



Smarter Ways Forward

How small measures can make a big impact in delivering sustainable transport

Transform Scotland Trust
June 2009





Smarter Ways Forward:

How small measures can make a big impact in delivering sustainable transport

A report for the Transform Scotland Trust.

Written by Mary Church and Siobhan Reardon. Edited by Colin Howden.

Published by the Transform Scotland Trust, June 2009.

Note on the report:

This report was commissioned by the Transform Scotland Trust, with support from the Scottish Government. It is based on a dissertation presented by Mary Church for the degree of Master of Science at The University of Edinburgh, 24th August 2007.

Note on the authors:

Mary Church wrote the dissertation upon which this report is based when studying at The University of Edinburgh. She is now employed by Friends of the Earth Scotland and Vipre UK. She is also Secretary of the Transform Scotland Trust.

Siobhan Reardon is Development Manager of Transform Scotland.

Colin Howden is the Director of Transform Scotland.

CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	4
Chapter One: Introduction	7
Chapter Two: Survey results	14
Chapter Three: Issues around implementation	26
Chapter Four: Conclusions	30
Chapter Five: Recommendations	32
References	34
Appendix 1: Methodology	36
Appendix 2: Respondents	39
Appendix 3: Urban/Rural Classification of Scottish Local Authorities	40
Appendix 4: Survey sent to Local Authorities	42
Appendix 5: Questionnaire sent to Regional Transport Partnerships	48

Smart choice is the only choice

Choosing to undertake a journey and choosing the appropriate transport mode to use have a direct impact on the environment. Transport choices thus need to be smart choices. Direct impacts of motorised transport on the planet include: anthropogenic (man-made) global warming through the production of greenhouse gases from the burning of fossil fuel; vehicle emissions affecting local pollution and health; vehicle noise; land take for roads and parking, railways and airports; extraction of materials for manufacture; and waste from scrapped vehicles.

Improving the fuel efficiency of vehicles and reducing the fossil carbon content of transport fuel are supply-side measures, while encouraging use of more sustainable forms of transport and more fuel conscious driving are demand-side measures. Unfortunately, the adoption of cleaner cars may still lead to overall increases in environmental burden through sheer growth in activity volumes as well as the rebound effect. Rebound effects are the off-set part of a successful implementation of a more efficient technology, which compensates for some of its environmental gains or even negates them entirely by stimulating additional, unanticipated resource consumption, and/or use of the technology.

Improving the fuel efficiency of vehicles or reducing the fossil carbon content of transport fuel may actually stimulate demand by increasing distances travelled. Indeed, in the worst case scenario, motorists, given more environmentally friendly cars and fuel, may feel they can thus drive more frequently, further and faster. This is akin to the risk compensation or behavioural adaptation drivers show in consuming car safety benefits as performance benefits.

In October 2006, at the launch of the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change the then Prime Minister, Tony Blair MP, said: *“There is nothing more serious, more urgent or more demanding of leadership ... the Stern Review has demolished the last remaining argument for inaction in the face of climate change ... We will not be able to explain ourselves to future generations if we fail.”*

And he was right. But as we enter the era of peak oil, problems with energy security and scarcity generating diplomatic incidents and oil wars, increased emissions fuelling anthropogenic climate change, increased road congestion and rapid growth in domestic and international aviation, there is an urgent need to burn less carbon-based fuel as we go about our daily business. To rely on supply-side measures to save the planet would be dumb. Demand-side changes are the smart choice.

There are two stages in persuading people to change their behaviour. First, they need to see reasons to change. The more reasons, the more compelling the reasons, the more personally advantageous or salient the reasons, and the more thoroughly they think about the reasons the more likely they are to change. Second, they typically need practical support, help and advice on how to make the change in as easy and painless a way as possible and how to fit the changes into their life. Relatively small individual changes can, cumulatively, make big differences. Recent research shows that many car users in Scotland are ready, willing and able to cut their car use.

This excellent report, the second in what promises to be a stimulating and timely series of Transform Scotland Trust research reports, summarises the support, readiness and enthusiasm for Smarter Choices amongst local government officers in Scotland. They have, in the main, seen the reasons to change and endeavoured to act. Now they need the policy support, encouragement and relatively small amount of funding from the Scottish Government to effect change towards a more sustainable, and smarter, Scotland.

Stephen Stradling

**Professor of Transport Psychology, Transport Research Institute, Edinburgh Napier University
and Chair of the Transform Scotland Trust**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background to this report

Smarter Choices are a cost-effective set of measures enabling individuals to choose more sustainable forms of travel. A number of studies, including those commissioned by government, have demonstrated Smarter Choices' effectiveness in reducing carbon emissions whilst increasing productivity. Their relatively low cost of implementation, combined with a high rate of return, means that Smarter Choices provide an economically viable way to reduce reliance on carbon intensive modes of transport. The benefits provided through Smarter Choices measures are further 'locked in' when used in conjunction with traffic demand management measures.

The transport sector is the fastest growing contributor to climate change emissions. In Scotland, the transport sector accounts for at least 24.4% of all CO₂ emissions, and most of this comes from road users. The Scottish Climate Change Bill currently proceeding through the Scottish Parliament sets a mandatory long-term target to achieve an at least 80% reduction in emissions by 2050. In order to achieve these targets it is vital that government tackles the fastest growing contributor to climate change emissions – transport. Greenhouse gas emissions from the Scottish transport sector rose by 14.3% between 1990 and 2006, whereas all Scottish emissions fell by 12.3% over this same period;¹ with forecasts that traffic levels on Scotland's roads may rise by 27% between 2005 and 2021,² it is clear that the transport sector faces a huge challenge if it is to decarbonise.

Too much traffic also costs the economy millions of pounds each year in congestion costs, while the effects on health and social inclusion are well documented. Research has found that each £1 spent on Smarter Choices could result in £10 worth of benefits in reduced congestion (a Benefit-Cost Ratio of 10:1), and even more in heavily congested areas (Cairns *et al.* 2004). Smarter Choices have also been found to achieve a nationwide reduction in all traffic of about 11% (Cairns *et al.* 2004).

In September 2007, the Commission for Integrated Transport (CfIT) recommended a mix of practical, cost-effective measures to reduce transport's impact on the environment. Within this package, the report *Transport and Climate Change* states the need for the more intensive promotion of Smarter Choices to encourage use of public transport, walking and cycling, supported by improvements in the carbon performance of public transport.

The Scottish Government has already invested in some Smarter Choices measures, including workplace travel planning and school travel planning. *Scotland's National Transport Strategy* (December 2006; hereafter "NTS"), published by the previous administration, proposed that, prior to committing to an "exact programme of investment", there would be an appraisal of Smarter Choices activity; this report goes some way to setting out the level of activity already underway.

The current administration has indicated support of some further Smarter Choices measures. The SNP's 2007 manifesto set out an aim to "decouple ownership and usage of cars" by persuading users to use other modes in order to cut congestion. In order to do this, promotion of flex-working and home-working, and Park + Ride schemes were highlighted. There was also support for encouraging a shift towards active travel modes such as walking and cycling, and the aforementioned commitments to reduce climate change emissions.

Progress has also been made in implementing local, integrated travel initiatives such as 'sustainable travel towns'. These projects provide scope for the delivery of innovative and strategic solutions to transport

¹ NAEI figures. Transport emissions were 13128 tCO₂e in 1990 and 15001 tCO₂e in 2006. Total emissions including international emissions were 70002 tCO₂e in 1990 and 61359 tCO₂e in 2006.

² Audit Scotland (2006) *Scottish Executive: An overview of the performance of transport in Scotland* – p.17.

issues, gaining sustainable modal shift and reducing carbon emissions – as well as addressing health, accessibility and economic growth. The DfT's projects in England (Darlington, Peterborough and Worcester) have produced excellent results - with car use falling by up to 9%, walking increasing by up to 14%, and cycling increasing at least 12%.³ The Scottish Government's own programme *Smarter Choices, Smarter Places* is now well underway; investment in initiatives like these, combined with support for local and regional government to deliver Smarter Choices, is fundamental to delivering the Government's five Strategic Objectives - a Healthier, Safer, Greener, Smarter and Wealthier Scotland.

Whilst some appraisal of Smarter Choices activity amongst English local authorities has been undertaken, to date the only review which has taken place in Scotland is specifically in regard to workplace travel planning in local authorities, RTPs and public bodies (Halcrow 2006). This study provides a more complete picture of Smarter Choices implementation by Scottish local authorities, in order to assess current activity and how these measures could be best supported. By concentrating on Smarter Choices activity undertaken specifically by Scottish local authorities, the report will significantly underplay the extent to which Smarter Choices are being utilised throughout Scotland, particularly as it does not capture Smarter Choices activity within the private sector.

Local authorities play an important role in implementing Smarter Choices, both as employers and as administrators. The study concludes that whilst there is considerable, albeit inconsistent, activity already taking place there is a clear need for greater support and guidance from central, regional and local government.

Key Findings

Findings are based on responses from twenty-four local authorities (a 75% response rate) and six out of the seven Regional Transport Partnerships (a 86% response rate).

1. **Smarter Choices are popular at both regional and local level, however levels of activity vary amongst local authorities.**

- All local authorities that responded to the survey are currently active in at least two Smarter Choices activities out of the 8 measures surveyed.
- On average, the mean number of measures in place, facilitated or being promoted by respondents is 4.6 - however the number varies significantly between respondents, from two to seven measures.

2. **Measures with a ready framework for implementation (car sharing) or which are supported through central government (workplace and school travel plans) are most popular.**

- Nine local authorities (38%) stated that they have an operational travel plan, with a further 9 stating that they were awaiting approval of a recently developed plan, or were in the process of developing one.
- 96% of respondent promote or plan to promote car sharing.
- 61% of Scottish schools are involved in school travel planning at some level.

3. **There is no significant difference between rural and urban local authorities.**

- Urban authorities are averaging almost five (4.92) Smarter Choices measures, with mixed urban/rural authorities at four and a half (4.5), and rural authorities averaging four (4) measures per authority.

³ <<http://www.dft.gov.uk/press/speechesstatements/statements/wmssustravelcity>>

Summary of Recommendations

As a result of the study, the Transform Scotland Trust recommends that government as well as other key delivery stakeholders take forward a national programme of activity on Smarter Choices (see Chapter 5 for the full set of recommendations):

1. ***A national Smarter Choices programme***

- 1.1 The Scottish Government to put in place **funding for a national Smarter Choices programme** as part of its next Spending Review.
- 1.2 The Scottish Government should carry out **research into the wider economic benefits of investment in Smarter Choices** – including monetised health benefits.
- 1.3 **Local authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships should report annually** on delivery of Smarter Choices in their areas, as part of their wider reporting duties.

2. ***Car clubs***

- 2.1 Government (LAs, RTPs and/or the Scottish Government) should commission a **review of possible support strategies that would encourage the development of car clubs** to serve communities throughout Scotland.

3. ***Conferencing***

- 3.1 Local authorities (and/or RTPs) should increase access for small businesses and voluntary organisations to affordable conferencing facilities through **creation of local ICT hubs**.

4. ***School travel plans***

- 4.1 We recommend that **School Travel Coordinator posts be a mandatory requirement of Local Authorities**; that Local Authorities should provide **adequate budgets for school travel planning**; and that the Scottish Government (as part of recommendation 1.1 above), consider reinstating **ringfenced funding for the School Travel Coordinator programme**.

5. ***Public transport information***

- 5.1 The Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers in Scotland (ATCO Scotland) should take forward **work on improving common standards for public transport information** across Scotland.

6. ***Further research***

- 6.1 The Scottish Government should commission the Transform Scotland Trust to **carry out an update to this study on a regular basis** (every 2-3 years).

.....

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background

This study comprises of three parts: a brief overview of the background to the problems of traffic congestion and pollution, and review of literature relating to Smarter Choices; a survey of all local authorities in Scotland; and a questionnaire of Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs) and review of their current Strategies.

The findings of the research are analysed and conclusions and recommendations drawn from them. Of the 10 measures identified as Smarter Choices by the UK Department for Transport (DfT), a survey concerning the following eight was designed: workplace travel plans; personalised travel planning; public transport information; travel awareness campaigns; car clubs; car sharing; teleworking; and teleconferencing.

On the advice of the Scottish Government, school travel planning was not reviewed by the survey: instead, Sustrans provided information on the extent and success of implementation of this measure. Home shopping was only included as part of a question relating to other measures being promoted or facilitated by the local authority. This was because it was felt that local authorities have a less practical role to play in the promotion of this measure than other Smarter Choices.

