



PROSPECTS – TASK 13

A Report on Policy Measures

Prepared by Bryan Matthews

Version of Report: Final
Date: 1 March 2001

PROJECT FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION UNDER THE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME OF THE 5TH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

Contents

Preface 3

Summary 4

1. INTRODUCTION 5

2. POLICY MEASURES..... 6

3. PACKAGING AND IMPLEMENTATION..... 11

4. PRIORITIES 14

APPENDIX A - INITIAL PAPER 17

APPENDIX B - Supplementary Questions on Packaging and Priorities 21

Preface

PROSPECTS (Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European City Transport Systems) is a project funded under the European Commission's Environment and Sustainable Development Programme. It is designed to provide cities with the guidance they need in order to generate optimal land use and transport strategies to meet the challenge of sustainability in their particular circumstances. The PROSPECTS consortium is led by ITS, University of Leeds and includes the partners TUW (Vienna), TØI (Oslo), KTH (Stockholm), UPM (Madrid) and VTT (Helsinki).

This note contains the report on task 13 of PROSPECTS, for which ITS has had responsibility. It is not a part of the formal deliverables of the project. The report was written by Bryan Matthews and Tony May. All PROSPECTS partners have contributed to the work on the task. Mary Huby has provided secretarial services.

We gratefully acknowledge national financing to ITS' work in PROSPECTS by the UK Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR). We also like to thank representatives of planning authorities, politicians and organisations in the six cities of Edinburgh, Vienna, Oslo, Stockholm, Madrid and Helsinki for their contribution during a series of interviews. The views expressed by the interviewed representatives have however been personal and do not necessarily reflect the standpoints of the cities.

Leeds, February 2001
Institute for Transport Studies

Bryan Matthews
Research Fellow

Summary

The report presents the results of Task 13 - Policy Measures - of the first work package of the project PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European City Transport Systems. The work was conducted in close collaboration with six Core Cities: Edinburgh, Helsinki MA, Madrid, Oslo, Stockholm, and Vienna.

The review has identified 80 policy measures which may play a part in cities' development of sustainable transport and land-use strategies. It has categorised this list of measures under 7 main headings: Land-use measures; Attitudinal and behavioural measures; Provision of infrastructure; Management of infrastructure; Provision of information; Pricing measures; and Compensatory measures. Where relevant, it has sought to identify where policy measures influence car-use, influence public transport, provide for cyclists and pedestrians or provide for freight. In addition, the report identifies the benefits of combining sets of policy measures and different approaches to developing coherent policy combinations. Lastly, the report identifies the core cities' priority policy measures, covering the full range of different possible measures. These priority policy measures include: Development densities; Public awareness campaigns; Flexible working hours; New rail lines; Bus priority; Public transport frequency; Real-time passenger information; Parking charges; Urban road charging; and Public transport fares levels.

1. INTRODUCTION

Aim

The aim of this task was to identify the full range of policy measures which may need to be addressed in developing sustainable strategies. In the course of the work we also sought to clarify the role of ‘policy packaging’ and to highlight the priorities amongst the range of policy measures.

The method

The starting point for this task was a survey of policy measures which had been conducted by the Institute for Transport Studies at Leeds for the UK Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (May and Still, 2000)¹. That survey had been carried out for a different purpose: guidance for a series of multi-modal studies in interurban corridors. However, it provided the most up to date list of potential land use and transport policy measures, and was thus used as a basis for initial approaches to the Core Cities. It identified some 60 policy measures, and categorised them into five groups:

1. land use measures;
2. infrastructure provision;
3. management of the infrastructure;
4. information provision; and
5. pricing.

Based on this earlier work, we prepared an initial paper (see Appendix A) which provided a structured listing of policy instruments available to transport planners for discussion in interviews with city planners in the six core cities. Supplementary sets of questions on packaging and on policy priorities (see Appendix B) were then prepared for discussion in subsequent interviews with the city planners.

About this report

This report provides a distillation of the comments received during the three rounds of interviews with the city contacts. Following this introduction, section two provides a revised listing and categorisation of policy measures with summary comments arising from the interviews. Section three then provides discussion of policy packaging, again with summary comments arising out of the city interviews. Section four then discusses the policy priorities identified by the different cities.

¹ May A D and Still B J (2000) The instruments of transport policy. Working paper 545. Leeds, Institute for Transport Studies.

