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Structure of presentation

- Definitions
- Examples of MM at the employer level (travel plans - TPs) from around the world
- Effectiveness: what makes a good travel plan and what can it achieve?
- Barriers to implementation and how to overcome them
- The role of government in travel plan implementation – *Key Messages for Governments*
- Other “soft factors”
- Conclusions and recommendations
Sources of information used

- Own research
  - DfT, TRICS Consortium (UK); OPTIMUM and OPTIMUM2 European Projects
- Other DfT (UK) research – *Smarter Choices* (2004)
- EU Framework 5 research – [http://mo.st](http://mo.st)
- VTPI TDM Encyclopaedia (Canada)
- US TDM Clearinghouse
- Australian State websites
- List of relevant websites provided on final slide
Definitions: typical travel plan initiatives

- Most receptive organisations – large ones, with a **problem** – hospitals, universities, drug companies, banks

- Typical measures implemented:
  - Promotional and awareness raising
  - Car-sharing – databases, reserved parking spaces
  - Improved walking and cycling facilities
  - Cheaper and better public transport
  - Car park management/charging
  - Flexible and tele-working and on-site facilities – cut need to travel
  - Financial incentives

- Barriers?
  - New idea – not so many tested examples – few obvious results
  - Not central to business
  - Costly? Can cause controversy
Examples of travel plans 1

- Egg banking plc, Derby, UK
- Call centre, 1400 staff (880 on site at once), 500 parking spaces, occupied 2001
- No convenient on street parking but P+R nearby
- Travel plan consists of:
  - Parking charges for staff (£0.5/day) but not car sharers
  - Cheap frequent buses to town centre and nearby P+R site
  - Cycle parking and shower and changing facilities.
- 53 cars per 100 staff per day arrive at site; regional average is 62
- Travel plan is related to planning application
Examples of travel plans 2

- University of Washington, Seattle, USA
- 52,000 students and staff 4 miles north of Seattle CBD
- U-PASS introduced 1990 – for US$12.50/mth (staff) or US$9/mth it gives:
  - Unlimited local public transport and vanpool use within Metro Seattle
  - Free carpool parking at University and GRH
  - Local public transport service increased by 20%
  - 8 days’ parking at half-price
  - Local shopping discounts
  - Parking costs about the same as but also includes a U-PASS
- Overall programme costs US$7 million a year
- 74% of people on campus have a U-PASS
- 1990-1996 peak hour car trips into campus area dropped 13%
Examples of travel plans 3

- **Bluewater Shopping Centre, Kent, UK – opened 1999**
- **Up to 8,500 permanent staff – up to 5,500 on site at any one time**
- **13,000 parking spaces but almost all for shoppers**
- **Travel plan measures (aimed at staff and shoppers)**
  - 60 buses per hour to site, bus station, discounted tickets and information.
  - Shuttle bus from nearest train station, Bluewater Railcard (33% off fares) and Bluewater as “station” in national rail information systems
  - Cycle routes to site, with cycle parking
  - A month’s free travel on public transport for new employees
  - Parking management, enforcing low levels of provision for staff
  - Local recruitment strategies
  - Cost £5 million plus £200k/year
- **40% of staff drive to work; local average around 80%**
- **Travel plan is related to planning application**
Examples of travel plans 4

- Astra Zeneca, Cheshire, UK
- Drugs company, 4,200 staff, 3,277 parking spaces, greenfield out of town site
- Travel plan related to development of site
- Key travel plan elements:
  - Subsidised buses and inter-site shuttle bus (initially free to staff)
  - Car sharing scheme with reserved spaces
  - Tele-working/more flexible working practices
  - Better on-site facilities for cyclists
- Solo drive mode share 90% in 1997, 73% 2001
Examples of travel plans 5

- Water Corporation HQ, Leederville, Perth, Australia
- Environmental image imperative for plan
  - Improved bicycle parking and lockers.
  - Car parking bays reserved for car poolers
  - Intranet bulletin to facilitate car pooling.
  - Workplace access guide to travel options.
  - Bus and train timetables at reception (station nearby).
  - Articles in the corporate newsletter on travel options and green transport plan initiatives.
  - Encouragement of participation in cycling programs.
- 760 staff – car use cut by ~ 20% to 51% of workforce 1999-2003
Effectiveness: what makes a good travel plan

- Some level of resources
- Travel co-ordinator – at least 0.3 FTE/1000 staff
- Management support
- Monetary incentives
- Parking management
- In UK cases, shuttle buses and public transport improvements
- In US – car sharing
- In NL – public transport discounts, cycling improvements
Effectiveness: what can a travel plan achieve?

- Netherlands – reviews from late 1990s to date conclude following range of reduction in vehicle km travelled (VKT):
  - < 10% “basic” plans
  - 10-20% for plans with incentives
  - 20%+ for plans with incentives and disincentives
- USA – most authoritative reports concluded average 19% cut in VKT from “good” plans
- Malaga, Spain, large business park – 12% decrease in car use
- GKK Health company, Graz – parking charge introduced, increase in non-car modes
- Potsdam, Germany – 11% decrease in car usage
Some UK results

  
  - About 7% of UK employers claimed (2002) to have travel plans (car travel decreased by 7% to 12% at active sites)
  
  - 18 organisations reviewed in 2002 – average 17.8% reduction in drive alone commuting
  
  - 33 organisations in 7 economically buoyant areas reviewed in 2004 – average 18%
  
  - Same areas – travel plans calculated to reduce total car commuting by 0.4% - 3.3%
  
  - Costs per employee around £47/US$80/€62 per year
Barriers to TP implementation

- Presentation to ECMT Round Table 121 identified the following barriers:
  - Companies’ self interest and internal organisational barriers
  - Personal taxation and commuting
  - The nature of public transport provision (in the UK)
  - Lack of regulatory requirements for travel plans
  - Lack of examples due to novelty of the concept

- Have these changed/are there additional barriers?
  - Relative costs of different modes of transport

- Are barriers different in other countries?

- See comparison of framework conditions from MOST
Overcoming barriers to implementation 1

- EU MOST research project – detailed advice, related to *Key Messages for Governments*
  - Policy
  - Actors and Structures
  - Integration
  - Resources
  - Basic conditions
  - Inverse policies
Key messages for government on TPs

Many of the *Key Messages for Governments* are relevant to TPs. A selection of the most important:

- Establish supportive national policy, legal and regulatory frameworks
- Co-ordinate land-use and transport policy
- Provide a consistent framework for investment in transport
- Inform transport clients
- Seek partnerships
- Pricing and fiscal structure should send the right messages
Conclusions and recommendations

- Experience, particularly in UK, indicates that TPs can reduce car use - but debate on system-wide impact

- Evidence from elsewhere in Europe and USA rather more patchy

- Framework conditions at site level, employer level and governmental level will assist adoption of effective plans

- Governments may need to make changes to facilitate wider implementation of travel plans

- Relevance to developing countries?
EU and other research in MM and TBC

See websites for:
- ADONIS
- CAMPARIE
- COSMOS
- EPOMM
- IMPACT
- INPHORMM
- MOMENTUM
- MOSAIC
- MOST
- PROSITRANS
- TAPESTRY
- TOOLBOX
- WALCYNG

Much useful information also available at:
- www.epommweb.org
- www.eltis.org
- http://www.kennisplatform-verdi.nl/Pdf/Vervoermanagement%20-%20een%20kwestie%20van%20draagvlak%20en%20maatwerk.pdf (NB in Dutch)