Problems of climate change & congestion

The Stern Review described climate change as the greatest and wide-ranging market failure ever seen (HM Treasury 2006), and transport is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions. The Commission for Integrated Transport (CfIT), in its September 2007 report *Transport and Climate Change*, stated that “using the most appropriate basis of measurement, transport is now the largest single source of emissions in the UK, within which road transport is the main component and of which cars are the most significant element.” (CfIT 2007) In the UK, the transport sector accounts for approximately 28% of all CO₂ emissions (Defra 2006), and most of this comes from road users (Steer Davies Gleave 2006). Worldwide, emissions from transport are growing faster than those in any other energy-consuming sector (IPCC 2007).

Recent estimates of the costs of congestion to the UK economy vary considerably – depending upon the method used – from £7 billion per year to £24 billion per year (Grant-Muller & Laird 2007). There is some criticism about the usefulness of such calculations (Grant-Muller & Laird 2007); however, the consequences of congestion – wasted time, effects on health and stress, localised air and noise pollution, and social implications (DfT 2005) – present a tremendous cost to individuals and society.

Part of the cause of growing congestion and transport emissions is the increasing dependency of individuals on their cars. Over two-thirds of Scottish households have one or more car, and cars and vans are the most common means of transport to and from work (Scottish Executive 2005).

Distances as short as one kilometre are regularly travelled by car (Scottish Executive 2005). Nearly a quarter of car journeys are less than 2 miles and over a half of all journeys made by car are less than 5 miles (CfIT 2007). Research on the impact of Smarter Choices by Sustrans/Socialdata found significant modal shift is possible: 50% of all local car trips in non-metropolitan towns could be replaced by walking, cycling and/or public transport (CfIT 2007).

In its report, the CfIT recommended ‘a mix of practical, cost-effective measures to reduce transport’s impact on the environment. It stated that the combined effect of CfIT’s recommendations would reduce carbon emissions from UK transport by 2020 by 71% over current plans – seeing transport emissions fall against 1990 levels rather than stabilise at 2005 levels.

Within this package, the report states the need for the more intensive promotion of Smarter Choices to encourage use of public transport, walking and cycling, supported by improvements in the carbon performance of public transport.

Delivering behavioural change

As long ago as 1963, the Buchanan Report pointed to “the provision of good, cheap public transport, coupled with the public’s understanding of the position” as “the most potent factor in maintaining a ‘ceiling’ on private car traffic in busy areas”, and the likelihood that to achieve the control of traffic “...will demand an almost heroic act of self discipline from the public”, whose understanding of the situation is “essential” (Buchanan *et al.* 1963). Recent years have seen attention focus on a number of measures which can help the public to understand the causes and consequences of congestion and pollution, and assist individuals to choose to be “heroic”.

Smarter Choices

Smarter Choices are an inexpensive yet effective set of measures enabling individuals to choose more sustainable forms of travel.

Smarter Choices⁴ is the term used to cover a range of techniques and measures designed to help people become less car dependent, and encourage them to use more sustainable modes of transport. Interventions promoted under Smarter Choices include:

- Workplace travel plans
- School travel plans
- Personalised travel plans
- Public transport information
- Travel awareness campaigns
- Car clubs
- Car sharing schemes
- Teleworking
- Teleconferencing
- Home shopping.

A number of studies, including those commissioned by government, have demonstrated Smarter Choices’ effectiveness in reducing carbon emissions whilst increasing productivity. Their relatively low cost of implementation are combined with a high rate of return, meaning that Smarter Choices provide an economically viable solution to an increasing reliance on carbon intensive modes of transport. The benefits provided through Smarter Choices measures are further ‘locked in’ when used in conjunction with traffic management measures.

⁴ The DfT uses the term ‘Smarter Choices’, the Scottish Government has used the term ‘SMART Measures’; and older research has referred to ‘soft factors’ or ‘soft measures’. Research on ‘soft’ factors generally includes measures additional to these 10, such as parking restrictions. However, as parking restrictions are effectively not a ‘choice’ for individuals, they are not included under the label Smarter Choices. This research is specifically focussed on measures that allow individuals to *choose* to change their travel behaviour, therefore this report will use the term ‘Smarter Choices’ throughout.

Smarter Choices have only recently surfaced as a mainstream transport policy (Cairns *et al.* 2004), though several of the individual measures have been implemented and used – though not necessarily to reduce travel – for much longer. The idea is to use a psychological approach to modal shift by informing people about travel options, marketing sustainable transport effectively, targeting new services to specific markets, and providing options that reduce the necessity of travel (Transform Scotland 2007a). Smarter Choices are designed to help people change their behaviour and choose more environmentally-friendly means of transport, thus reducing congestion without the aid of large scale infrastructure (Transform Scotland 2007a). The measures are largely uncontroversial, and reasonably popular (Cairns *et al.* 2004).

Smarter Choices – Changing the Way We Travel, commissioned by the DfT, draws on these and other earlier studies; case studies of specific initiatives; and the experiences of public, voluntary and commercial stakeholders (Cairns *et al.* 2004). It assessed the potential costs and impacts of implementing Smarter Choices in the UK. Its primary conclusion is that when implemented alongside measures to constrain induced traffic, Smarter Choices provide an efficient and effective means of increasing modal shift, and as such they “merit serious consideration for an expanded role in local and national transport strategy” (Cairns *et al.* 2004).

Two ten-year policy scenarios were envisaged and their effects on traffic levels identified. In the ‘high intensity’ scenario, activity is significantly expanded to the widespread application of good practice, keeping within the restraints of resources and funding, and the practicality and effectiveness of particular measures in different locations.

The ‘low intensity’ scenario was activity continued at present levels both nationally and locally. This ‘low intensity’ scenario could see a 2-3% reduction in traffic nationwide and 5% reduction of peak traffic in urban areas (Cairns *et al.* 2004).⁵ However, the report finds that the ‘high intensity’ scenario could achieve:

- A reduction in peak period urban traffic of about 21% (off-peak 13%);
- A reduction of peak period non-urban traffic of about 14% (off-peak 7%);
- A nationwide reduction in all traffic of about 11% (Cairns *et al.* 2004).

Both scenarios would require back up in the form of ‘hard’ measures such as road capacity re-allocation, pedestrianisation and parking control (Cairns *et al.* 2004).

The report also concluded that Smarter Choices offer good value for money: the cost of reducing traffic by Smarter Choices is estimated to be an average of 1.5 pence per vehicle kilometre (vkm). Official estimates put the value of decreased congestion at 15 pence per vkm (Cairns *et al.* 2004). Therefore, each £1 spent on Smarter Choices could result in £10 worth of benefits in reduced congestion, and even more in heavily congested areas (Cairns *et al.* 2004); that is, a Benefit-Cost Ratio of 10:1.

Extrapolating these figures to the Scottish context, an intensive programme of Smarter Choices which led to an 11% reduction in traffic levels would be expected to cost £72.6m and deliver a tenfold benefit in terms of congestion relief.⁶ While Cairns *et al.* argue that the methodology they use is robust, these calculations are necessarily approximate and we make it a recommendation of this report that further research is carried out to quantify the costs and benefits of the implementation of an intensive Smarter

⁵ It should be noted that a subsequent analysis was carried out by the DfT for the Climate Change Programme (CCP) (subsequently published in Defra, 2007) to examine carbon savings and cost-effectiveness of both the ‘low intensity’ and ‘high intensity’ models. According to the CfIT, the analysis for the CCP was conservative when compared to the Cairns *et al.* research. Unlike Cairns *et al.* which concluded that Smarter Choices could potentially achieve a 11% reduction in national road traffic/15% in car traffic in a supportive policy environment after 10 years of intensive application, the CCP appraisal assumes only 5.3% reduction by 2020 (after 14% of implementation).

⁶ The total volume of traffic on Scotland's roads in 2007 was 44 billion vkm (Scottish Transport Statistics (2008), p.17). Assuming that a ‘high intensity’ Smarter Choices programme would deliver 11% nationwide traffic reduction (Cairns *et al.* (2004), p.356), and the approximate average cost of Smarter Choices per vkm saved is £0.015 (ibid, p.358), then the total cost of Smarter Choices interventions to deliver 11% traffic reduction would be calculated as 4,840,000,000 * £0.015 = £72,600,000.

Choices programme. As pointed out in an earlier Transform Scotland Trust report,⁷ Cairns *et al.* look only at the congestion relief benefits of Smarter Choices; a more thorough appraisal of the benefits would also consider, *inter alia*, the health-related economic benefits.

A UK perspective: Smarter Choices south of the border

The DfT subsequently produced national guidance and carried out “substantial engagement” with local authorities in England to help them in developing their Local Transport Plans (LTPs⁸) (ORU 2007a). The DfT aimed to assist local authorities in their understanding of how Smarter Choices could help meet their local transport aims, so that these measures would be introduced as “an integral part of their transport strategies” (ORU 2007a).

The success of this engagement was assessed in a report prepared for the DfT by the Operational Research Unit (ORU) which reviewed LTPs for the extent to which Smarter Choices are “embedded” within them (ORU 2007a). The review found that 80% of LTPs made a “reasonable or significant reference” to Smarter Choices as a whole (ORU 2007a). However, the extent to which individual Smarter Choices measures were embedded varied considerably: an impressive 69.5% of LTPs made “reasonable or significant reference” to school travel plans, but only 7.3% to teleconferencing (ORU 2007a).

Overall, 26.8% of local authorities were deemed to be implementing a “wide range” of measures, recognising that “traditional ‘hard’ measures alone ... are unlikely to produce the local transport outcomes that residents and the country want” (ORU 2007a). Some local authorities however, “lack[ed] real conviction” in their references to Smarter Choices.

The review concluded that there was no discernible pattern in the way Smarter Choices were implemented across the country: this was interpreted as indicative that the move to implement Smarter Choices does not stem from specific local conditions such as traffic levels, or local geography, instead being influenced largely by the “opinions of LA management” (ORU 2007a). Most local authorities appeared to demonstrate “a lack of evidence-based decision making” (ORU 2007a). However, authorities implementing Smarter Choices to a higher degree were generally shown to be utilising funding most effectively (ORU 2007a).

The ORU followed up this review with several in-depth case studies of local authorities in order to assess how far Smarter Choices were embedded beyond LTPs: in the culture of the organisations themselves, as well as in their overall transport strategies (ORU 2007a). In the case studies, findings did not contradict the LTP review findings to any great degree. The case studies did, however, indicate that there was more being done in terms of workplace travel plans, school travel plans, public transport information and marketing, travel awareness campaigns and car sharing, than was apparent from the review (ORU 2007b). The case studies also provided the ORU with information on the problems and barriers faced by local authorities in terms of Smarter Choices. These included: lack of leadership, attitudes of councillors and senior management, lack of dedicated staff, lack of funding, difficulties with partnership working, difficulty in effective marketing to the public, and a perceived or real lack of evidence of the success of Smarter Choices (ORU 2007b).

The case studies also highlighted several areas where local authorities felt the DfT could assist them with the implementation of Smarter Choices. Several case study authorities wanted clearer guidance from the DfT on national transport policies, many were concerned about inconsistent messages from different government departments, and most felt they needed more detailed evidence about the effectiveness of Smarter Choices in order to be able to better market their benefits to stakeholders. Local authorities also called for the profile of Smarter Choices to be raised, and for dedicated, long-term funding to allow them to make long-term plans (ORU 2007b).

⁷ Transform Scotland Trust (2008) *Towards a Healthier Economy*. See p.7.

⁸ English local authorities prepare Local Transport Plans (LTPs) whilst Scottish local authorities prepare Local Transport Strategies (LTSs).

The DfT's 5-year *Sustainable Travel Demonstration Towns* project¹⁰ was set up to demonstrate the effect a sustained package of Smarter Choices measures can have when coupled with infrastructure investment. Darlington, Peterborough and Worcester were selected from more than 50 local authorities in England who expressed an interest in becoming 'showcase' demonstration towns. The three towns are sharing in £10m of revenue funding over a 5-year period. Initial results have been encouraging, with increases in walking rates of up to 14%, increases in cycling up to 113%, bus use increases by up to 35%, and car use decreasing by up to 9%.¹¹

The DfT has subsequently announced (May 2009) that it intends to extend the scheme to large urban areas, through the creation of a Sustainable Travel City demonstration project.¹² The DfT has announced that it intends to spend £29m on this project over a three-year period.