2. POLICY MEASURES

Introduction

Whilst we began this task with a structured list of 60 policy measures and with a relatively recent review of the performance of these 60 measures, we recognised that the listing was not necessarily exhaustive and did not necessarily reflect the particular attributes of the different core cities and the needs of PROSPECTS. In the interviews we initially sought the planners' views on:

- whether the suggested grouping of policy instruments seemed reasonable
- whether the city contacts had suggestions for improvements to the grouping of policy instruments
- which groups are seen as most important / receive most attention and why?
- whether there are important policy instruments which are not under the control of the city authority?
- which policy instruments are not relevant to the city and why?
- what policy instruments are missing?
- which policy instruments are seen as most important / receive most attention and why?

Overall Structure

In general, the interviewees felt that the overall structuring of policy instruments suggested in the initial paper was fine. However, there were a number of useful points raised which would improve this overall structure.

Firstly, it was felt that it is not helpful to sub-divide provision for the car into 'improved provision for the car' and 'measures to restrain the car'. This sub-division is not made for any other mode and it is not always obvious whether a particular measure will facilitate or restrain car-use; it can depend upon what the objective is and how the measure is implemented. This leads on to a more general point which was made, that sometimes policy instruments can have quite diverse effects. This caused some interviewees to express a degree of unease about grouping policy instruments in any particular way.

An alternative structuring was suggested by interviewees in Oslo. However, they felt that this alternative actually mapped quite closely onto the original structuring suggested in the initial paper.

It was felt that measures which affect public transport vehicles, eg the size and quality of the public transport vehicle fleet, had not been properly included throughout the listing. It was felt that this could be amended by including these measures under the Infrastructure Provision heading.

Land-use

A number of comments were received under this heading. These included suggestions for re-grouping and re-naming of options, as well as comments on priority and ability to influence.

Firstly, it was felt better to re-name 'development corridors' as 'development pattern', the former simply being an example of the latter. Secondly, it was felt important to separate out development mix, densities and pattern from other land-use measures. These are, it was argued, the three fundamental issues and stand out as being different from the other listed options. These could, therefore, exist in their own group or sub-group.

It was felt that certain fiscal related land-use measures had been omitted from the list. The most notable of these was value capture taxes, though there is some overlap between these and developer contributions and commuted payments. It was also felt, by one of the sets of interviewees, that it is important to refer to land-use policy options specifically relating to shopping centres and similar such developments.

Infrastructure Measures

In common with the earlier comment relating to public transport vehicles, it was felt that provision of new bus services should be included under this heading. It has not been included perhaps because it does not require dedicated fixed infrastructure; nevertheless, it is a useful instrument and one which is more likely to be implemented than a number of other instruments listed under this heading.

Information Provision

Whilst it includes provision of information, it was felt that public awareness is more than simply an information measure. It perhaps would fit better under a heading relating to behaviour modification, alongside such measures as company travel plans and flexible working arrangements, if such a grouping was to emerge out of the re-grouping of some of the land-use options. Related to this, it was highlighted that it is important to reflect the linkage between information provision and all other groups of instruments.

Pricing Measures

Two options were felt to be missing from the list under this heading. Firstly, it was felt that the private costs of running a car, including tax, insurance and fuel, might be included here. Whilst it is unlikely that cities will, in general, be able to directly influence these issues, unitary states will be able to and other cities may wish to try to influence debate and policy development in their region or country and, therefore, it was argued that they should be included under this heading. Also, it was highlighted that subsidies to public transport should be included under this heading. However, this is a more difficult issue as the effect of subsidies can be diverse; one of their impacts could be on the price of public transport but it also influences whether a service exists or not and whether new services can be introduced. If there were a grouping of fiscal measures then subsidy would fall easily into it but, whilst there is not, it may be most appropriate to place it within the pricing group.

Revised Structured List

As a result of our consultation with the Core Cities, we were able to expand the list to some 80 types of policy measure which are available to cities. These included measures outside the transport field which might help compensate users for any unfairness in the distribution of travel costs. In response to the comments received, we re-categorised the list into the following 7 categories:

- **land use measures;**
- **attitudinal and behavioural measures;**
- **infrastructure measures;**
- **management of the infrastructure;**
- **information provision;**
- **pricing; and**
- **compensatory measures outside of the transport field.**

Where relevant we list in order, under these headings, measures which are aimed towards influencing car-use; aimed towards influencing public transport use; provide for cyclists and pedestrians; and provide for freight. Land use, attitudinal and behavioural measures and compensatory measures cannot in the main be focused on a particular mode, and are therefore considered together in this section.

Space precludes a detailed description of each, but brief explanations are given for those which might be less clear. May and Still (2000) provide fuller descriptions, and a brief assessment of performance, for those which were on the original list. Deliverable 4, which is scheduled for August 2001, will update this to cover the full range of measures listed.

