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Unlocking the potential of Site Based Mobility Management through Local Travel Plan Groups

Dr Marcus Enoch*, Mr Lian Zhang and Dr Stephen Ison
Transport Studies Group, Department of Civil and Building Engineering, Loughborough University, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK.

Abstract
Travel Plans are potentially an important means by which excessive car use can be addressed. They involve traffic generators such as retail parks, hospitals and local authorities and are seen as a relatively cheap and uncontroversial measure that can be introduced in a targeted and site-specific manner. They are however predicated on these organisations being motivated to embrace travel plans in helping to address a problem, for example congestion, which they may not see themselves as being the major cause of. One way of addressing the resistance of organisations to meaningfully adopt travel plans is for local authorities to set up some form of ‘Local Travel Plan Group’ (LTPG) or ‘Network’ offering organisations more influence as to how local transport decisions are enacted.

The aim of this paper is to detail the reasons why the widespread adoption of travel plans has failed to materialise and whether establishing LTPG’s is likely to aid the situation. The paper classifies LTPG’s, explores how they might be implemented and what type is appropriate in what circumstances. The paper is based on a review of existing LTPG’s and their potential for effective policy transfer. The paper draws on research undertaken for the European Commission North West Europe Interreg IIIB programme OPTIMUM2.

1. Introduction

In the UK Government guidance ‘A Travel Plan Resource Pack for Employers’ (EEBPP, 2001a) a travel plan is defined as:

‘a general term for a package of measures tailored to meet the needs of individual sites and aimed at promoting greener, cleaner travel choices and reducing reliance on the car. It involves the development of a set of mechanisms, initiatives and targets that together can enable an organisation to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment, whilst also bringing a number of other benefits to the organisation as an employer and to staff.’¹

The idea behind travel plans started in the USA – particularly on the West Coast - as a quick and easy response to the fuel crises during the 1970s, but they were fairly slow to permeate across the Atlantic. Indeed, in the UK the first travel plans only began to appear during the

* Corresponding author: Tel: +44 (0)1509 223408. Email: m.p.enoch@lboro.ac.uk.

¹ Travel plans have been known in Europe as ‘site-based mobility management’, ‘green transport plans’, ‘green travel plans’, ‘green commuting’, ‘company mobility plans’, and ‘employer transport plans’, while in the USA they are encompassed by the term TDM (Transportation Demand Management).
early 1990s, with the first official policy record being made in the 1998 Transport White Paper – *A new deal for transport: Better for everyone* (DETR, 1998). In brief, the attractions of travel plans to Governments and local authorities are that they are reasonably quick to introduce, relatively cheap and perhaps most importantly are usually politically acceptable. In short, they are an ‘easy win’. This is in marked contrast to other transport measures which often require high levels of investment over a long period of time and can carry a high political risk. Crucially however, travel plans are dependent on other organisations, namely traffic generators such as employers, retail parks and hospitals being motivated to participate in helping to solve something that ‘is not their problem’. Thus, organisations will generally only consider travel plans if they:

- need to solve a transport problem, such as access for employees, shortage of parking, traffic congestion, air pollution (for airports in particular) on site or off-site.

- need to address a space problem. Here an organisation maybe expanding and in order to develop needs to build on land currently given over to parking spaces.

- need planning permission. If they are seeking to expand an organisation will require planning permission which may stipulate the need to introduce a travel plan.

- want to save money, since parking provision is expensive and reducing levels of parking provision can reduce company costs.

- want to enhance their image either in the local community or at a board level. The argument could be we are an environmentally conscious organisation and so deserve to be invested in by your ethical account holders.

- are told to do so. In the UK, the National Health Service now requires its sites to develop plans, as do Government Departments. Schools are now also being pushed to adopt travel plans for a number of reasons: reducing congestion, air pollution and road traffic accidents and also for health reasons.