Smarter Choices in Scotland

School travel plans were the first Smarter Choices measure to receive attention in Scotland, with the Government funding School Travel Coordinators for each local authority from 2003 onwards (Halden 2005). The Government also appointed sustainable transport charity Sustrans Scotland to act as an umbrella group, and provide training and expertise for School Travel Coordinators (Halden 2005). Following the Strategic Spending Review (November 2007), which devolved power in this area to local authorities, School Travel Coordinators have been taken forward by local authorities.

Travel planning was given a further boost when in 2005, the Transport (Scotland) Act, set out legislation to create Regional Transport Partnerships (RTPs). The primary function of the Act was to develop statutory regional transport strategies, ensuring that transport be "provided, developed, improved and operated so as...to be consistent with the principle of sustainable development and to conserve and enhance the environment". The previous Scottish Government administration then provided funding for Travel Plan Coordinators for the RTPs from 2006-2008, and committed to the production of guidance; funding for these posts continues until 2010, and most have now been taken on as part of core staff.

According to the NTS, these measures would ensure that by all Local Authorities and large hospitals and health centres would have "operational" travel plans (Scottish Executive 2006a), and it is understood that all of these bodies now have travel plans in at least basic form. The Scottish Government published its own travel plan in December 2007.¹³ Chapter four of the NTS, entitled 'Reduced Emissions', further committed the Scottish Government to "*actively promote [Smarter Choices] such as travel plans, and high quality travel information to encourage more sustainable travel*" (Scottish Executive 2006a).

These measures and commitments were all initiated by the previous Scottish Government administration. However, the current administration has continued investment in Smarter Choices interventions, including: the re-launch and extension of the *Chooseanotherway.com* travel awareness website in June 2008; continued support to organisations wishing to develop a travel plan; a Ministerial letter to all public sector chief executives calling upon them to produce a travel plan; and the development of a Travel Plan Monitoring Tool.¹⁴

¹⁰ See <<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/demonstrationtowns/sustainabletraveldemonstrati5772>>.

¹¹ Socialdata / Sustrans evaluation of sustainable travel towns 2004-2008.

¹² See <<http://www.dft.gov.uk/press/speechesstatements/statements/wmssustravelcity>>.

¹³ See <<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/12/06160535/0>>.

¹⁴ It is expected that this tool will be launched later this year and will help organisations develop, monitor and report on outputs as well as outcomes of its travel plan.

Smarter Choices, Smarter Places

The Scottish Government has now put in place its sustainable travel town programme *Smarter Choices, Smarter Places* (SCSP) as a partnership project with COSLA. The SCSP programme follows a commitment made by the previous administration in the NTS.¹⁵

The programme is designed to reduce car use, increase active travel and public transport use, and tackle transport emissions and health problems caused by lack of regular exercise. It is intended that this be accomplished by a combination of infrastructure improvements and public behaviour change campaigns in each of the project communities. A wide range of interventions will be tried, including personal travel planning in local households, workplaces and schools, walking and cycling promotion, bus try-outs and active travel prescriptions through GPs and health centres.

The SCSP project communities are Kirkwall, Glasgow East End, central Dundee, Stenhousemuir/Larbert, Kirkintilloch/Lenzie, Barrhead and Dumfries, ranging in size from 10,000 to 37,000 residents. Each project is developing its own brand and identity, some linked to existing campaigns such as 'Better Barrhead', and others stressing health or other benefits, such as 'Travel Active' in Dundee, 'Take The Right Route' in Larbert/Stenhousemuir and 'Healthy Habits' in Kirkintilloch/Lenzie.

The total cost of the programme over its three years (2009-2012) is £15m: £10m from Scottish Government plus £5m match funding from the participating local authorities and other local funders.

Across the seven communities, infrastructure improvements (cycle/walking paths, public realm work and public transport enhancements) were the main focus in the first eight months following the announcement in August 2008. The main behaviour change measures started in May 2009 following completion of a baseline profile of local travel behaviours and attitudes to change.

As part of the SCSP programme, a centrally managed monitoring and evaluation study is being carried out by an Aberdeen University-led consortium across the seven communities involved in the programme. The purpose of the study is to assess and analyse the impacts of the SCSP initiatives within and across each community to ascertain whether the objectives of the SCSP programme have been met.

A key question that the final evaluation will aim to address is 'what next for SCSP, or sustainable transport initiatives more generally, in Scotland?' The evaluation will hopefully have been able to ascertain what impacts certain types of initiatives have had, how the impacts have differed in various parts of Scotland, and what the reasons have been for how successful it has been in changing active travel behaviours.

Given the range of initiatives being evaluated, it should also have built up a keen understanding of where to strike the balance between combinations of hard/infrastructure, soft/marketing and complementary/lifestyle measures.

One end result will be an informed set of recommendations that can be used to suggest what types of initiatives tend to work best in certain types of areas, and whether or not it would be desirable to roll them out in other parts of Scotland.

The SCSP baseline survey will incorporate input from:

- Existing national data on travel and health;
- Qualitative research (focus groups and in-depth interviews in each project area)

¹⁵ "161. To demonstrate our commitment to SMART measures, we intend to investigate a further integrated package of measures. These could include:

- Supporting travel awareness and marketing campaigns at a local level to promote SMART measures on all journeys, focusing especially on the commute to work, where currently two thirds of commuters travel by car, and other journeys under 5 miles.
- Funding, with LAs, RTPs and other key stakeholders, sustainable travel demonstration towns and villages across Scotland to reduce car use and promote cycling, walking, home zones, tele-working and pedestrianisation to test different approaches and share best practice." (NTS, p. 49)

- Quantitative research (12,000 door-to-door surveys including travel diary and 4000 telephone surveys to establish attitudes to a wider range of variables).
- Local data from traffic counters and scheme implementation data.

Telephone surveys and local data will be collected in 2010 and 2011, with final surveys including door-to-door and telephone surveys carried out in 2012.

Existing appraisals of Smarter Choices in Scotland

Whilst there has been some work to appraise implementation of Smarter Choices measures in England, there has been no comprehensive appraisal of the take-up of Smarter Choices in Scotland.

The NTS proposed that, prior to committing to an “*exact programme of investment*”, the Government would undertake an appraisal of Smarter Choices in Scotland. Measures to be introduced might include “*supporting travel awareness and marketing campaigns at a local level to promote [Smarter Choices] on all journeys; and funding*” (Scottish Executive 2006a).

To date the only review which has taken place in Scotland is specifically in regard to workplace travel planning in local authorities, RTPs and public bodies (Halcrow 2006). In the absence of such an appraisal of all Smarter Choices measures, and in the face of substantial evidence to support the use of Smarter Choices as a cost-efficient and effective means of encouraging individuals to change their travel behaviour, there is a clear need for an examination of Smarter Choices activity amongst Scottish local government and within local authority areas. This report attempts to fill that gap by putting together a comprehensive picture of Smarter Choices measures being implemented by local authorities, and where the RTPs stand on utilising these measures and techniques across their region and Scotland as a whole.

The study will attempt to identify which measures are being implemented, to what extent, and why. It will also examine barriers to implementation and best practice across Scotland. The study will also explore whether local geography and circumstances have an impact on the extent to which Local Authorities are implementing Smarter Choices, and in particular, whether rural authorities are less active in this area than their urban counterparts.

The findings of this research will be compared and contrasted with the findings of the ORU review of Smarter Choices in England to gauge whether implementation of measures varies between the north and south of the border, and whether the problems experienced by local authorities are similar.

.....

CHAPTER TWO: SURVEY RESULTS

The following two chapters outline the findings of the survey. Chapter 2 examines how many local authorities are implementing or planning to implement Smarter Choices measures. Chapter 3 looks at issues around the implementation of Smarter Choices; it examines what evaluation is being carried out, what problems are being encountered, and respondents' thoughts on what would help them to further implement Smarter Choices.

Findings from follow-up, more qualitative, interviews with respondents are also examined. The report then gives a brief review of responses from RTPs in relation to regional transport strategies and their incorporation of Smarter Choices measures. Additionally, respondents have been classified as urban, rural or mixed urban/rural, based on Scottish Government figures¹⁶ in order to establish whether the implementation of Smarter Choices as a whole, or of individual measures, can be said to vary depending upon the geography of the local authority concerned.

2.1 All Smarter Choices measures

All local authorities that responded to the survey (75%) are currently active in at least two Smarter Choices measures out of the eight on which they were specifically questioned. It must be noted that two of the ten Smarter Choices measures – school travel plans and home shopping – were not included within the survey.¹⁷ On the advice of the Scottish Government, school travel planning was not reviewed by the survey. Instead, Sustrans Scotland provided information on the extent and success of implementation of this measure. Home shopping was only included as part of a question relating to other measures being promoted or facilitated by the local authority. This was because it was felt that local authorities have a less practical role to play in the promotion of this measure than other Smarter Choices.

On average, the mean number of measures in place, facilitated or being promoted by respondents is 4.6, however the number varies significantly between respondents, from two to seven measures. On average, urban authorities are implementing the most measures, at 4.92, with mixed urban/rural authorities close behind at 4.5, and rural authorities trailing by approximately one measure at an average of 4 measures per authority. However, as *Table 1* demonstrates, other than this difference, there is little discernible pattern in the number of measures implemented across local authorities in terms of their urban/rural classification. Indeed, as all local authorities classified as rural responded to the survey, these figures represent an accurate picture across all rural authorities in Scotland.

Table 1: Activity in number of measures by urban/rural classification

	Two measures	Three measures	Four measures	Five measures	Six measures	Seven measures	Total
Urban	1	2	2	3	2	3	13
Mixed	0	2	0	3	1	0	6
Rural	0	2	2	0	1	0	5
Total	1	6	4	6	4	3	24

.....

¹⁶ See Appendix 1 for a full list of local authorities who responded to the survey and RTPs who responded to the questionnaire. See Appendix 2 for a breakdown of all local authorities by the Scottish Government's 6-fold classification and the 3-fold classification designed for this report.

¹⁷ School Travel Planning is not included in these calculations because the measure did not form part of the survey questions (see Chapter 2 for why), and because the figures provided by Sustrans, and recorded in this chapter, were not comparable to those collected by the survey.

2.2 Workplace travel plans

Workplace travel plans (WTPs) are designed to help employees to travel to and from work, and for work purposes, more sustainably – e.g. on foot, by cycling, on public transport or through car sharing. Plans can cover a specific workplace, or site such as a business park, or they can cover all employees of a particular organisation over a number of sites.

Workplace travel plans may typically include:

- Dedicated ‘works buses’
- Personalised journey plans
- Interest-free season ticket loans
- Reduced public transport fares
- Secure cycle parking and shower facilities
- Preferential car parking for car sharers
- Encouragement of teleworking.

Most respondents, 18 of 24, stated that they had a workplace travel plan, were awaiting approval of a recently developed plan, or were in the process of developing one. The five respondents who did not fall into these categories were asked if they intended to develop a workplace travel plan, and if so in what timescale.

Those who chose ‘yes’ but failed to specify a timescale are recorded as intending to develop a plan, while those who state a timescale are recorded as having a plan to do so and considered to be doing more in this respect. All but one intended to develop a workplace travel plan. The sole respondent that stated they had no intention to develop a workplace travel plan noted that they thought the RTP would probably develop one for the local authority.¹⁸

Table 2: Respondents at different stages of implementing a workplace travel plan

WTP in place	WTP awaiting implementation	WTP being developed	Total
9	2	7	18

Table 3: Plans of respondents not currently implementing a workplace travel plan

Plan to develop WTP	Intend to develop WTP	Don't intend to develop WTP	Total
3	2	1*	6

* this respondent noted that they thought the RTP would develop a WTP for the authority.

Several respondents with currently low levels of activity in Smarter Choices, and little in the way of plans to implement them, indicated in their responses that various measures would be, or might be, implemented when their travel plan was in place. This would indicate that perhaps local authorities with a workplace travel plan in place have a higher level of activity in implementing other measures.

¹⁸ The RTP concerned stated in their response to the questionnaire that they will ensure that local authorities in their area have a workplace travel plan in place by April 2008, but that it is the responsibility of the authority concerned to carry out the plan.

However, activity in local authorities which have implemented a workplace travel plan is not appreciably different from those without a plan. On average, respondents with a workplace travel plan have in place 5.2 measures, including their workplace travel plan. Respondents without a currently operating plan have an average of 4.2 measures in place. This indicates that having a workplace travel plan in place does not necessarily lead to the implementation of more Smarter Choices. However, it is clear that some respondents view the workplace travel plan as a channel by which to implement other measures.

