, before making sponsor recruitment calls.

**Situation**: Timing, the pros and cons of back to school

**Lesson learned**: Parents are inundated with paperwork during the first few weeks of school. Faculty and staff are swamped processing new students and all of the paperwork parents receive, fill out and return.

**Recommendation**: Have your program lined up and ready to go before the start of the school year. Post any signage during the summer. Aim to distribute anti-idling information the third or fourth week of school in order to have the greatest impact. Pitch the program as “it’s a new year and a great time to start practicing new behaviors” or something similar.

**Situation**: Building in funding for contingencies

**Lesson learned**: Fixing unexpected problems and investing face time can be costly

**Recommendation**: While this pilot did succeed in recruiting and retaining three locations, when a fourth location dropped we were unable to invest the necessary assets to recruit a replacement location. Also, the program team was not able to invest in the amount of face-to-face interaction it would recommend for future implementation of anti-idling programs. Our recommendation would be to reserve funding specifically for getting program staff in front of partners several times during the program.

**Situation**: Separate pilot/control locations vs. single pilot with pre- and post-campaign idle time measurement

**Lesson learned**: Every research methodology has its pros and cons

**Recommendation**: Select your methods, work hard to make sure all data collected are sound and replicate your collection over a period of time. Measuring the same place, at the same time in the same way over a period of months or years will give you stronger data for measuring change and campaign influence.

**Situation**: Including information on district bus pollution reduction measures

**Lesson learned**: Through executive interviews with both district and contractor transportation supervisors, we learned most internal policies forbid extended idling due
mostly to the impact on operating expenses. However, anecdotal information gathered during the pilot phase showed some drivers do idle longer than their supervisors expect. **Recommendation**: Dedicate program resources exclusively for tracking bus idling times and deliver information to transportation supervisor.

**Situation**: Sustained faculty contact in implementation phase  
**Lesson learned**: While very few classrooms returned zero responses, several returned less than 80% participation  
**Recommendation**: Work with the principal to nudge and encourage teachers during program implementation as one way to improve the number of classrooms meeting or exceeding the 80% participation goal

**Situation**: Key tag durability  
**Lesson learned**: Thicker key tags are necessary. Pilot key tags were run on 10 pt white vinyl.  
**Recommendation**: Consider heavier vinyl or another medium for key tags

**Situation**: Key tags triggering incentives  
**Lesson learned**: A program that utilizes key tags to trigger incentives at multiple locations takes a great deal of time to design and adds unique variables to the program  
**Recommendation**: If you feel a key tag is the best vehicle for triggering incentives, begin negotiations early with sponsoring partners and be ready to deal with the variables this option requires. For example, the sponsor may want to honor the tag for a limited time period or number of discounts – be aware of this and think of creative ways to keep your key tag attached to parents’ key rings after the incentive period ends.

**Situation**: Encourage anti-idling behavior by parents at bus stops  
**Lesson learned**: Some parents idle while waiting for buses to pick up or drop off students at neighborhood bus stops  
**Recommendation**: Specifically address this behavior in program materials, perhaps by including it when listing other places people frequently idle, e.g., drive ins, ATMs, etc.

**Situation**: Questions from parents  
**Lesson learned**: Some parents will inquire about district anti-pollution measures  
**Recommendation**: When customizing program materials, include information on measures such as anti-idling policies, bus retrofits or fuel grade choices, etc. that are useful pieces of information for parents to understand current anti-pollution efforts

**Situation**: Sustained principal contact at critical points in the campaign  
**Lesson learned**: Keep in touch  
**Recommendation**: Do the bulk of your preparation work in the spring and early summer, then reduce the frequency of contact while the principal deals with the crush of the new school year. Be in touch to take care of any pre-launch questions and during implementation. Stay in contact while data are analyzed and deliver the data once they’re finished. Be sure to say “thank you.”

**Situation**: Arming idling measurement volunteers/temps with information for parents  
**Lesson learned**: Parents will ask why people are standing around with clipboards  
**Recommendation**: Give your volunteers/temps information about the program to share with parents who ask questions. Some parents are concerned their license plates are
being taken down, etc. Be sure the volunteer/temp has a number or e-mail to refer parents to who have further questions.

**Situation**: Measuring idling times, the pros and cons of temps and volunteers  
**Lesson learned**: Training volunteers and temps is both difficult and critical. Temps cost money and will show where and when you need them. Volunteers are free but can’t always show up where and when you need them. Limited budgets may make this a non-issue for many programs, making volunteers the only option.  
**Recommendation**: Which ever option you select, give all idling timers consistent training. This requires face-to-face interaction but the investment will yield better returns in the area of higher quality, more reliable data.

**Situation**: Revising data collection sheet  
**Lesson learned**: Data collectors need pre-determined answers for each category. This improves data standardization and makes it easier for each temp or volunteer to quickly enter accurate data.  
**Recommendation**: Make standardized answers for each category and put them on a form that is easy to read and fill out. If budget allows, many data scanning services will help you design a form that suits your program’s needs. Subsequent scanning of these forms will increase data coding accuracy and save time.
Data collection sheet

The PRR and Ecology created the following sheet to capture idling time data at both pilot and control schools. These sheets were distributed to student volunteers in Cheney and temp workers in Battle Ground and Seattle who measured idling times at participating schools.
Vehicle idling measurement form

Instructions:
- The Department of Ecology is conducting a pilot program to better understand and attempt to influence idling in school zones.
- For morning measurement, begin 30 minutes before classes start and continue measuring 20 minutes after classes begin.
- For afternoon measurement, begin 30 minutes before classes end and continue measuring 30 minutes after classes end.
- Watch for visible exhaust fumes, engine noise, vibrating tail pipe or exterior lights to assess if vehicle is idling.

Please fill out the information below at the start of each session

school name: ___________________ date _____ start time______ end time______
weather (cloudy, rainy, sunny): ____________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle type (car, truck, SUV, minivan, full-size van, bus)</th>
<th>Idling time</th>
<th>Driver’s gender</th>
<th># people in car</th>
<th>In-car activity (reading, watching for child, listening to radio, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contacts
For information regarding the pilot phase of Department of Ecology’s anti-idling program, please contact:

Leslie Thorpe
Washington State Department of Ecology
PO Box 47600
Lacey, WA 98504-7600
360.407.6848
leth461@ecy.wa.gov

Mike Rosen
PRR, Inc.
1109 First Avenue, Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98101
206.623.0232 x206
mrosen@prrbiz.com