As a result, studies have shown at the site level that UK plans combining both incentives to using alternatives to the car, together with disincentives to drive, can achieve a 15-30 percent reduction in drive alone commuting (DTLR, 2001), while Knaap and Ing (1996) reported a 20 percent average reduction at sites in the Netherlands and the USA. Meanwhile Schreffler (1998) noted that some exceptional case studies in the USA reported trip reduction rates of 50 percent and more. But, at the network level the figures are almost negligible. For instance, Rye (2002) estimates that travel plans have removed just over 150,000 car trips from British roads each working day, or 1.14 billion km per year, i.e. around three quarters of one percent of the total vehicle km travelled to work by car overall². Rye (2002) identifies several key barriers to wider travel plan implementation, namely:

- Companies’ self interest and internal organisational barriers;

- Lack of regulatory requirements for travel plans;

- Personal taxation and commuting issues;

- The poor quality of alternatives (particularly public transport);

---

² There is an argument that any traffic that Travel Plans remove from the network will simply be replaced by previously suppressed traffic unless some form of congestion charging is in place to prevent this occurring. Nevertheless, Travel Plans can be a key part of any wider transport strategy to reduce car use and improve travel choices, particularly as they target trips during peak times when the negative impacts of car use (i.e. congestion, noise, emissions etc.) are at their worst.
• Lack of examples due to novelty of the concept.

One possible way to overcoming some of these barriers, is to establish some kind of ‘Local Travel Plan Group’ (LTPG) and this forms the focus of this paper.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 defines and details the potential benefits of LTPG’s, while Section 3 describes how LTPGs may fit within a wider transport planning organisational structure and Section 4 seeks to classify a range of types of LTPG. Section 5 examines how LTPGs have performed in practice and Section 6 investigates the role of the ‘strategic level’ of transport planning organisation. Section 7 details implementation issues and Section 8 presents conclusions.

2. Local Travel Plan Groups and their potential benefits

Any group of organisations that comes together to share resources and ideas for developing and implementing a travel plan in their local area could be identified as being a Local Travel Plan Group (LTPG). There are a number of benefits of forming some type of LTPG. For instance, such a grouping is collectively able to achieve more than single agencies or employers when dealing with common concerns. This is based on pooled resources, delivering higher investment, dedicated staff, and greater political influence, yet it allows the member companies/organisations to focus more on their core competencies. Secondly, LTPGs have the ability to move Transport Demand Measures (TDM) from a site-specific application to a more flexible and effective area-wide application. The nature of transportation and environmental issues is that each employer or agency has the potential to impact upon others and to allow each member to become part of the solution (Anderson and Ungemah, 2002). Finally, LTPGs can improve the level of communication between the sectors and allow the level of flexibility necessary to ensure that transport objectives are met in ways that maximise the benefits for businesses, residents and commuters.

Such an approach is supported in the seminal Department for Transport’s Smarter Choices Report (Cairns et al., 2004), which noted that one of the key issues necessary for ‘scaling up’ the use and impact of travel plans was for an area wide approach to be adopted. Specifically it stated that “travel planning might become more commonplace in smaller organisations if it was part of a neighbourhood or area wide approach.”

EEBPP (2001b) found that travel plan networks were ‘especially effective in furthering travel plans’ and suggested they have four main roles, namely to:

• exchange information, ideas and good practice;
• provide moral and practical support for those involved in travel plan development;
• make viable the provision of services relating to travel plans on a collective basis; and
• combine efforts to generate an effective bargaining force.

It continues that “the benefits of networks are that concerted action by a number of organisations makes things more likely to happen. Travel plans are more likely to be prepared and implemented by organisations with the impetus of a network behind them... largely from the greater influence of a larger organisation and economies of scale”. Finally, the EEBPP report notes the benefits to local authorities of establishing a network. These, it states, are:

• the advantage of a single contact point for a variety of organisations;
• novel ideas that might not have been considered can emerge from a network, and be applied to other networks with which the authority might be involved;
• contact with a network allows an authority to gauge attitudes towards its own initiatives and can offer early warning of problems;

• news of successes, and the fact that collective effort is seen to be applied to transport and access problems, can benefit the local economy by attracting new businesses to an area and retaining existing businesses.

Clearly, the LTPG may be worth considering as a new way of delivering travel plans.

3. LTPGs within the wider transport planning organisational structure

Traditionally, transport and planning functions have been undertaken at a variety of administrative levels, whereby European and National Government decisions influence the overall direction of policy, and the actual application of those policies is carried out at the regional and/or local government level. In recent years however there has been a shift in emphasis towards ‘partnerships’ being formed with community groups and the private sector (Newman and Thornley, 1996). In this sense the adoption of the concept of LTPG’s forms part of this trend, whereby another ‘delivery’ level of transport tools effectively comes into being – these can be termed tactical and strategic.