Table 4 shows that urban authorities are more likely to have a workplace travel plan in place, or be developing one than mixed or rural authorities. All urban respondents either have a workplace travel plan in place, are awaiting implementation, or plan to have one.

Table 4: Workplace travel plan status by urban/rural classification

	WTP in place	WTP awaiting approval	WTP being developed	Plan to develop WTP	Intend to develop WTP	Don't intend to develop WTP	Total
Urban	7	1	4	1	0	0	13
Mixed	1	1	1	2	1	0	6
Rural	1	0	2	0	1	1	5
<i>Total</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>24</i>

Ten respondents specified one or more employers in their areas had a workplace travel plan.

.....

2.3 Personalised travel planning

The DfT defines Personal Travel Planning (PTP) is “a technique that delivers information, incentives and motivation to individuals to help them voluntarily make sustainable travel choices. It seeks to overcome habitual use of the car, enabling more journeys to be made on foot, by bike, bus, train or in shared cars” (2007).

Personalised travel planning offers advice and information to individuals based on their specific travel requirements. The work is usually done by consultants, e.g. Socialdata, Steer Davis Gleave and Vipre UK currently offer this service – but local authorities can develop an in-house role to operate this measure (Transform Scotland 2007a).

Survey responses show very little in the way of activity in personalised travel planning: only three respondents currently have, or had in the past, used this technique. Moreover, over half of respondents had no intention of offering personalised travel planning, and a further few suggested that they might utilise this measure depending on the outcome of their draft or proposed workplace travel plan.

It is clear that there is some confusion in the understanding of exactly what constitutes personalised travel planning. The service described by one respondent who stated they offered personalised travel planning, was closer to a journey planning website than what is specifically identified by the DfT as personalised travel planning.

Table 5: Respondents activity in personalised travel planning

Offer or have offered PTP	Plan to offer PTP	Don't intend to offer PTP	Depends on workplace travel plan	Total
2	5	13	4	24

The two respondents who stated they offer or have offered personalised travel planning were both urban authorities, as are those who planned to utilise the measure.

The most common concern raised regarding personalised travel planning was cost-effectiveness. Many authorities stated that they thought this measure was too resource intensive, and questioned whether the costs outweighed the benefits. While some of these respondents appeared to disregard the measure, others suggested that, were a robust business case made for the effectiveness of the measure, they would certainly consider it.

.....

Smarter Choices in practice:

Sustrans & Socialdata carried out an Individualised Travel Marketing project with 1,500 homes in east Inverness.

Their TravelSmart ITM campaign reported substantial increases in walking (up by 22%), cycling (up by 27%) and use of public transport (up by 11%), while there was a 13% decrease in car trips.

2.4 Public transport information

Almost all local authorities in Scotland provide public transport information in some form or another, but it is the recognition of the potential of high quality, well marketed information to change individuals' travel behaviour that is significant. All but two respondents currently provide public transport information in some form to the public and/or their employees. The two who do not state that it is the responsibility of the RTP to provide and publicise this information. However, other respondents from within these same RTP areas do provide some public transport information.

The survey asked local authorities how they provided public transport information: in what formats and which locations. Responses were categorised as basic, reasonable, or comprehensive. Those authorities categorised as 'basic' provided information only in timetables at bus stops and free timetable leaflets available at various outlets. 'Reasonable' provision constitutes 'basic' information plus information on the local authority's website, with links to online journey planners such as Traveline Scotland. 'Comprehensive' provision is where all these elements are complemented with extra resources, such as interactive journey planning kiosks, or a regular mail-out of information to residents.

Most respondents offered a 'reasonable' provision of information, and, as Table 6 illustrates, there is no discernible relationship between quality of provision and the urban/rural classification of authorities.

Table 6: Quality of public transport information by urban/rural classification

	Urban	Mixed	Rural	Total
Basic	2	1	0	3
Reasonable	7	4	4	15
Comprehensive	2	1	1	4
Total	11	6	5	22

Most authorities recognised the need to improve their provision of information, as demonstrated by Tables 7 & 8. There is very little discernible pattern between urban and rural local authorities other than rural local authorities stating that they are less likely to have plans to improve their provision than their urban or mixed counterparts.

Table 7: Plans to improve public transport information by current level of provision

	Plan to improve	Intend to improve	Don't plan to improve	Total
Basic	2	0	1	3
Reasonable	10	3	2	15
Comprehensive	2	1	1	4
Total	14	4	4	22

Smarter Choices in practice:

Renfrewshire Council has developed 'Workplace Journey Planners' specifically aimed at assisting unemployed people to access employment opportunities through Jobcentre Plus, which would have otherwise been perceived as inaccessible. Workplace Journey Planners provide clear, straightforward public transport information tailored to an individual's workplace and shift patterns.

Table 8: Plans to improve public transport information by urban/rural classification

	Plan to improve	Intend to improve	Don't plan to improve	Total
Urban	9	0	2	11
Mixed	4	0	2	6
Rural	1	4	0	5
Total	14	4	4	22

The scale of plans for improvement of public transport information also varied, however, 5 respondents from within three different RTP areas mentioned that they were currently consulting on or developing a bus information strategy.

.....

2.5 Travel awareness campaigns

Travel awareness campaigns can be aimed at the general public, designed to target a particular group, or specifically directed towards an organisation's employees. They aim to help their audience understand the problems that traffic growth causes, and look toward their own behaviour as being part of the solution.

66% of respondents (16) have run a travel awareness campaign in the past; several of these specified that they annually took part in national initiatives such as Bike Week and European Mobility Week. Over four-fifths of those who had run a campaign intended to do so again. Tables 9 & 10 demonstrate that there is little difference between urban and mixed authorities in terms of travel awareness campaigns, but proportionally fewer rural authorities have run a campaign, or plan to run in the future.

Table 9: Travel awareness campaigns by urban/rural classification

	Have run a travel awareness campaign	Have not run a travel awareness campaign	Total
Urban	10	3	13
Mixed	4	2	6
Rural	2	3	5
Total	16	8	24

Table 10: Plans to run a travel awareness campaign for the first time by urban/rural classification

	Plan to run a travel awareness campaign	Don't plan to run a travel awareness campaign	Depends on workplace travel plan	Total
Urban	3	0	0	3
Mixed	1	0	1	2
Rural	1	1	1	3
Total	5	1	2	8

.....

Smarter Choices in practice:

Glasgow City Council is one of a number of Scottish cities who take part in the annual European Mobility Week, and has twice won the award of 'Best UK participant'. In order to qualify for participation in European Mobility Week, local authorities must hold a week of travel awareness activities, implement at least one permanent measure contributing to modal shift and close one or more streets or town areas to cars for a whole day.

2.6 Car clubs

Car clubs provide individuals with convenient access to a car without having to own one. Car clubs can also be effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Research by TRL¹⁹ has reported:

- **A reduction in cars:** Each car club vehicle replaced 23 cars on average. Scaled up, this suggested that, by December 2008, over 40,000 vehicles had been taken off UK roads.
- **Fewer car journeys:** Members are considerably less likely to make journeys by car than non-members, opting instead to walk, cycle or use public transport.
- **Lower emissions:** The average car club vehicle is around 35% more efficient than the average private vehicle.

Smarter Choices in practice:

The City of Edinburgh Council supports the City Car Club in a number of ways, including block booking cars as an alternative to leasing cars for staff (Transform Scotland 2007a). The Council's response to the survey stated that there was "very high uptake" of this service amongst staff.

There is currently only one car club in Scotland: Edinburgh's *City Car Club*, which has reduced the annual car mileage of members by an average of 3,600 km per member (Transform Scotland 2007a).²⁰ Local authorities can help car clubs to establish by:

- Providing start-up grants
- Designating on-street parking bays for car club vehicles
- Block-booking club vehicles as a car pool for staff members.

Two respondents stated that they promoted or facilitated car clubs, indicating their commitment to the above measures. However, no businesses have yet come forward with a proposal to establish a car club in their areas. Both of these respondents are urban.

Approximately 70% of the remaining respondents did not plan to do anything to help facilitate or promote car clubs in their area. Although several mixed and rural respondents stated that car clubs were not a practical measure for a rural or dispersed area such as their own, a higher proportion of rural authorities plan to facilitate and promote car clubs than do mixed or urban.

Table 11: Plans to facilitate car clubs by urban/rural classification

	Plan to facilitate / promote car clubs	Intend to facilitate / promote car clubs	Do not intend to facilitate / promote car clubs	Depends on workplace travel plan	Total
Urban	1	1	7	1	10
Mixed	0	0	6	0	6
Rural	2	0	2	1	5
Total	3	1	15	2	21

•••••

¹⁹ Carplus news release - <http://carsharing.carplus.org.uk/478/news/decongesting-britain.html>. The full report, *Carplus annual survey of car clubs 2008/09*, is available at <http://www.carplus.org.uk/carplus/pdf/annualsurveyreport0809.pdf>.

²⁰ In March 2009, the Transform Scotland Trust held a conference to celebrate the tenth anniversary with a conference held at Edinburgh's City Chambers. The findings of the conference are available: <http://www.ratransport.co.uk/postcarclubconf.html>.

2.7 Car sharing

Car sharing is best targeted at individuals commuting daily by employers who can either buy car sharing software or join an internet based group such as Liftshare to allow employees to ‘match’ journeys with each other. Employers can also provide incentives such as preferential parking schemes for car sharers (Transform Scotland 2007a).

Over half of respondents currently facilitate and promote car sharing to their employees, and most of these do so also to the public. Of those who do not currently facilitate or promote car sharing, all but one plan to. As Tables 12 & 13 demonstrate, although all but one rural local authority does not currently facilitate car sharing, all but one plan to facilitate car sharing.

Table 12: Car sharing by urban/rural classification

	Promote car sharing	Don't promote car sharing	Total
Urban	9	4	13
Mixed	5	1	6
Rural	1	4	5
Total	15	9	24

Table 13: Plans for car sharing by urban/rural classification

	Plan to promote car sharing	Don't plan to promote car sharing	Total
Urban	4	0	4
Mixed	1	0	1
Rural	3	1	4
Total	8	1	9

.....

Smarter Choices in practice:

UK average car occupancy is only 1.6, so an increase of 10% - with 1.76 persons per car on average - this would reduce traffic on our roads by 9%.

Since October 2001, liftshare has provided over 1,250 private car-sharing schemes within the UK and over 340,000 members have joined the UK-wide car-sharing network. Members of liftshare are currently taking 40,000 cars off the road every day, sharing an estimated 63 million miles per year.

liftshare are working in Scotland with 5 of the 7 RTPs (Nestrans, SEStran, SPT, SWestrans & Tactran) to encourage local car-sharing.

2.8 Teleworking

Teleworking is working at home, or nearer to home, than an employee's usual workplace some, or all, of the time. Eighteen of the 24 respondents claimed to facilitate teleworking, and of those who do not, 4 plan or intend to. However, it does not appear from the results of the survey that teleworking is actually done to any great extent at any of the respondent local authorities, and it is apparent that some respondents did not understand the term or thought it meant simply working from home. There is also no discernible pattern between facilitating teleworking and the urban/rural classification.

Several respondents highlighted that teleworking was seen as a privilege for staff, and/or something that staff had to prove there was a business case for in order to be allowed to do. Others saw teleworking as an *ad hoc* arrangement whereby an employee could work from home in order to get an important piece of work done away from the distractions of a busy office. Only two respondents could point to any real evaluation being done of teleworking at their authorities, and both indicated that it appeared to work well for those who undertook it. One of these respondents is rural, the other urban. Despite the Scottish Government's claim, this survey demonstrated very little use or enthusiasm for the technique.

Smarter Choices in practice:

Aberdeenshire Council has been piloting innovative 'IT HotStops' in Huntly and Peterhead through the European sustainable transport group SustAccess. These HotStops provide first class information and communications technology, including PCs for hotdesking, videoconferencing facilities and wi-fi access free of charge.

2.9 Teleconferencing

Teleconferencing involves a meeting or training session taking place via video links or webcams, or through a conference telephone call. Teleconferencing facilities are widely available across respondent authorities. Twenty respondents currently have teleconferencing facilities, and a further three plan to introduce them, leaving only one respondent with no activity in this area. Several respondents also planned to extend their facilities or further promote their use in the council, and 15% had only recently installed or improved existing facilities.