Land-use

- Development densities, involving an increase in density of development throughout an area to reduce the need to travel;
- Development pattern, including transport corridor-based developments designed to encourage provision and use of public transport;
- Development mix in which homes, jobs and shops are placed close together, thus reducing the need to travel;
- Protection of certain sites from development;
- Parking standards for new development;
- Commuted payments, whereby developers can provide less parking, but pay for public space;
- Developer contributions to the financing of infrastructure;
- Value capture taxes, designed to reflect the windfall benefits to existing developments from improved accessibility; and
- Other land-use taxes, including property taxes.

Attitudinal and behavioural measures

- Public awareness campaigns, designed to encourage individuals to use alternatives which reduce overall travel, and travel by car;
- Flexible working hours;
- Telecommunications as an alternative to travel; and
- Company travel plans, in which firms set out ways in which they can reduce their demands on the transport system.

Infrastructure measures

Measures to influence car use

- New road construction; and
- New off-street parking.

Measures to influence public transport use

- Upgrades to existing fixed infrastructure;
- Reopening closed rail lines;
- New rail stations;
- New rail lines;
- New rail services on existing lines;
- Light rail systems;
- Guided bus systems;
- Park and ride;
- Terminals and interchanges; and
- Enhancement of bus and rail vehicles.

Provision for cyclists and pedestrians

- Cycle routes;
- Pedestrian routes; and
- Pedestrian areas.

Provision for freight

- Lorry parks; and
- Transhipment facilities.

Management of the infrastructure

Measures to influence car use

- Road maintenance;
- Conventional traffic management;
- Conventional speed controls and restrictions;
- Urban traffic control systems;
- Intelligent transport systems, which use new technology to improve the performance of the road network;
- Accident remedial measures;

- Traffic calming measures;
- Physical restrictions;
- Regulatory restrictions;
- Parking controls, including controls on duration, entry times and designated users; and
- Car sharing.

Measures to influence public transport use

- Maintenance of existing fixed infrastructure;
- New bus services;
- Bus priorities;
- High occupancy vehicle lanes;
- Changes in bus and rail frequencies;
- Timetabling strategies, such as regular “clock-face” departure times and simple schedules (eg 10 minute headways);
- Bus service management measures designed to improve reliability; and
- On-bus cameras for traffic regulation enforcement.

Provision for cyclists and pedestrians

- Cycle lanes and priorities;
- Cycle parking provision;
- Pedestrian crossing facilities; and
- Safe routes to school, including innovations such as “walking bus services” in which children walk together.

Provision for freight

- Lorry routes and bans; and
- Lorry parking and loading restrictions.

Information provision

Measures to influence car use

- Conventional direction signing;
- Variable message signs;
- Real-time driver information systems and route guidance; and
- Parking guidance and information systems.

Measures to influence public transport use

- Conventional timetable and other service information;
- Real time passenger information;
- Trip planning systems which provide information on alternatives before the start of the journey; and
- Operation information systems such as bus fleet management.

Provisions for cyclists and pedestrians

- Static direction signs; and
- Tactile footways.

Provision for freight

- Static direction signs; and
- Fleet management systems.

Pricing

Measures to influence car use

- Parking charges;
- Charges for ownership of private parking space;
- Urban road charging, including area licensing and road pricing;
- Vehicle ownership taxes; and
- Fuel taxes.

Measures to influence public transport use

- Fare levels;
- Fares structures, such as flat fares, zonal fares and monthly passes;
- Integrated ticketing systems; and
- Concessionary fares, which are lower for identified groups of users such as elderly people.

Compensatory measures outside the transport field

- Changes in local taxes;
- Changes in business taxes;
- General subsidies for specific groups; and
- Targeted assistance for specific groups, such as payment for double-glazing where there are noise impacts.

For the purposes of implementation and/or modelling, it would be necessary to specify each of the policy measures in greater detail. For example, there are a number of different forms of urban road pricing and each one could be implemented at different pricing levels, for different time periods and in different areas. These issues will be addressed further in Work Packages 30 and 40.

3. PACKAGING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Background

Whilst it is useful to identify the full range of policy measures in such a form as is presented in the previous section of this report, we should encourage planners to think about the links between policy measures and how measures might be packaged together. In actuality, policy-makers and planners may tend to think about policy measures not under specific headings but as responses to problems and in this way they may arrive at policy packages. The issue of packaging was, therefore, given further consideration within this task via a supplementary set of questions to core city contacts.