The **tactical** level is the basic implementation of travel plans measured on the ‘ground’ – that is the ‘new’ LTPG’. The **strategic** level effectively comprises the local and regional planning and transport authorities. These bodies are responsible for applying wider strategic policy objectives and strategic implementation frameworks in a specific local/regional context and distributing the allocated resources. There may also be a **supra-strategic** level consisting primarily of European and National government. This level however falls largely outside the remit of this paper.

These relationships are illustrated in Figure 1.

Insert figure 1 here

4. Developing a taxonomy of LTPG types

In terms of the research undertaken as part of the OPTIMUM2 programme it was possible to identify the following six categories in terms of the tactical level of LTPG’s namely: Individual Organisations, Development Zones, Area Based Groups, Business Improvement Districts, Transportation Management Associations, and Transportation Management Districts. These can be described as follows:

Individual Organisations (IO’s) refer to local authorities, government departments, hospitals, school/universities and private organisations who have one or more large scale worksites at a range different locations. Aimed at employees, visitors, customers and suppliers, IO’s introduce travel plans for many reasons, including solving transport or space problems, saving money, enhancing their image, in order to get planning permission or because they are legally required to. Typically, IO’s appoint a coordinator to establish, manage and monitor the travel plans by using their own resources with or without local authorities support.

Development Zones (DZ’s) refer to local areas developed for a specific use, such as business parks, retail parks, industrial estates, leisure parks and even airports. The overall area is usually owned (or at least managed) by a single private or public sector body that ‘hosts’ a number of ‘tenant’ organisations that are located there. The motivation for DZ’s being involved in the development of a travel plan are largely similar to those facing the larger IO’s. With or without local authorities support, the site owner or manager (sometimes a tenant) provides travel plan coordinator(s) who establish, manage and monitor travel plans by using contributions, levy or rental fees from the tenants.
Area Based Groups (ABG’s) are informal networks of organisations that operate, or are interested in operating, travel plans located within a loosely defined neighbourhood. They exist where two or more organisations feel combining resources will be a more effective way to deal with transport issues, and are generally formed either by local authorities ‘suggesting’ groups or by one leading organisation taking the lead in helping to address a specific transport issue.

Business Improvement Districts (BID’s) are a partnership management initiative between a local authority and the business community which provides investment within a defined area. A BID is designed to assist business in funding and developing projects in order to address specific problems and issues with solutions the businesses believe are right (UKBID’s, 2005). To date, the focus in the UK schemes has mainly been on physical improvements to the urban realm and community safety, although accessibility and transport objectives are sometimes included.

Transportation Management Associations (TMA’s), (also known as Transportation Management Organisations) is an “organised group applying carefully selected approaches to facilitating the movement of people and goods within an area” (NCTR, 2001). TMA’s are often led by the private sector in partnership with the public sector aimed at solving transport problems.

Transportation Management Districts (TMD’s) utilise Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to encourage the use of alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle commuting within a legally designated geographical area. The crucial difference between a TMD and the other forms of LTPG already identified is that organisations with more than a set minimum number of employees within the District are legally required by local ordinances to participate – usually by being obliged to produce, implement and monitor some form of travel plan.

The various LTPG’s can be illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1 illustrates the range of LTPG’s. With IO’s all the decisions are taken ‘in house’; whereas on an area/neighbourhood basis, most notably in terms of DZ, BID, TMA, and TMD transport matters are delegated to a single management company. As for ABG’s they are far more loosely and informally structured. Also evident is the split between organisational structures where transport is the major reason for the group’s existence and where it is but one of several.

Member participation would seem to vary from quite didactic relationships between landlords and tenants with for example DZ’s and TMD’s to more equitable arrangements for the others, while motivations for establishing the groups tends to be driven either by organisational self interest or by legal requirement. Interestingly, the primary and secondary actors switch between the public and private sector, with the private sector leading where self interest is the motivating factor and the public sector taking charge when mandatory schemes are paramount. Developing this further by examining the role of the local authority, when travel plan schemes and networks are voluntarily established by the business community, the role of the local authority is supportive. Where travel plans are not a business priority the role is far more intensive and regulatory, for example, where the planning system (via planning obligations or conditions) is used to require developers to establish a travel plan in return for obtaining planning permission.

Finally, funding types tend to be ad hoc arrangements, often public or private sector grants or investments, for IO/DZ/ABG’s, but rather more formalised for the BID’s and TMA’s.