Table 14: Plans to extend, improve or introduce teleconferencing facilities by urban rural classification

	Currently facilitate teleconferencing			Don't facilitate teleconferencing		Total
	Plan to improve	Recently improved	Don't plan to improve	Plan to facilitate	Don't plan to facilitate	
Urban	5	1	3	3	1	13
Mixed	3	0	3	0	0	6
Rural	1	2	2	0	0	5
Total	9	3	8	3	1	24

Rural local authorities are notably more active in teleconferencing than their urban counterparts. 60% of the respondents who facilitate teleconferencing have recently improved or plan to improve their facilities. This is supported by respondents' comments on usage of teleconferencing facilities by staff. All five rural local authorities noted regular or extensive use by staff. Only two other respondents could provide any indication of use of facilities by staff, and both stated that it was low.



2.10 School travel plans

School travel planning is arguably the most comprehensively, and certainly the longest, funded and supported of all Smarter Choices measures in Scotland. In early 2003, the then Scottish Government administration announced national funding for School Travel Coordinators, and by 2004 all local authorities had at least one Coordinator in post. The role of Coordinators include:

- Promotion of best practice within schools and with school travel teams (including providing support in their preparation of school travel plans);
- Working across local authority departments to provide facilities, advise on Cycling Walking Safer Streets (CWSS) spending;
- Co-ordinating the work of the travel teams within any cluster of schools and identifying and developing any opportunities for the travel teams to work within existing local initiatives, thereby working with others towards common goals (Halden 2005).

From late in 2003, Sustrans Scotland has provided training and support for the Coordinators. Since November 2007, Sustrans Scotland has received more than £8 million from the Scottish Government to encourage and enable children to travel to school in ways that benefit their health and the environment.

Sustrans' *National Hands-Up Survey Scotland 2008* (May 2009)²¹ reported that 51.8% of Scottish children travel to school by active travel modes – a greater number than those who get to school by car, bus or taxi (47.7%). The number of children cycling (2.8%) or walking (48.3%) to school was greater than Sustrans had expected. It was found that 27.6% of children were driven to school for all or part of their journey (6.1% of this amount took the car for part of the journey and walked the rest) while 18.1% took the bus.

Sustrans published its end-of-year report on its *Tackling the School Run*²² programme at the same time as it published the *Hands-Up Survey*. The *Tackling the School Run* programme operated at 103 schools across Scotland, and Sustrans is funded by the Scottish Government to deliver practical measures, such as cycle paths and cycle storage facilities for schools, as well as education campaigns for school children and their teachers.

The report showed that where money is invested in promoting active travel to school, the number of children travelling to school by cycle or on foot rises sharply. This has a knock-on positive effect on local traffic congestion and air pollution, as well as children's health. As a result of the *Tackling the School Run* programme, it was reported:

- There had been a doubling (on average) of the use of cycling and walking routes around project schools;
- 135,690 more cycling and walking trips to school throughout Scotland;
- 30,929 young people now have access to safer walking and cycling routes to school.

•••••

²¹ Available from <<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/what-we-do/safe-routes-to-schools/316/scotland/320>>.

²² *Ibid.*

2.11 Attitudes of Regional Transport Partnerships

Six of the seven RTPs responded to a brief questionnaire regarding their attitudes to Smarter Choices, and their perceived role regionally and nationally in helping to achieve the sustainable transport aims enshrined in the NTS.

All RTPs responded very positively about Smarter Choices on the whole, though two stated concerns about 'branding'. These comments raise an important point which was also highlighted by several local authorities during the course of follow-up interviews. Many respondents perceive that there have been so many different sustainable transport or travel behaviour campaigns over the past decade that it is hard to keep up; and there was a loss of credibility regarding the implementation of new 'national' travel awareness campaigns. Here is a summary of the findings:

- Respondent One stated that they are very much "signed up" to Smarter Choices. They see an important role for RTPs in promoting, developing and co-ordinating Smarter Choices on a region-wide basis, and noted the importance of working with other RTPs to achieve mutual aims. However, they noted that specific initiatives to achieve Smarter Choices objectives would rely on the availability of funding.
- Respondent Two was generally supportive of Smarter Choices, particularly the implementation of workplace travel plans across the region. They recognised an urgent need to improve public transport information and promote travel behaviour change through awareness campaigns. However, the RTP could see little benefit in promoting or facilitating car clubs for their particular area, and said that the benefits of teleworking and teleconferencing are 'limited'. The respondent also expressed uncertainty over the use of the term 'Smarter Choices'.
- Respondent Three stated their commitment to travel planning and travel awareness, and the belief that focus should be on the Scottish Government's existing targets of travel plans for all local authorities, hospitals and larger health centres by April 2008. However, this RTP questioned use of the term 'Smarter Choices' and its appropriateness in engaging with key stakeholders and the general public.
- Respondent Four identified the promotion of Smarter Choices and provision of travel planning advice as one of their core activities. They stated that Smarter Choices can contribute to all of their strategic outcomes. They also mention that long-term Scottish Government financing of Travel Plan Officers is essential to the implementation and success of Smarter Choices. They note that Smarter Choices represent excellent value for money, and therefore the Scottish Government should support local authorities in implementing them.
- Respondent Five viewed Smarter Choices as an "established, accepted, and proven component of a balanced approach to strategic transport planning", and see them as an essential tool to lock in the effects of infrastructure development. They see Smarter Choices working most effectively where collaborative partnerships between stakeholders, including RTPs, local authorities, employers, and public transport operators exist. National measures to incentivise modal shift would be welcomed.
- Respondent Six stated that because Smarter Choices are acknowledged across all RTPs this allows the discussion of targets and sharing of best practice. Smarter Choices highlight specific target areas to focus on and therefore move towards meeting RTPs' strategic aims – particularly in travel planning.

Respondents Four and Five appeared to be particularly aware of the effectiveness of Smarter Choices, and keen to take a long term approach to implementation. These RTPs between them cover the most populated areas in Scotland. Support for Smarter Choices at a regional level is therefore apparently well established.



CHAPTER THREE: ISSUES AROUND IMPLEMENTATION

3.1 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation of Smarter Choices measures is important in order to establish what impact they are having on travel by staff, and indeed wider traffic levels. Monitoring and evaluation can highlight which measures are successful, which are not, and point to ways to make a measure more effective. Local authorities were asked about the success or popularity of each of the eight Smarter Choices measures reviewed, and specifically for teleworking and teleconferencing, what evaluation was undertaken of these measures.

Of respondents with a workplace travel plan in place, a few who had only recently implemented theirs could not yet point to any signs of success, nor did they indicate how success would be monitored in the future. Respondents who had plans in place for a number of years varied in terms of monitoring and evaluation. Some noted statistics of reduced single car occupancy commutes, whereas most stated that no formal evaluation had been undertaken. Several said that anecdotal evidence suggested the plans had been successful in raising awareness, but as yet had impacted little on behaviour. All three respondents who had run personalised travel planning had monitored and evaluated the success of their programmes.

A third (5) of respondents who had run a travel awareness campaign stated that no evaluation had been undertaken, whilst two respondents stated that they undertook evaluation via a twice yearly staff travel survey. The remaining local authorities (17) responded that they evaluated campaigns on the basis of numbers of people showing up for events, numbers signing up for car sharing, etc. One respondent stated that a 'before and after' survey of schoolchildren taking part in a Safer Routes to School campaign had been utilised to evaluate the success of school travel planning.

Of those respondents who currently promote or facilitate car sharing schemes, just over half evaluated success by numbers signing up for the scheme. The rest, however, were unable to offer any data on how popular car sharing was proving to be.

Of the 18 respondents who facilitated teleworking, 11 did not undertake any evaluation of the scheme, or were unaware if any evaluation was undertaken. Fourteen were unable to say how successful the measure was or what employee uptake was like. Likewise, with teleconferencing, 15 out of the 20 respondents with teleconferencing facilities were unable to say whether any evaluation took place, or noted that none took place.

Overall, 18 respondents appeared to undertake little or no formal evaluation. Two respondents noted that they undertook a staff travel survey twice annually and that this formed a substantial part of their evaluation. The remaining four noted that they undertook some evaluation, but not across all measures.

However, it is important to note that staff travel surveys were being undertaken at the time of this research by several respondents to develop their workplace travel plans. It is possible that these will continue to be carried out on a regular basis.

Sustrans currently support the School Travel Coordinator Initiative. In his 2005 review, Halden described Sustrans' role as "essential" in supporting the delivery of the initiative. Sustrans acts as an umbrella group for the initiative, organising two regional²³ meetings and one national conference or training event each year. These meetings, and Sustrans acting as a national forum, enables good communications and best practice sharing between School Travel Coordinators.

²³ Regional groupings are established roughly along the lines of the RTPs, with meetings based in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Perthshire and the Highlands.

Sustrans provides a UK-wide service enabling information provision and dissemination of best practice. In addition, a School Travel Working Group was set up by Sustrans in Scotland, including government representatives from health, education and transport departments, plus School Travel Coordinators from each RTP region. The Working Group took a leading role in pushing forward the publication of the *National Hands-Up Survey* published in May 2009.²⁴

3.2 Barriers to implementation

Local authorities were asked what would help them implement measures and what, if any, problems they had encountered in attempting to implement measures, regardless of their current activity in a particular measure.

Attitudes to Smarter Choices

Several respondents comment that general problems such as ingrained car culture among staff, and lack of senior management buy-in to Smarter Choices make it difficult for them to implement various measures.

Suggested solutions include greater information and best practice sharing, the need for a national and/or regional approach to emphasise the importance of Smarter Choices measures and a demonstration that the political will is there to implement them.

All rural and mixed urban/rural authorities were asked a number of questions pertaining to the unique experience of rural areas regarding sustainable transport generally, and Smarter Choices specifically.

All agreed that there was a perceived or real greater need to travel by car in rural areas, and several agreed that there was a tendency on the part of local authorities and the general public to feel that car users in urban areas should be targeted more than rural drivers to change their behaviour.

This was partly due to a perceived or real lack of alternatives, and partly due to a perceived or real lack of evidence of the problems caused by traffic in their area, e.g. congestion and air quality. However, all but one (rural) authority felt that Smarter Choices as a concept was applicable to rural areas, as were most of, if not all, the individual measures. Moreover, the one authority that did not find Smarter Choices on the whole useful, did recognise the need to cut single car use in their area, and currently has a high level of use of teleconferencing facilities.

Some respondents mentioned that the promotion of Smarter Choices was, however, in their experience, directed toward urban areas, and that greater assistance and sharing of information and case studies featuring rural areas would be welcomed.

Priority setting

A number of problems were raised by almost all respondents at some stage of the survey: funding, resources, staff and time (and lack thereof) were highlighted frequently as both a barrier and a solution.

Lack of available funding was a major problem for many respondents across almost all measures. Most saw the solution as additional, dedicated funding from the Scottish Government or other bodies, though some mentioned that prioritisation of Smarter Choices by senior management would see the necessary funding supplied internally. An extension of this barrier is lack of time on the part of the member of staff responsible for implementing various measures. Not all local authorities have a dedicated member of staff to deal with sustainable transport issues, let alone Smarter Choices, and often the role of the Travel Plan Officer is 'tacked on' to an existing role in the transport department.

More funding to employ a dedicated member of staff, or reorganisation and reprioritisation of job roles could help address this. One respondent in particular stated that what would help implement all Smarter

²⁴ See <<http://www.sustrans.org.uk/what-we-do/safe-routes-to-schools/316/scotland/320>>.

Choices was dedicated, long-term funding from the Scottish Government, linked to the achievement of measurable traffic reduction.

All respondents were asked what their reaction would be if the Scottish Government were to 'require' local authorities to implement Smarter Choices as a means of meeting the objectives and targets of certain policies, such as Best Value, or the voluntary Scottish Climate Change Declaration, to which all local authorities are signatories. Responses were mixed, with several local authorities agreeing that direction from the Scottish Government in any form would help to achieve greater senior management buy-in and internal resources directed towards Smarter Choices, though some added that this would be at the expense of another service within the council unless the Government were to provide additional, ringfenced funding.

It was also made clear by many respondents that the approach taken by the Scottish Government, and indeed by the local authority, to promoting Smarter Choices would be vital in achieving senior management buy-in and public interest. While some respondents felt that the issue of climate change was the best approach, others felt that this may turn their audience off. Respondents from authorities with a high level of deprivation noted that highlighting Smarter Choices as a means of achieving social inclusion and improving health was the best way to appeal to both senior management and the general public.

Respondents were then asked in the light of funding issues whether additional, dedicated funding from the Scottish Government to implement Smarter Choices would be welcomed if tied to targets to reduce traffic levels. All respondents agreed that it would, though enthusiasm for such a move varied significantly. Most noted that targets would have to be realistic and achievable, and specific to their own particular circumstances, including car ownership, traffic levels and geography, and not generic across Scotland, in order to achieve any worthwhile outcome.

