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# About this guide

This guide helps to interpret the results of a site audit and survey, and then assess what actions may be most relevant to include in a travel plan.

Actions need to be appropriate to the size and context of your organisation. For example, if survey results indicate a ‘high interest’ in riding to work, a site with 30 staff will respond differently to one with 3,000.

You can use the *Travel plan actions template* to identify the most appropriate actions for the level of travel plan being considered by your workplace.

# Overall approach

A travel plan aims to remove workplace barriers to walk, ride a bike, use public transport or carpool to work.

Based on the background analysis, look for opportunities to:

* make it easier for staff to learn about all their transport options and promote available options
* make it timely by giving information when it is most relevant (such as at staff induction)
* make it easier and more attractive by improving bicycle end-of-trip facilities
* make it fair by implementing policies that support travel choice (such as remote work practices or parking management based on need)
* encourage incremental changes, such as using a sustainable travel option one day a week or one day more than currently used.

For **active** and **comprehensive** travel plans, also include actions to make it:

* attractive and social through events, campaigns and programs
* easier by advocating for improvements to the local area and public transport.

# Tips when analysing your results

| Survey questions | Possible interpretation and actions |
| --- | --- |
| Usual travel option (on survey day) | * Car travel will dominate travel options except for central city locations with good public transport, walking and cycling access. * Consider proportion of staff within 5 km to assess potential to increase walking or bike riding. * If some travel options are not usually used or are less than one per cent, it indicates that transport access (such as public transport availability) is the biggest barrier and may be difficult to encourage. |
| Other travel options used | * It is a positive sign if a reasonable proportion of staff (over 15 per cent) regularly use other travel options. This indicates potential to increase how frequently other travel options are used and to encourage other staff to use these options. * Compare results with comments and staff interest in other interventions to identify the best actions to target. For example, if:   + five per cent of people sometimes ride   + there is feedback on wanting to improve end-of-trip facilities   + there is interest in bike riding interventions   this suggests that actions to improve end-of-trip facilities would boost riding.   * Workplace size will be an influence here. It may change the priority of actions or the timeline of implementation due to available budget.  For example, if five per cent of staff out of 3,000 ride more often, that can free up 150 car spaces. In a smaller organisation of 300 staff, this is only 15 car spaces. |
| Travel time | * If travel times by car are short, it is unlikely that promotional campaigns will influence travel choices. This is because it is very convenient and most often much faster than the same trip by public transport (unless in the inner city, with high frequency public transport). * Compare proportion of short travel times against satisfaction with current travel. If people are highly satisfied then passive-level actions may have limited effect. * Short travel times may indicate an opportunity to shift some travel to walking and bike riding. Assess the potential for this against staff interest in these options. * If a large proportion of staff travel long distances, assess the potential to increase remote working or for carpooling (it may be an incentive to save money). Further incentivising carpooling may help, such as by providing priority parking. |
| Satisfaction with current travel | * If most staff (over 50 to 60 per cent) are satisfied or highly satisfied then passive-level actions may have limited effect. * If there are higher levels of dissatisfaction, this may be a motivator to shift travel. Compare with interest in specific interventions to encourage change to help identify potential actions. |
| Arrival and departure times | * What proportion of staff arrive and leave work at the same time each day? If this is high (such as 40 per cent arriving between 7:30 am and 8:30 am, and leaving between 4:30 pm and 5:30 pm), it may enable more people to carpool. Assess interest in carpooling from responses to other questions and comments. * Toolkit resources: *Travel plan resources*, *Carpooling program summary guide* |
| Interventions that would encourage using other travel options | * This is a general indicator of interest in specific actions. However, what someone says they might do does not guarantee they will change their travel if that action is implemented. * Look at the overall ranking of options to inform what is more or less appealing. For example, if most bike riding actions rate very low, it may not be worth making significant investments in bike riding (through events or facilities). * If some options receive very high interest (higher proportions of ‘very likely’), add these actions into the plan but get more input through focus groups or other staff feedback. |
| Other commitments influencing travel choice | * This may indicate restrictions on shifting travel choices if percentage is high. * If percentage is low, it may challenge perceptions that hospital staff have little flexibility. For example, four recent hospital travel surveys identified only 25 per cent of staff had other commitments that influenced their travel choice. |
| Flexibility | * Comparing how people are currently working to their perception about whether their role can be completed remotely helps to assess the overall culture of flexible work. * If fewer people are working remotely than are able to, this may indicate organisational barriers to supporting remote work – which should be investigated. This will inform actions to increase remote working rates. |
| Open comments and feedback | * These are important to uncover general staff sentiment, issues and site-specific recommendations. Comments may reiterate findings from the site audit, which makes the identified actions (such as filling gaps in footpath connections) a higher priority for the travel plan. |
| Demographics | * For very large workplaces, the survey sample may be large enough to look at whether demographic factors influence travel choice. For example, comparing the usual travel option against age or work. |
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