5. LTPG’s in practice

This section provides examples of each type of LTPG and provides some indication of their effectiveness.
Individual Organisations

The US-based pharmaceutical company Pfizer has its main UK manufacturing and research facility in Sandwich, Kent and a European corporate headquarters in Walton Oaks in Surrey. Pfizer employees were frustrated by the traffic congestion especially at its Kent plant. Many staff had difficulty finding parking spaces and often had to walk a long distance from their parking space to the office (Pfizer, 2005). In addressing these problems, Pfizer introduced a travel plan at its working sites both for employees and visitors. A ‘parking cash out’ incentive scheme and shuttle bus service have also been provided. According to Pfizer’s first travel survey, the number of cars coming onto its Sandwich site for every 100 staff fell from 75 in 1998 to 68 in 2001 where it has since stabilised. As a result, the company reduced its parking spaces by approximately 400. Other examples of IO’s include Derriford Hospital in Plymouth and Vodafone in Berkshire.

Development Zones

Stockley Park occupies a large site near Heathrow Airport to the west of London and accommodates 7,700 full time equivalent staff. Overall, the site is operated as a single entity, and the travel plan is included within this management remit. The Park has had a travel plan since 1998 which covers various initiatives e.g. car sharing, cycling and walking, public transport and awareness raising. A survey conducted in 2002 shows that since 1999, there was a one percent increase in the use of underground rail, a 1.2 percent increase in rail commuting and a 3.4 percent increase in bus use. There is also a target of reducing car use for commuting by 20 percent by 2009 (SPCL, 2004). Other DZ examples include BAA Heathrow Airport in west London and Regent’s Place in central London.

Area Based Groups

Bristol City Council set up a Green Commuter Club in 1999 following a conference designed to promote travel plans among companies in the city. This now has more than 85 members and meets on a quarterly basis. In 2001, a number of the members were about to move into a new development area known as Temple Quay and so decided, together with the City Council, to set up their own sub-group. The Temple Quay Employer Group now has 15 members both in and next to the newly developed area. Members of the sub group are required to sign up to a statement of intent which commits the company to addressing common issues. Projects such as a car sharing database – are financed by contributions from the Council and member companies on a project by project basis. Initially, the TQEG was run by the council, but recently some of the organisational effort has been taken on by Norwich Union (Ginger, 2005). Other ABG examples include Northside, Southside and Lenton Lane Employer Groups in Nottingham.

Business Improvement Districts

Downtown BID of the City of Boulder in Colorado is a 49-block neighbourhood which suffers a shortage of parking. To keep the downtown area healthy and attractive, the city decided to build no more parking and instead focus on promoting alternative commuting. A goal is to get employees of business in the BID out of their cars at least two days a week by providing subsidised transit passes, free bicycle rentals and other initiatives with full support from the local businesses. When the programme started in 1994, 35 percent of the district’s 10,000 employees participated. Participation in 2002 was up to 42 percent (BWC, 2002; Ward, 2005). Other BID examples include the Perimeter Community Improvement Districts in Atlanta, Georgia and Kingston First in Kingston upon Thames.

Transportation Management Associations

The Amsterdam Schiphol Airport TMA is a partnership between the Dutch central government, airport operator, airport-based companies and public transport operators. TMA Schiphol was established to achieve a high level of accessibility and assist employees in finding optimal solutions to and from Schiphol airport. Companies interested in joining the TMA need to register as a member by paying a membership fee and in return, they receive
TMA services such as consultancy on airport accessibility, public transport information and car sharing. Between 1997 and 2001 the number of TMA member companies increased from 45 to 67. In 2001 these companies employed 42,300 employees, or 80 percent of the total workforce of Schiphol-based companies. Total car use, including car sharing, reduced from 72 percent in 1996 to 69.6 percent in 2000/1 and total public transport use increased from 19.4 percent to 21.1 percent over the same period. Schiphol airport regarded this as a success, as car use in society as a whole has risen during this period (Tapestry, 2003; Reeven et al., 2003 and Sam, 2001). Other examples of TMA’s include Dyce TMO in Aberdeen, Black Creek Region TMA in Greater Toronto and Lloyd District TMA in Portland, Oregon.

Transportation Management Districts

The only TMDs in operation currently exist in Montgomery County, Maryland. Approximately 120,000 commuters and 1,120 employers are arranged in four TMDs, that range in size from 5,000 to 65,000 employees (50 to 520 employers). TMDs legally require employers of more than a set minimum of employees to produce, implement and monitor a travel plan. The purpose of the TMDs, was to promote the County’s land use and economic development objectives of increasing development densities around transit stations and making station areas attractive and convenient places in which to live, work, shop and do business (MCC, 2004).