Some respondents stated that additional, dedicated funding would be the only way to achieve greater emphasis on Smarter Choices, and that any linked targets would be accepted as a means to access the funding. Others were more positive about the use of targets, stating that they were helpful, and necessary to ensure that Smarter Choices were implemented effectively. However, others expressed concern that should targets not be met, funding would be withdrawn leaving the authority in 'limbo' with their plans.

3.3 Individual Smarter Choices measures

A number of respondents raised specific issues relating to individual measures.

Teleworking / Teleconferencing

Teleworking was thought by some respondents to either have a negative impact on the office environment, or cause difficulties in terms of staff 'covering' for one another over lunch break, for example, in smaller offices.

Problems associated with teleconferencing ranged from the practical – equipment in one room used for others purposes also; equipment at council HQ meaning workers at other offices have to travel to use it – to user reactions – many individuals are not confident or comfortable using the technology concerned; the benefit of face-to-face meetings is lost; individuals feel on the 'fringe' of a meeting depending on the layout of equipment.

Several respondents also noted that they were – or thought they might be – held back in utilising teleconferencing because of a lack of corresponding equipment at the 'other end'. Quality of technology was seen as a problem regarding both teleconferencing and teleworking by some respondents, and the lack of high speed broadband (until recently) was also raised as a barrier in some areas. However, one respondent was taking steps to improve connectivity themselves in exploring the use of internet telephony (such as Skype) to help roll out greater teleworking.

Teleworking gave rise to fears over information security and the health and safety implications of working from home.

Car sharing / car clubs

Concerns about liability and tax implications for local authorities were mentioned as barriers to facilitating car clubs and car sharing, while several respondents also mentioned flexi-working policies as working against car sharing.

.....

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSIONS

Smarter Choices are viable measures to reduce congestion and pollution across Scotland. There is considerable, albeit inconsistent, activity already taking place. However, there is a clear need for greater support and guidance from central government and other bodies to ensure a national framework of implementation, monitoring and evaluation is developed.

This study set out to review the implementation of Smarter Choices in Scottish local authorities in order to gain a better understanding of what is needed to employ the various measures to greatest effect. The high response rate (75%) and the overall positive reception of the undertaking of this research indicates that this review was welcomed by local authorities.

4.1 Smarter Choices are popular - although some measures are more popular than others

Overall, the measures which appeared from survey responses to be most confidently approached by local authorities are those which have a national and/or regional focus to them. These are: workplace travel plans and car sharing.

Travel planning is probably the most high profile area of Smarter Choices in Scotland, due to the presence of local authority School Travel Coordinators and the Travel Plan Coordinators employed by the RTPs. The role of RTPs in assisting local authorities to develop their own travel plans, and the high profile emphasis put on this measure by the previous administration appears to be crucial to the level of activity in this area. Indeed, it was through the development of workplace travel plans that the then administration envisaged the introduction of other Smarter Choices taking effect (Scottish Executive 2006c).

All but one respondent currently facilitated, or planned to facilitate, car sharing. This is likely to be due to two factors:

- The availability of a high quality car sharing software and internet package – *liftsharesolutions.com*;
- The promotion and funding of the creation of regional and local groups through this package by some RTPs.

What is apparent is that activity in other measures is not as consistent:

- While most respondents facilitate teleworking, there is little if any promotion of it as an (occasional) alternative to travel – instead, it exists as a statutory right, or even as a staff ‘perk’, and is made little use of.
- Teleconferencing facilities are available in most authorities, but apparently used to capacity in few.
- Public transport information is provided by almost all respondents, and most of these plan to improve it. There is, however, little indication of any attempt to market the information to new audiences to change travel behaviour.
- Personalised travel planning and car clubs are seen by few respondents as viable options on grounds of practicality and resources.
- The respondents who have run travel awareness campaigns have generally joined in nationally organised campaigns such as National Bike Week and European Mobility Week. This evidence supports the calls by some respondents for a national Smarter Choices campaign.

4.2 There is no significant difference between urban and rural authorities

Twenty-four local authorities responded to the survey. These included all the local authorities in Scotland categorised, for the purposes of this study, as rural. Therefore the results are fully representative of the experience of rural authorities, which is one of the main areas the research set out to assess.

Rural authorities raised few distinctive problems or requirements. In terms of the overall implementation of measures, the results demonstrate that rural authorities are, on average, implementing one less measure than their urban, and 0.5 measures less than their mixed urban/rural, counterparts. This might be explained by the fact that all rural authorities responded – perhaps the urban and mixed urban/rural authorities who did not respond to the survey are implementing fewer measures, and had they responded, the average implementation level of the other categories might have been lower. However, a brief search of non-respondents' websites, compared to respondents' websites did not indicate any obvious gulf in terms of implementation of Smarter Choices.

The only rural-specific problems or barriers raised by respondents were in terms of broadband roll-out for teleworking, and small, dispersed populations – making it difficult to facilitate or organise car clubs. However, issues of size, and even dispersal, were also raised by some of the smaller mixed and urban authorities, who felt they could not support a car club on their own, but would need a regional approach.

There is not a great deal of discernible difference in the types of measures currently facilitated by rural authorities compared with either urban or mixed authorities. There is, however, a notable lack of rural authorities who have run a travel awareness campaign – only two out of five had done so, and a further two do not plan to run one in the future. This might be explained both by a perceived lack of alternatives to the car, and, in some areas, a perceived absence of problems of congestion and air pollution – a point which was specifically raised as a barrier to all Smarter Choices by one rural respondent. However, rural authorities compensate for this by their extensive use of teleconferencing facilities compared with their urban and mixed counterparts. Where rural authorities differ, therefore, is in their actual implementation, not in their will to implement.

4.3 Comparison with the review of Smarter Choices in England

The problems and barriers identified in this study do not, on the whole, differ greatly from those identified in the Operational Research Unit's (ORU) review of English local authority Transport Plans (2007a&b).²⁵ However, the activity in Smarter Choices identified in this study does vary in some respects to that identified by the ORU's review, though, as the ORU itself points out, its review of Local Transport Plans does not necessarily give a full picture of implementation.

According to the ORU review, workplace travel plans were one of the most commonly implemented measures, whereas personalised travel planning and car clubs had very few significant references in Local Transport Plans (ORU 2007a). These findings are similar to this study's findings in Scotland.

However, while car sharing is well established, in terms of implementation or plans to implement, in Scotland – in England, less than a third of LTPs made reasonable or significant reference to them.

Teleworking was poorly represented in LTPs, but this is comparable to the actual use of it in Scotland.

However, teleconferencing was shown to have even fewer significant or reasonable references to it in Travel Plans (ORU 2007a). If it is reasonable to compare this study with the ORU's review, it could be concluded from these figures that Smarter Choices are implemented to a greater extent in Scottish local authorities than in English local authorities.

•••••

²⁵ See Chapter One for the problems and barriers detailed by the ORU

CHAPTER FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the study, the Transform Scotland Trust recommends that government as well as other key delivery stakeholders take forward a national programme of activity on Smarter Choices.

1. **A national Smarter Choices programme**

- 1.1 The Scottish Government to put in place **funding for a national Smarter Choices programme** as part of its next Spending Review.²⁶ The programme would be delivered at local and regional levels – making commonplace the implementation of schemes such as workplace travel plans, school travel plans, car clubs, and car sharing. To avoid the problems already being observed as a result of the loss of ringfencing for active travel,²⁷ this funding should appear as a specific budget line in the Spending Review.
- 1.2 The Scottish Government should carry out **research into the wider economic benefits of investment in Smarter Choices** – including monetised health benefits resulting from modal shift to walking and cycling. This research could be conducted as part of the *Smarter Choices, Smarter Places* programme.²⁸
- 1.3 **Local authorities and Regional Transport Partnerships should report annually** on delivery of Smarter Choices in their areas, as part of their wider reporting duties. This would enable public scrutiny of activity and provide an opportunity to evidence benefits derived from sustainable transport policy across all sectors – health, education, development, justice and economic growth.

2. **Car clubs**

- 2.1 Government (LAs, RTPs and/or the Scottish Government) should commission a **review of possible support strategies that would encourage the development of car clubs** to serve communities throughout Scotland (i.e. pools of cars for members to book and use that may be run by commercial operators, independent co-ops and community businesses, and by voluntary organisations).²⁹ Amongst other things, the review would consider the potential for interoperability of car clubs, bike hire and public transport; and consider the opportunity for supporting new co-operatives, new employment and improved social cohesion through the expansion of the sustainable transport sector.

3. **Conferencing**

- 3.1 Local authorities (and/or RTPs) should increase access for small businesses and voluntary organisations to affordable conferencing facilities through **creation of local ICT hubs**.

²⁶ As set out on p.9, and based on the work of Cairns *et al.*, a national Smarter Choices programme for Scotland that could deliver 11% traffic reduction might be expected to cost in the region of £72 million. We understand that further analysis will be carried out as part of the *Smarter Choices, Smarter Places* programme as to the costs and benefits of Smarter Choices interventions, and that the DfT is itself in the process of carrying out further research in this area.

²⁷ See, for example, the annual Spokes survey and analysis of cycle project investment in Scotland. Available at <http://www.spokes.org.uk/index.php?name=News&file=article&sid=161>.

²⁸ As set out on p.9, and based on the work of Cairns *et al.*, a national Smarter Choices programme

²⁹ The Transform Scotland Trust, working with Chas Ball Associates, is in the process of seeking funding for this research to be carried out.

4. **School travel plans**

- 4.1 The most recent evaluation of school travel planning (the 2008 *Hands-Up Survey* collated by Sustrans; see also p.24) reported good progress towards increasing the share of school travel made by the active travel modes, and it is widely accepted that a major part of this success is down to the School Travel Coordinator programme (previously funded by the Scottish Government and now the responsibility of Local Authorities). There is however now concern that the number of School Travel Coordinators, and the funding available to them, may decline due to the loss of ringfencing.³⁰ We recommend that **School Travel Coordinator posts be a mandatory requirement of Local Authorities**; that Local Authorities should provide **adequate budgets for school travel planning**; and that the Scottish Government (as part of recommendation 1.1 above), consider reinstating **ringfenced funding for the School Travel Coordinator programme**.

5. **Public transport information**

- 5.1 The Association of Transport Co-ordinating Officers in Scotland (ATCO Scotland) should take forward **work on improving common standards for public transport information** across Scotland. The work should be carried out with the active cooperation of public transport operators, established national information providers (e.g. Traveline Scotland), and passenger representative groups (e.g. Passenger Focus, Passengers' Views Scotland).

6. **Further research**

- 6.1 The Scottish Government should commission the Transform Scotland Trust to **carry out an update to this study on a regular basis** (every 2-3 years).

.....

³⁰ See Spokes research referred to above.