Benefits of Packaging

No one measure on its own is likely to provide a solution to transport problems. Most have at least one positive contribution to make, in reducing travel time, environmental impact or accidents, but also have adverse impacts on, say, accessibility or equity. Some, such as traffic calming, can achieve benefits in one area at the expense of deterioration elsewhere. Some, such as bus priorities, would be more effective if they could influence mode choice; without such an impact they only benefit the users of the affected mode.

For all of these reasons, a package of measures is likely to be more effective than selecting any one measure on its own. A set of measures is likely to tackle more problems; one measure can offset the disadvantages of another or avoid the transfer of problems to another area; a second measure can reinforce the impact of the first, for example, inducing a change of mode and generating greater benefits.

In these ways, synergy can be achieved between measures; that is, the overall benefits are greater than the sum of the parts. The identification of measures which might achieve such synergy is at the core of successful transport planning.

Packaging can potentially achieve benefits in several ways. The first involves measures which complement one another in their impact on users. Obvious examples are the provision of park and ride to increase rail or bus patronage; the use of traffic calming to reinforce the benefits of building a bypass; the provision of public transport, or a fares reduction, to intensify the impact of traffic restraint; and the encouragement of new developments in conjunction with rail investment.

The second involves measures which make other elements of the strategy financially feasible. Parking charges, a fares increase or road pricing revenue may all be seen as ways of providing finance for new infrastructure.

The third concerns public acceptability, and the need to package measures which are less palatable on their own with ones which demonstrate a clear benefit to those affected. Once again an example is to be found in road pricing, which attitudinal research demonstrates is likely to be much more acceptable if the revenue is used to invest in public transport.

Furthermore, there may be benefits in terms of the delivery or implementation of policy, ie mixing policy measures with short term expected impacts and those with longer term expected impacts may help to demonstrate to the public that change is taking place and may help to foster an acceptance of change.

The reinforcement of other policy measures could be outside transport and land-use in the strict sense. That is, transport measures could be packaged with urban design measures and, together, these could have positive economic development impacts, for example.

There might also be disadvantages in packaging. Road pricing is perhaps a tax that has insignificant distortionary effects on the economy. When the revenue from road use charging is earmarked for certain purposes, the advantage might be lost and an efficiency loss might occur in the economy.

Packaging many policy measures together could also be a speculative way of gaining acceptance for particular measures, “confusing” the public by including controversial measures in complex packages.

Approaches to Packaging

Policies are often packaged on the basis of what they are targeted towards. For example, it is common for pedestrian policies and cycling policies to be packaged together; in addition to this there could be a public transport package; and then a package based around car use measures. Alternatively, it sometimes helps to have a policy package relating to that geographic area. In this case the modes might be grouped together differently.

Another approach to packaging might be to look at the organisations involved. That is, packaging one authority’s policies with those of neighbouring authorities, of the regional authority and of the EU.

Compensating Losers

There are also other compensatory measures the planners would like to see being used. When restrictions are imposed on car use, public transport improvements should take place simultaneously. At present, this is often supposed to happen but is not actually taking place. When goods or services such as parking space is limited one should see to that individuals with an actual need for the service (parking) are prioritised.

Consultation and the amendment of plans is one way of trying to minimise the negative impacts as far as possible but there is a difficult balance between the good to the city as a whole and the negative impacts to, for example, particular sub-areas of the city, that can sometimes create difficulty.

There are benefits where the transport planning department is part of a larger, multi-disciplinary department. If there are going to be negative impacts then these can be addressed through the whole planning process. For example, in the case of a particular planning application, the department can look at it on its merits and try to minimise the negative impacts that the development might have and, in some cases, get something a bit more positive out of it. For example, retailers are quite keen to provide improved crossing facilities or footways near a store.

Complementary non-transport or land-use policies generally come from other parts of the city authority but there is a strong push amongst some authorities to look more at issues of social inclusion. This is helped where the department responsible for transport and land-use planning works closely with other departments across the same authority, eg in Edinburgh where, together with the Education department, they have developed local safe routes to school initiatives.

Table 3.1 shows the way in which our core cities combine the key policy measures. It can be seen that many of the cities use these policy measures in combination with one another and with other complementary measures. The measures identified appear to complement one another in two ways. Firstly, measures often tend to be combined by mode, eg bus priority with bus frequency and with real-time information, so that several mode-specific enhancements build upon one another. Secondly, measures are combined such that one acts as a ‘carrot’ and the other a ‘stick’, eg combining parking charges with public transport improvements.

Table 3.1 Measures which are packaged with others by Core Cities.