From the research undertaken – which was based on existing material supported by email, telephone or face to face interviews – it is difficult to judge the effectiveness of the groups in delivering their transport objectives, since in many cases the data does not exist and even when it does it is not robust enough to draw more than cursory conclusions. For this to be remedied, a series of in-depth case studies would need to be undertaken to examine group or perhaps network issues, such as the type of member participation, degree of internal communication, level of awareness of group existence, contextual issues and the results of the group in terms of transport goals achieved. Despite this, it is still worth considering the various contextual factors that are exhibited for each LTPG type, and these are summarised in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 here
In terms of the geographic factors the DZ's and TMA's tend to have distinctive borders and are typically located at edge or out-of-town sites, whereas ABDs, BID's and the TMD examples are usually found in inner city or downtown areas and can have quite blurred boundaries.

The organisational environment refers to the number of organisations, locations (edge of town, city centre), distribution (clusters, evenly spread, corridors), sectors (industrial, leisure, retail, commercial, health, education etc), and size (number of employees and visitors).

Politically, the split is actually less to do with type of LTPG than with the motivation behind its formation – i.e. is it implemented because of self interest or as a legal requirement. The exceptions are that TMD’s are always pushed by legal requirement while the ABG’s are usually voluntary. Of the remainder, IO’s and DZ’s tend to be either voluntary or mandatory, while the BID’s and TMA’s seem far more dependent on both public and private bodies ‘buying in’ to the groups and taking the lead at different stages of their development.

IO’s, DZ’s and ABG’s can legally exist anywhere, as can TMA’s although some advice may be necessary as to the most effective administrative form. BID’s would require legislation if they are to be used in areas outside North America or the UK, while TMD’s are not legally sanctioned anywhere outside of Montgomery County, Maryland in the USA.

The institutional issue is focused on whether a suitable existing group may be used to ‘piggyback’ transport issues. This can be easier than setting up a brand new specialist group but can also be less focused on delivering transport goals, especially if transport objectives are not fully accepted by other members. IO’s, DZ’s and BID’s form the pre-existing LTPG types, while ABD’s, TMA’s and TMD’s are set up specifically to deal with transport issues. Related to this is the scope of the problem. Thus, is transport the only, or at least most significant, local issue, or should a group deal with wider issues too?

The scale of the problem refers to whether the issue to be dealt with requires a localised or site-based solution, or whether it needs to be addressed on a neighbourhood basis. IO’s, DZ’s and TMA’s tend to focus on site specific concerns, whereas the others are more amorphous and deal with issues across neighbourhoods.

The final contextual factor relates to the travel plan specific policy context of the local area or the scope of the problem.

In summary, it is probably the contextual factors that most strongly influence the choice of LTPG type in the first instance. This is because the motivations for group formation and primary actors depend on the perceived scope and scale of the problem, while this combined with the geographic, organisational environments, political, and institutional factors encountered will significantly restrict the choice of group type.

6. The strategic level

The typical actors, in the UK at least at the strategic level would tend to be regional and local planning and transport authorities, most notably Passenger Transport Executives, Transport for London, London Boroughs, County Councils, District Councils and Unitary Authorities. The roles of such actors would be that it:

- applies wider strategic policy objectives to the specific regional/local context;
- applies wider strategic implementation frameworks to the specific regional/local context; and
- distributes allocated resources.
It is the link between the strategic and tactical levels however that is of particular interest. The research undertaken as part of this study reveals that interfacing arrangements between the public and private sectors (strategic and tactical levels) began appearing in the late 1980s, and in general are based on some kind of agreement between a particular local authority and one or more private sector interest groups with the aim of promoting specific partnership projects within their area of operation. Some have also involved or co-opted representatives from the local community and the voluntary sectors. Overall management is provided by a board or committee made up of local authority councillors and participant company directors, with day to day activity undertaken by employed officials, some on a permanent basis, but most seconded from the agency’s partners for varying periods of time (Gore, 1991).

But, as Verma (2005) points out, partly because of shrinking funding levels and partly because of growth within the sector, both the not-for-profit and public organisations have been experiencing increased competition for scarce resources. To achieve the best results, a joint enabling agency needs to have a clear sense of mission, a well led, professionally managed and fiscally sound organisation (Gelatt, 1992). Therefore, as with for-profit companies, not-for-profit partnerships tend to establish clear objectives in terms of their implementation. But unlike for-profit organisations, they often do not establish readily quantifiable targets and this can make monitoring their performance somewhat difficult (Oster, 1995).