REFERENCES

Buchanan, Colin, *et al.* (1963) *Traffic in Towns: A study of the long term problems of traffic in urban areas* HMSO, London

Cairns S, Sloman L, Newson C, Anable J, Kirkbride A & Goodwin P (2004) *Smarter Choices – Changing the Way We Travel: the final report of the research project 'The influence of soft factor interventions on travel demand'* Department for Transport (DfT), London <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/smarterchoices/ctwwt/>

Commission for Integrated Transport (2007) *Transport and Climate Change: Advice to Government from the Commission for Integrated Transport (CfT)*, London - <http://www.cfit.gov.uk/docs/2007/climatechange/pdf/2007climatechange.pdf>

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (2007) *Synthesis of Climate Change Policy Appraisals* (Defra), London - <http://www.defra.gov.uk/ENVIRONMENT/climatechange/uk/ukccp/index.htm>

Department for Transport (2005) *Tackling Congestion & Pollution: The Government's First Report* Department for Transport (DfT), London <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/roads/tpm/congestionresearch/tacklingcongestionandpolluti4028>

Department for Transport (2007) *Making personal travel planning work: summary report* Department for Transport (DfT), London - <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/travelplans/ptp/>

Derek Halden Consultancy (2005) *Evaluating the School Travel Co-ordinator Initiative* Scottish Executive Social Research, Edinburgh <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/69582/0018066.pdf>

Grant-Muller, S., & Laird, J., (2007) *Costs Of Congestion: Literature Based Review Of Methodologies And Analytical Approaches* Scottish Executive Social Research, Edinburgh <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/153566/0041321.pdf>

Halcrow Group Ltd. (2006) *The Provision of Travel Plans: Mapping Activity in Scotland* Scottish Executive Social Research, Edinburgh <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/130277/0031213.pdf>

HM Treasury (2006) *The Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change* (TSO), London - http://www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/stern_review_economics_climate_change/stern_review_report.cfm

Operational Research Unit (ORU) (2007a) *Review of the Take-Up of Smarter Choices in Local Transport Plans: Initial Findings from a Review of LTPs* Department for Transport (DfT), London <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/smarterchoices/smarterltps/pdfinitialfindltps>

Operational Research Unit (ORU) (2007b) *Review of the Take-Up of Smarter Choices in Local Transport Plans: Case Study Findings* Department for Transport (DfT), London <http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/smarterchoices/smarterltps/pdfcasestudyfindings>

Scottish Executive (2005) *Household Transport in 2005: some Scottish Household Survey results* Scottish Executive, Edinburgh <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/152805/0041055.pdf>

Scottish Executive (2006a) *Scotland's National Transport Strategy* Scottish Executive, Edinburgh - <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/12/04104414/0>

Scottish Executive (2006b) *Urban Rural Classification 2005-2006* Scottish Executive, Edinburgh - <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/07/31114822/0>

Scottish Executive (2006c) *Changing Travel Behaviour* Scottish Executive News Release, 17th March 2006 <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/Releases/2006/03/17100211>

Steer Davies Gleave (2006) *Driving Up CO2 Emissions from Road Transport: An Analysis of Current Government Projections*, Report for Transport 2000, London http://www.transport2000.org.uk/library/CO2_emissions_report_Final_v3.pdf

Stradling, S.G., (2004) *Changing individual travel behaviour: from policy to perceived behavioural control* Proc. Symposium on Travel Psychology, 3rd International conference in Traffic and Transport Psychology, Nottingham, 5-9 September 2004 <http://www.tri.napier.ac.uk/Research/pubs/stradling/12ICTP04StradlingChangingTravBehav.pdf>

Transform Scotland, (2007a) *Smarter Choices: Changing Travel Behaviour*, Transform Scotland, Edinburgh - http://www.transformscotland.org.uk/info/docs/2007-02-26_Smarter_Choices.pdf

UN-Energy (2007) *Sustainable Bioenergy: A Framework for Decision Makers* United Nations <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a1094e/a1094e00.pdf>

IPCC, (2007) *Transport and its Infrastructure*. In: *Climate change 2007: Mitigation. Contribution of Working group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Metz, B., O. R. Davidson, P. R. Bosch, R. Dave, L. A. Meyer (eds.)], Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Legislation

Transport (Scotland) Act 2005 <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/legislation/scotland/acts2005/20050012.htm>
Part 1: Chapter 1: Sections 1 & 5

Websites

Defra, (2006), Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 'Key Facts about: Climate Change. Carbon dioxide emissions by end user: 1970-2004 United Kingdom' (7th August 2006) <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/statistics/globalatmos/kf/gakf07.htm> (accessed 10th August 2007)

Transform Scotland, (2007b), home page, <http://www.transformscotland.org.uk/> (accessed 22nd August 2007)

.....

APPENDIX 1: METHODOLOGY

Background

This study is a review of Smarter Choices activity in Scotland, commissioned by Transform Scotland, and supported by the Scottish Government.

The study comprises of three steps: a brief overview of the background to the problems of traffic congestion and pollution, and review of literature relating to Smarter Choices; a survey of all local authorities in Scotland; and a questionnaire of RTPs and review of their current Strategies.

The findings of the research are analysed and conclusions and recommendations drawn from them. Of the 10 measures identified as Smarter Choices by the DfT, a survey concerning the following eight was designed: workplace travel plans; personalised travel planning; public transport information; travel awareness campaigns; car clubs; car sharing; teleworking; and teleconferencing.

Scottish Government input

Interest in the findings of this study was indicated by the Scottish Government's Sustainable Transport Team in a meeting during the early stages of this research project. They indicated two areas in which they were particularly interested: the experience of and activity in rural local authorities of Smarter Choices, and whether any 'levers' could be identified which would encourage local authorities to implement Smarter Choices to a greater degree than they are already doing.

These two issues were therefore raised in short follow-up telephone interviews with respondents, which were also used to clarify various points from the returned surveys and fill in as far as possible any blank spaces left in the survey.³¹ Because of the relatively sensitive nature of the latter question, these interviews were only semi-structured, and therefore the information gained from them has been used with caution. The findings of the survey, questionnaire and follow up interviews are reported in the next chapter.

On the advice of the Scottish Government, school travel planning was not reviewed by the survey: instead, Sustrans provided information on the extent and success of implementation of this measure. Home shopping was only included as part of a question relating to other measures being promoted or facilitated by the local authority. This was because it was felt that local authorities have a less practical role to play in the promotion of this measure than other Smarter Choices.

Literature Review

As Smarter Choices are relatively new as a mainstream transport policy in the UK, most of the available literature reviews the potential of these measures; few studies have yet been carried out into their actual implementation. Two studies that have reviewed implementation are: the Operational Research Unit's review of English local authorities Transport Plans and case study authorities (2007a&b); and Halcrow's mapping of travel plan activity in Scotland (2006). These studies used different methodology. Aspects of both have been incorporated and used for this research project.

Review by the Operational Research Unit (ORU)

The ORU conducted a desktop review of English local authorities' Local Transport Plans (LTPs) to obtain an overview of the extent to which Smarter Choices are embedded in the new LTPs, following a concerted effort by the DfT to promote the measures.³² Such a review has limitations, as authorities might not report activity already undertaken in their LTPs, nor would it necessarily be clear where an authority was convinced that Smarter Choices were worth pursuing, or where it was merely paying lip service to the latest DfT sustainable transport policy. Therefore the ORU followed up this review by approaching 10 local

³¹ Follow up interviews were undertaken with all but two respondents, whom it was not possible to make contact with again. Fortunately the surveys completed by both these respondents needed no clarification, therefore all that was missed was responses to questions regarding 'levers' and the experience of rural authorities of Smarter Choices (the respondents concerned are classified as 'rural', and 'mixed urban rural').

³² See Chapter 1.

authorities for a detailed case study involving interviews with transport directors and officials. Authorities were chosen in order to represent a cross section of regions in England, and though in general these case studies backed up the findings of the review,³³ discrepancies were highlighted, demonstrating that it is not possible to assume that case studies can be taken to be representative of other authorities. On the whole this approach has benefits though: it is relatively cheap to do a desktop review such as this, and limiting case studies to 10 is less time consuming than following up every authority in detail. However, it was not possible to do a similar review for this study as Scottish authorities are at different stages of development of their Local Transport Strategies (LTSs): some have recently published a new LTS, and others are working to replace their out of date strategies

The Halcrow Report

The Halcrow Group conducted a review of local authorities, RTPs and public bodies for information about how widely and with what success travel plans were being implemented across Scotland. The main research carried out for this review was a telephone interview with all local authorities and two RTPs, who were contacted initially by telephone to establish: whether they were willing to take part; whom the appropriate officer was; and when a suitable time to conduct the interview was. Questionnaires were also emailed in advance, so that officers had time to prepare answers. All but one local authority agreed to and took part in the telephone survey. The telephone survey threw light on a number of other organisations across Scotland who had developed a travel plan. Four of these organisations were chosen, along with three local authorities and one RTP to focus on for more detailed study. Face-to-face consultations were undertaken with travel plan officers and other relevant staff. A “barriers and solutions” review was then undertaken with stakeholders in order to help inform the conclusions and recommendations of the review.

The case study organisations and authorities were chosen by Halcrow to represent “varying geographic and demographic characteristics” of Scotland (Halcrow 2006). While in-depth interviews obviously can provide consultants with valuable, detailed information, a review of this scale can hardly provide a comprehensive picture of travel planning activity across Scotland. The intention of this study is to do just that, but to provide a comprehensive picture of several Smarter Choices measures, not just one. It was considered that questions on each Smarter Choice should not encompass more than one A4 page in order to keep the survey to a manageable length and so as not to deter respondents before they even began. Therefore, to some extent, this survey was a compromise between detail and breadth of measures covered.

Survey Methods

All local authorities were sent a copy of the survey by email, and all contacts who had not responded by the initial deadline set were telephoned or emailed as a reminder. Only a handful of individuals could not be contacted at this stage. In total 24 contacts responded to the survey, representing 75% of the 32 local authorities: this high response rate may have been due in part to the involvement of both Transform Scotland and the Scottish Government in the research; however, it also points to a high level of awareness of and interest in Smarter Choices in Scottish local authorities.

RTPs were also contacted by telephone, and an appropriate individual at each was asked whether they would be willing to complete a brief questionnaire. All were willing, and were therefore emailed the questionnaire – 6 of the 7 RTPs responded.

This questionnaire was different to the survey sent out to local authorities, and was significantly shorter. The aim of this questionnaire was to establish how the RTPs saw Smarter Choices being implemented and utilised in their regions, and what they saw their role as in establishing or promoting this policy. The information provided was analysed alongside local authority responses from each region in order to see whether approaches and attitudes synchronised or conflicted.

³³ See Chapter 1

Survey Constraints

Ideally this study would have reviewed local authorities and RTPs as well as other public bodies, health facilities and businesses. However, time constraints led to the decision to focus on local authorities with some subsequent research into RTPs.

Local authorities were chosen as they are the biggest employers in Scotland, and, as public authorities, have an impact not only on their employees, but on the public and businesses within their area. Also, as the NTS states, the Scottish Government expects public bodies to lead the way in terms of Smarter Choices. Local authorities were, however, asked whether they knew of any Smarter Choices activity in their area being undertaken by other organisations, and what they were doing to encourage organisations and businesses to implement measures.

Time and resource constraints also led to the decision not to conduct interviews over the phone or in person; instead, local authorities were contacted to establish the appropriate individual to approach, and the individual was asked in advance if they would be willing to respond to the survey. Contact was successfully made with an appropriate individual at all but one local authority.³⁴

However, it is necessary to be aware of a number of factors which may have affected the results of this research. One of the main problems encountered during this study was the variation in detail provided by local authority respondents. This has led to a potentially conservative estimate of Smarter Choices activity in Scotland. A further factor is that the main points of contact at each local authority held posts of varying seniority. It is entirely possible that responses were influenced by the position the individual held.

There were also a number of missed opportunities during this research: it would be useful to know for certain whether the various measures were implemented under the guise of Smarter Choices, or travel behaviour change, or whether they were facilitated for other reasons. It would also have been useful to establish how many local authorities have a dedicated member of staff to implement the various measures, and if not, which staff are responsible for these measures, and to what extent. Nonetheless, it has still been possible to conclude that most local authorities do not have a dedicated member of staff by the fact that the job titles of most respondents suggest otherwise.

.....

³⁴ It was not possible to contact this individual by phone before emailing the survey, so the survey was emailed with an explanatory note. However, this did not affect the result, as this local authority did respond to the survey.

APPENDIX 2: RESPONDENTS

Table 1 shows local authorities who responded to this report's survey.

Table 1: Local Authority Respondents

Local authority	
Aberdeen City	Glasgow City
Aberdeenshire	Highland
Angus	Midlothian
Argyll & Bute	Moray
City of Edinburgh	Orkney Islands
Dumfries & Galloway	Perth & Kinross
Dundee City	Renfrewshire
East Dunbartonshire	Scottish Borders
East Lothian	Shetland Islands
Eilean Siar	South Ayrshire
Falkirk	West Dunbartonshire
Fife	West Lothian

Table 2 shows the RTPs who responded to this report's questionnaire, and the local authorities they cover.

Table 2: RTP respondents

Regional Transport Partnership	Local Authorities who responded to survey	Local Authorities who did not respond to survey
Hitrans	Argyll & Bute, Eilean Siar, Highland, Moray, Orkney Islands	
Nestrans	Aberdeenshire, Aberdeen City	
SEStran	Edinburgh, East Lothian, Falkirk, Fife, Midlothian, Scottish Borders, West Lothian	Clackmannanshire
SPT	East Dunbartonshire, Glasgow City, Renfrewshire, South Ayrshire, West Dunbartonshire	East Ayrshire, East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, North Ayrshire, North Lanarkshire, South Lanarkshire,
SWestrans	Dumfries & Galloway	
Tactran	Angus, Dundee City, Perth & Kinross	Stirling

The remaining RTP is ZetTrans which covers Shetland Islands local authority only. Shetland Islands Council did respond to the survey.