7. Implementation issues

As the lead partner at the strategic level Local Authorities role is to develop a structure for the LTPG network in its area; to define the goals of this overall project and the objectives of the different partners; and to identify the roles of different partners involved (Samii, 2002). In that local authorities are all important in implementing, operating and supporting LTPGs, it can be stated that their role falls somewhere between a federalised and centralised frame.

The various attributes of each organisation within these two frames of reference are illustrated in Table 3.

Insert table 3 here

The federalised frame tends to exist in situations where there are a fairly small number of large, powerful, influential and cohesive local groups/organisations already in place, which in the UK at least form the vast majority of cases. However, perhaps the most notable exception to this is occurring in Birmingham, England where the local authority has taken on a far more pro-active role and instead encourages companies to join its centrally run travel plan to use its centrally administered travel plan services as and when required (Cairns et al., 2004). The philosophy here is that greater overall behavioural change can be generated by many companies making relatively small contributions than by far fewer companies making larger individual impacts - affiliates are charged with achieving a reduction of ten percent in car commuting journeys. As of September 2006, 242 organisations had signed up to Company TravelWise covering over 152,000 employees, or just over 30 percent of the city's workforce making it the largest such group in the UK (Cooper, 2006). By contrast, the expectation for organisations in other areas can sometimes be that car use should be reduced by anything up to 30 percent.

There is also the issue relating to the level of involvement of the planning or transport authority at the strategic level vis a vis the tactical organisations. This ranges from a highly interventionist to a more laissez faire approach. One example of the former is York City Council, whereby the council effectively chooses to work intensively with a relatively small group of organisations. Meanwhile Levantis (2005) has built on this approach in developing a so-called Zonal Travel Plan (a new form of ABG) in the London Borough of Islington, and DZ’s and ABG’s near Northampton, Southampton, Leicester and Newcastle. It does this by identifying organisations that already have travel plans and using them to anchor ‘clusters’ of other organisations with less well developed plans. By contrast in the Birmingham outlined
above, the council is far less ‘hands on’ and instead encourages organisations to use its central administered travel plan services as and when required (Cairns et al, 2004).

Following the choice of frame and LTPG type, the next step is to design and implement them. Kouwenhoven (1993) presents a framework or checklist designed to illustrate what is needed for the ‘perfect implementation’ of public private partnerships (PPP). This is suitable because LTPGs are most commonly a partnership between the public and private sector charged with delivering a mutually beneficial project. In brief, Kouwenhoven suggests that there are three types of ‘condition’ required, namely starting, interlinking and project.

The starting conditions for a public private partnership are:

- Interdependence between the two sectors; and
- Convergence of objectives.

Given the presence of these, the two secondary or ‘interlinking’ conditions are:

- The existence of a network of communication channels between the public and private sectors concerned; and
- The existence of a broker to facilitate negotiations.

Once these are in place, then the following project conditions need to be in place:

- Mutual trust;
- Unambiguous objectives and strategy;
- Unambiguous division of costs, risks and returns;
- Unambiguous division of responsibilities and authorities;
- Phasing of the project;
- Conflict regulation laid down beforehand;
- Legality;
- Protection of third parties’ interests and rights;
- Adequate support and control facilities;
- Business and market-orientated thinking and acting;
- ‘Internal’ co-ordination; and
- Adequate project organisation.

The control phase is concerned with monitoring the performance of the LTPG. Traditionally, monitoring of travel plans has tended to focus on their performance in meeting only transport and financial outcomes. But, while these indicators obviously remain important, it is also important to monitor how the LTPG’s and the interfaces are performing as organisations. Consequently, process factors such as the participation rates and levels of organisations within the LTPG’s, and of the awareness of LTPG’s and their roles at both organisational and individual levels are of key importance.
In summary, it should be noted that as with travel plans, every individual situation is different, and so care should be taken when transferring ideas from elsewhere to ensure that even subtle variations in context are accounted for. Therefore, while the general framework described above should be applicable in a wide range of situations, it should always be remembered that it is only a framework.

8. Conclusions

This paper has aimed to investigate how Local Travel Plan Groups have been introduced in practice in order to facilitate the design of such schemes in the future.

In conclusion six types of LTPG were identified, namely: Individual Organisations, Development Zones, Area Based Groups, Business Improvement Districts, Transportation Management Associations, and Transportation Management Districts. These were devised according to the degree of formality and hierarchy within the groups, and whether transport was the core issue for the group or not. Other factors examined included motivations behind group formation and the roles of the various actors.

In terms of the performance of each LTPG type with respect to transport goals, a lack of sufficient detailed evidence precluded conclusions from being drawn regarding which type operates best under what circumstances. In-depth case studies using perhaps a group formation or network analysis theoretical framework would be most useful in order to properly investigate this. Current indications though, are that performance seems to be more influenced by the individual circumstances of each group than the type of LTPG per se.

It also appears likely that it is the contextual factors that most strongly influence the choice of LTPG type in the first instance. This is because the motivations for group formation and primary actors depend on the perceived scope and scale of the problem, while this combined with the geographic, organisational environments, political, and institutional will significantly restrict the choice of group type that can be made. Beyond that, the choices are based on whether to adapt a suitable existing group to include transport within its remit or to set up a transport organisation. A decision needs to be taken as to how formal the group should be, on how it should be funded and ultimately on the exact roles of the stakeholders.

Moving to the role of local authorities interested in supporting LTPG’s, two possible frames, namely the centralised and the federalised – have been identified. Under the former, the ‘strategic agent’ takes far more of a lead and seeks to maximise the number of participants, while in the federalised approach the net is not cast as broadly but participants tend to be more involved. Once again, the choice of which to adopt is heavily influenced by contextual factors, in this case partly the policy context and partly the resources available.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>TYPICAL ACTORS</th>
<th>ROLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Supra-strategic** | • Regional government  
• National government  
• Corporate bodies and public sector agencies | • Sets wider strategic policy objectives  
• Sets wider strategic implementation frameworks e.g. legislative, regulatory, taxation and subsidies  
• Directs resources |
| **Strategic**   | • Regional and local planning and transport authorities                       | • Applies wider strategic policy objectives to specific regional/local context  
• Applies wider strategic implementation frameworks to specific regional/local context  
• Distributes allocated resources |
| **Tactical**    | • Individual Organisations (IOs)  
• Development Zones (DZs)  
• Area Based Groups (ABGs)  
• Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)  
• Transportation Management Associations/Organisations (TMA/TMO)  
• Transportation Management District (TMD) | • Implements travel plan measures |