•••••

APPENDIX 3: URBAN/RURAL CLASSIFICATION OF SCOTTISH LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Table 1: Scottish Government 6-fold urban/rural classification by local authority (2006c)

Local Authority	Large Urban Areas	Other Urban Areas	Accessible Small Towns	Remote Small Towns	Accessible Rural	Remote Rural
Aberdeen City	93	0	4.1	0	2.9	0
Aberdeenshire	0	26.8	8.6	11.3	37	16.4
Angus	7.5	53.8	12.1	0	25.9	0.6
Argyll & Bute	0	18	0	29.9	7.9	44.1
Clackmannanshire	0	53.7	31.3	0	15	0
Dumfries & Galloway	0	28.4	15.4	7.2	26.4	22.6
Dundee City	99.5	0	0	0	0.5	0
East Ayrshire	0	36.5	33.3	2.6	21.1	6.5
E. Dunbartonshire	59.1	26.9	7.1	0	6.8	0
East Lothian	24.5	0	33.7	14	15.5	12.3
East Renfrewshire	86.3	0	9.3	0	4.4	0
Edinburgh	95.9	0	2.8	0	1.4	0
Eilean Siar	0	0	0	21.1	0	78.9
Falkirk	0	86	4.6	0	9.4	0
Fife	0	65.7	16.4	0	17.9	0
Glasgow City	99.8	0	0	0	0.2	0
Highland	0	21.2	3.7	24.4	11.3	39.4
Inverclyde	0	87.7	4.8	0	7.6	0
Midlothian	0	66.2	15	0	18.8	0
Moray	0	23.8	18.1	14.4	29.9	13.7
North Ayrshire	0	70.6	17.3	0	7.3	4.8
North Lanarkshire	65.4	16.3	10.9	0	7.4	0
Orkney Islands	0	0	0	32.2	0	67.8
Perth & Kinross	1.2	32.4	9.7	10.8	33.3	12.6
Renfrewshire	75.3	9.8	9.5	0	5.4	0
Scottish Borders	0	26.8	19.9	4.9	37.5	10.8
Shetland Islands	0	0	0	30.6	0	69.4
South Ayrshire	0	68	4.1	6.2	18	3.8
South Lanarkshire	22.2	56.2	9.5	0	11.1	1.1
Stirling	0	52.5	9.2	0	31.4	7
W. Dunbartonshire	49.6	49	0	0	1.4	0
West Lothian	0	70.8	17.6	0	11.6	0

The Scottish Government calculates urban/rural classification for local authorities on a 6-fold and an 8-fold scale (Scottish Executive 2006c). For the purposes of this report it was not possible to find an overall classification for each local authority as urban, rural or mixed urban/rural. Therefore, using the 6-fold urban/rural classification from 2006 figures a basic formula was created by which to classify authorities in three categories:

- Authorities classified as solely rural or urban have 67% or more of one area
- Authorities classified as mixed urban/rural have at least 34% of both categories
- Large Urban Areas, Other Urban Areas, and Accessible Small Towns were classed as urban
- Remote Small Towns, Accessible Rural and Remote Rural were classed as rural

Table 2 demonstrates the classification used for the purposes of this report, for all 32 local authorities, not just respondents.

•••••

Table 2: Three-fold urban/rural classification

Local Authority	Urban/Rural Classification
Aberdeen City	Urban
Aberdeenshire	Mixed urban/rural
Angus	Urban
Argyll & Bute	Rural
Clackmannanshire	Urban
Dumfries & Galloway	Rural
Dundee City	Urban
East Ayrshire	Urban
East Dunbartonshire	Urban
East Lothian	Mixed urban/rural
East Renfrewshire	Urban
Edinburgh	Urban
Eilean Siar	Rural
Falkirk	Urban
Fife	Urban
Glasgow City	Urban
Highland	Rural
Inverclyde	Urban
Midlothian	Urban
Moray	Mixed urban/rural
North Ayrshire	Urban
North Lanarkshire	Urban
Orkney Islands	Rural
Perth & Kinross	Mixed urban/rural
Renfrewshire	Urban
Scottish Borders	Mixed urban/rural
Shetland Islands	Rural
South Ayrshire	Urban
South Lanarkshire	Urban
Stirling	Mixed urban/rural
West Dunbartonshire	Urban
West Lothian	Urban

APPENDIX 4: SURVEY SENT TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES



'Smarter Choices' Survey

This survey aims to gather information on which 'Smarter Choices' are being implemented across Scotland: which of these are successful, which are proving problematic, and why.

Measures generally incorporated under the title of 'Smarter Choices' include:

- Workplace travel plans
- Personalised travel plans
- Public transport information
- Travel awareness campaigns
- Car clubs
- Car sharing schemes
- Teleworking
- Teleconferencing
- Home shopping

School Travel Plans are usually included in this list, but for the purposes of this research will be looked at separately. There may be various 'Smarter Choices' being promoted or facilitated by Local Authorities, which do not appear on this list. If so, please use Q.10 to convey any relevant information regarding their implementation.

Name and job title of main person filling in survey: _____

Local Authority: _____

Phone number: _____

Email: _____

Ideally I would like to follow up this survey with a short phone interview, during the fortnight commencing 6th July. Please provide contact details of who would be willing to be contacted for this purpose:

Name and job title: _____

Phone number: _____

Email: _____

Proposed date/time of follow up phone interview: _____

How many people does this Local Authority employ: _____

Council Officers? _____

Public Sector Employees? _____

How many Council Offices are there in this Local Authority? _____

1

1. WORKPLACE TRAVEL PLANS:

1.1 Has the Council developed a workplace travel plan: _____

1.1.1 for Council Officers? Yes No

1.1.2 for Council employed public sector workers? Yes No

IF YES:

1.2 When were they set up? Past month Past 6 months Past year
 1-2 years ago 2-5 years ago Over 5 years ago

1.3 How many of your employees does it cater for:

1.3.1 Council Officers?

0-5% 5-10% 10-20% 20-30% 30-50% 50%+

1.3.2 Public Sector workers?

0-5% 5-10% 10-20% 20-30% 30-50% 50%+

1.4 If there is a specific section of employees who are not covered by the workplace travel plan, please specify who, and why: _____

1.5 How successful has the workplace travel plan proved to be so far? _____

IF NO:

1.6 Does the Council intend to develop a workplace travel plan? Yes No

1.6.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':

1.7 What would help the Council develop a new or existing workplace travel plan?

1.8 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to develop workplace travel plans: _____

2

2. PERSONALISED TRAVEL PLANS:

2.1 Has this Council run a personalised travel plan programme:

2.1.1 for Council Officers? Yes No

2.1.2 for Council employed public sector workers? Yes No

IF YES:

2.2 When did the programme run? Past month Past 6 months Past year

1-2 years ago 2-5 years ago

Over 5 years ago Still running

2.3 How many employees did it cater for:

2.3.1 Council Officers?

0-5% 5-10% 10-20% 20-30% 30-50% 50%+

2.3.2 Public Sector workers?

0-5% 5-10% 10-20% 20-30% 30-50% 50%+

2.4 How successful has personalised travel planning proved to be so far?

IF NO:

2.5 Does the Council intend to offer personalised travel planning? Yes No

2.5.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':

2.6 What would help the Council run or develop personalised travel planning?

2.7 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to develop workplace travel plans:

3

3. PUBLIC TRANSPORT INFORMATION:

3.1 Does this Council provide public transport information:

3.1.1 for Council Officers? Yes No

3.1.2 for Council employed public sector workers? Yes No

3.1.3 for the general public? Yes No

IF YES:

3.2 In which format(s) is the information provided, and where is it located? _____

3.3 Is the information developed or provided in partnership with local/national transport providers? _____

3.3.1 If so, with whom? _____

3.4 How is the availability of this information marketed or advertised, if at all? _____

3.5 Does the Council have any plans to improve public transport information, and the way it is marketed or advertised? _____

IF NO:

3.6 Does the Council intend to provide public transport information? Yes No

3.6.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':

3.7 What would help the Council provide high quality public transport information?

4

4. TRAVEL AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS:

4.1 Has this Council ever run a travel awareness campaign, encouraging shift to more sustainable modes (i.e. walking, cycling and public transport)? Yes No

IF YES:
4.2 How many has the Council run, and when? _____

4.3 What media did the travel awareness campaign(s) use? _____

4.4 What evaluation was undertaken, and how successful was the campaign?

4.5 Does the Council plan to run another travel awareness campaign? Yes No

IF NO:
4.6 Does the Council intend to run a travel awareness campaign focused on sustainable transport, to encourage modal shift? Yes No
4.6.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':
4.7 What would help the Council to run a travel awareness campaign? _____

4.8 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to run travel awareness campaigns focused on sustainable transport: _____

5

5. CAR CLUBS:

5.1 Does this Council promote or facilitate the setting up of car clubs:

- 5.1.1 to Council Officers? Yes No
- 5.1.2 to Council employed public sector workers? Yes No
- 5.1.3 to the general public? Yes No

IF YES:
5.2 How does the Council promote or facilitate car clubs? _____

5.3 How popular have car clubs proved to be with (please include figures if possible):

- 5.3.1 Council Officers? _____
- 5.3.2 Council employed public sector workers? _____
- 5.3.3 the general public? _____

IF NO:
5.4 Does the Council intend to promote or facilitate car clubs? Yes No
5.4.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':
5.5 What would help the Council to facilitate or promote car clubs? _____

5.6 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to promote or facilitate car clubs: _____

5.7 To the best of your knowledge, are any informal groups within this Local Authority currently running car clubs, if so who? _____

6

6. CAR SHARING SCHEMES:

6.1 Does this Council promote or facilitate the setting up of car sharing schemes:

- 6.1.1 to Council Officers? Yes No
- 6.1.2 to Council employed public sector workers? Yes No
- 6.1.3 to the general public? Yes No

IF YES:

6.2 How does the Council promote or facilitate car sharing schemes? _____

6.3 How popular has car sharing proved to be with (please include figures if possible):

- 6.3.1 Council Officers? _____
- 6.3.2 Council employed public sector workers? _____
- 6.3.3 the general public? _____

IF NO:

6.4 Does the Council intend to promote or facilitate car sharing schemes? Yes No
6.4.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':

6.5 What would help the Council to facilitate or promote car sharing schemes? _____

6.6 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to promote or facilitate car sharing schemes: _____

6.7 To the best of your knowledge, are any informal groups within this Local Authority currently running car sharing schemes, if so who? _____

7. TELEWORKING:

7.1 Does the Council facilitate and promote teleworking where possible/appropriate:

- 7.1.1 for Council Officers? Yes No
- 7.1.2 for Council employed public sector workers? Yes No

IF YES:

7.2 In which working circumstances is teleworking facilitated or promoted? _____

7.3 In these circumstances is teleworking compulsory or optional? _____

7.3.1 If optional, what is employee uptake like (please include figures if possible)? _____

7.3.2 If compulsory, are employees generally positive about teleworking? _____

7.4 What evaluation is undertaken, and how successful is teleworking? _____

IF NO:

7.5 Does the Council intend to facilitate and promote teleworking? Yes No
7.5.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':

7.6 What would help the Council facilitate and promote teleworking? _____

7.7 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to promote or facilitate teleworking: _____

8. TELECONFERENCING:

8.1 Does the Council facilitate and promote teleconferencing where possible/appropriate:

- 8.1.1 for Council Officers? Yes No
- 8.1.2 for Council employed public sector workers? Yes No

IF YES:

8.2 In which working circumstances is teleconferencing facilitated or promoted? _____

8.3 In these circumstances is teleconferencing compulsory or optional? _____

8.3.1 If optional, what is employee uptake like (please include figures if possible)? _____

8.3.2 If compulsory, are employees generally positive about teleconferencing? _____

8.4 What evaluation is undertaken, and how successful is teleconferencing? _____

IF NO:

8.5 Does the Council intend to facilitate and promote teleconferencing? Yes No

8.5.1 If yes, over what timescale? _____

BOTH 'YES' AND 'NO':

8.6 What would help the Council facilitate or promote teleconferencing? _____

8.7 Please detail any problems encountered in attempting to promote or facilitate teleconferencing: _____

9. ENCOURAGING OTHER EMPLOYERS:

9.1 What has been done by this Local Authority to encourage public and private sector employers to promote or facilitate 'Smarter Choices'? _____

9.2 To the best of your knowledge, have any employers in this Local Authority area promoted or facilitated 'Smarter Choices'? Yes No

9.3 Please give any examples: _____

Transform Scotland Trust
5 Rose Street
Edinburgh
EH2 2PR
t: +44 (0)131 243 2690
e: trust@transformscotland.org.uk

Charity No: SCO36706