*Figure 1: Tactical, strategic and supra-strategic actors and roles*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Individual Organisations (IOs)</th>
<th>Development Zones (DZs)</th>
<th>Area Based Groups (ABGs)</th>
<th>Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)</th>
<th>Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)</th>
<th>Transportation Management Districts (TMDs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisations that operate their own travel plans</td>
<td>Local areas developed for specific uses</td>
<td>Informal networks in a loosely defined neighbourhood</td>
<td>LA-business partnership to invest within a defined area</td>
<td>Private, non-profit, member-controlled organisations for defined area</td>
<td>Companies in defined area legally required to develop travel plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group structure</td>
<td>Single organisation</td>
<td>Leading organisation and members</td>
<td>Organisations all equal</td>
<td>Coordinating organisation created</td>
<td>Coordinating organisation created</td>
<td>Led by Local Authority coordinating organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of formality</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Landlord-tenant – formal</td>
<td>Common interest – informal</td>
<td>Financial (tax) – very formal</td>
<td>Financial (member fee) – fairly formal</td>
<td>Legal requirement – very formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport only issue?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member participation</td>
<td>In single organisation</td>
<td>Landlord in control</td>
<td>Power shared equally</td>
<td>Full membership in control</td>
<td>Full membership in control</td>
<td>Local Authority in control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of group formation</td>
<td>Legal requirement or self interest (e.g. corporate image, site congestion)</td>
<td>Legal requirement or self interest</td>
<td>Self interest. Members see benefits of sharing resources.</td>
<td>Self interest for majority who vote to form BID. Minority req’d to join.</td>
<td>Legal requirement or self interest. Members seek to jointly improve area</td>
<td>Organisations in designated areas legally required to adopt travel plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary actor</td>
<td>IO/ Local Authority</td>
<td>DZ/ Local Authority</td>
<td>LA/private companies</td>
<td>Local Authority initially, then private BID company</td>
<td>Local Authority/private companies</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary actors</td>
<td>Local Authority/IO</td>
<td>Local Authority/DZ</td>
<td>Private companies/Local Authority</td>
<td>Member organisations</td>
<td>Member organisations</td>
<td>Member organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Local Authority (vol. TP)</td>
<td>Support and implemeneter</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support and facilitator</td>
<td>Initiator and facilitator</td>
<td>Support and initiator</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Local Authority (req’d TP)</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>IO/ Local Authority – ad hoc</td>
<td>Ad hoc grants, rent</td>
<td>Ad hoc grants, scheme basis</td>
<td>Business levy</td>
<td>Ad hoc, sometimes fees</td>
<td>Local authority funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Local Travel Plan Group structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic</th>
<th>Individual Organisations (IOs)</th>
<th>Development Zones (DZs)</th>
<th>Area Based Groups (ABGs)</th>
<th>Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)</th>
<th>Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)</th>
<th>Transportation Management Districts (TMDs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IOs located anywhere. Clearly demarcated</td>
<td>Often ‘edge or out-of-town’ areas with non-car poor access. Clearly demarcated</td>
<td>Potentially anywhere but often within areas of large cities. Not clearly demarcated</td>
<td>Tend to be focused on city centres or large DZs. Clearly demarcated (legally)</td>
<td>Often ‘edge or out-of-town’ areas with non-car poor access. Often clearly demarcated</td>
<td>Located in suburban centres of major conurbation. Clearly demarcated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Mostly large</td>
<td>Often large numbers of</td>
<td>Whole range of sizes,</td>
<td>Typically large number</td>
<td>Often large numbers of</td>
<td>Whole range of sizes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment</td>
<td>organisations in public and private sector</td>
<td>private sector retail or industrial units</td>
<td>public and private sector; most sectors</td>
<td>of private sector commercial and retail companies of various sizes</td>
<td>private sector retail or industrial units of all sizes</td>
<td>public and private sector; most sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Can be internally or Local Authority driven</td>
<td>Can be internally or Local Authority driven</td>
<td>Usually internally driven with Local Authority support</td>
<td>Can be internally or LA driven but needs both to work effectively</td>
<td>Can be internally or Local Authority driven but needs both to work effectively</td>
<td>Local Authority driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Requires legal framework</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Requires legal framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Organisation pre-existing</td>
<td>Organisation pre-existing</td>
<td>New organisation</td>
<td>Organisation pre-existing</td>
<td>New organisation</td>
<td>New organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of the ‘problem’</td>
<td>Site based</td>
<td>Site based</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Site based</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of the ‘problem’</td>
<td>Several issues</td>
<td>Several issues</td>
<td>Transport only</td>
<td>Several issues</td>
<td>Transport only</td>
<td>Transport only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Contextual factors of the various Local Travel Plan Group structures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federalised</th>
<th>Centralised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic body</strong></td>
<td>As a facilitator</td>
<td>As a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays supporting role</td>
<td>Plays leading role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets up a network of tactical organisations</td>
<td>Establishes group for tactical organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May provide financial incentives</td>
<td>Provides financial assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides advice and encouragement</td>
<td>Provides advice and encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates contacts</td>
<td>but may also use regulation as a stick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitates meetings</td>
<td>Establishes contacts and negotiates deals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactical organisation</strong></td>
<td>As a member</td>
<td>As a ‘customer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plays leading role</td>
<td>Plays supporting role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joins network</td>
<td>Joins group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raises its own revenue</td>
<td>Draws on club resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implements measures if in it’s own interest</td>
<td>Buys services from strategic body if in it’s own interest or to meet regulatory targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes its own contacts</td>
<td>Makes use of existing contacts and negotiated deals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributes to meetings</td>
<td>Attends meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General comments</strong></td>
<td>Process is bottom up</td>
<td>Process is top down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatively small number of active/enthusiastic members</td>
<td>Relatively large but mainly passive/reactive membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large per member impacts</td>
<td>Relatively small per member impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples of interface models</strong></td>
<td>Commuters Planning Club Nottingham, Bristol Green Employers Group; City of Boulder Transportation Demand Management; City of San Diego; Toronto Smart Commute Initiative; Montgomery County TMD;</td>
<td>TravelWise Birmingham, Rotterdam Vervoer Coordinatie Centrums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The role of the Local Authority in terms of the federalised and centralised frame.