(E = Edinburgh, H = Helsinki, M = Madrid, O = Oslo, S = Stockholm V = Vienna)

Policy Measure	Yes	No	If so, which
Development	EHMOS	V	New PT lines, activity location
Awareness	EV	M	Bus priorities, service frequencies, parking charges
Flexible hours		EM V	
Rail infrastructure	EHMOS	V	Level of service improvement
Bus priorities	EMV		Bus/rail frequency, comfort improvement, awareness, service frequencies, parking charges
Service frequencies	EMSV		Real time info, awareness, bus priorities, parking charges
Real time info	EM	V	Priority
Parking charges	HMOSV	E	PT improvement, awareness, bus priorities, service frequencies
Road pricing	ES	V	Infrastructure investments, public transport fare levels
Bus/Rail fare levels	HS	EV	Road users charges, parking charges

4. PRIORITIES

Introduction

Different authorities, and even different parts within a single authority, may have different priorities about what groups of instruments are important. For example, a Planning and Building Department may view legal/regulation instruments as being most important, whilst a Transport Office might view operation and maintenance, information and marketing, and infrastructure provision as important.

The Core Cities were asked which of the measures listed above they considered to be the most important in developing their strategies. Cities differed in the numbers which they quoted, and there was a tendency for respondents to focus on the types of measure with which they were most familiar, and with measures which could readily be implemented. Some respondents commented that some of the measures listed had a more strategic role, while others were more local in their impact. The latter included measures for pedestrians, cyclists and freight, as well as several management measures.

Initial thoughts on prioritisation of land-use measures were that development pattern, development densities, parking standards, developer contributions and value capture taxes are most important. It was felt that flexible working hours are less important as they are less under the control of city authorities. Furthermore, commuted payments and company travel

plans are seen by some of our core cities as being not so important, whilst telecommunications as an alternative to travel is seen as something more for the future.

Initial priorities amongst infrastructure measures included pedestrian areas and cycle routes, thought to be increasingly important options. On the other hand, new road construction, light rail and guided bus schemes and re-opening closed railway lines do not appear to be viewed as important policy options.

Physical restrictions, parking controls and, increasingly, car-sharing (encouraged by high occupancy vehicle lanes in Madrid) are seen by some of our core cities as being the most important management measures. On the other hand, accident remedial measures and high occupancy vehicle lanes are not felt to be relevant to some cities, whilst there is no culture of cycle lanes and parking standards in other cities.

It was felt that, in general, it is more important to get the basics on information provision right than to spend lots of energy on some of the 'hi-tech' options such as real-time passenger information. However, these hi-tech options are likely to be more important in the future. In general, operation information systems and fleet management systems were seen as being not very important.

Pricing is the most important group for two of our cities. However, neither urban nor inter-urban road pricing is a high priority for some cities due to its low acceptability.

Overall Priority Measures

The 'long list' of policy measures which emerged as priorities, in response to the interviewees being asked which ten measures they currently viewed as most likely to play a part in achieving their city's objectives, are, in no particular order, shown in Table 4.1. Given the nature of the discussions, these results are of limited value, but they do show a greater emphasis on development patterns; public awareness campaigns; new rail lines; parking controls; public transport service levels; parking charges; urban road charging; and public transport fare levels.

Table 4.1 Core cities most important measures.

(E = Edinburgh, H = Helsinki, M = Madrid, O = Oslo, S = Stockholm V = Vienna)

POLICY MEASURES	E	H	M	O	S	V
Development densities	*					*
Development pattern	*	*	*	*	*	*
Development mix	*	*				
Development contributions				*		
Public awareness campaigns	*	*				*
Flexible working hours		*		*		
Company travel plans						*
New road construction				*	*	
New rail stations				*		
New rail lines		*	*	*	*	
New rail services						*
Park and ride			*			
Terminals and interchanges			*	*		
Cycle routes		*				
Intelligent transport systems			*	*	*	
Regulatory restrictions				*		
Parking control			*	*		*
Car sharing			*			
Bus priorities	*	*				*
High occupancy vehicle lanes			*			
Public transport frequency	*	*	*	*	*	
Cycle lanes and priorities		*			*	
Conventional timetable						*
Real-time passenger information		*				*
Parking changes	*	*		*	*	*
Charges for private parking		*				*
Urban road charging	*	*		*	*	
Fuel taxes				*	*	
Public transport fare levels		*	*	*	*	

APPENDIX A - INITIAL PAPER

NOTE ON POLICY INSTRUMENTS

Introduction

The aim of task 13 is to identify the full range of policy options which may need to be addressed in developing sustainable strategies. Below is a structured listing of policy instruments which we have identified as being available to transport planners (for a more detailed summary, the reader is referred to ITS Working Paper 545). This list forms a starting point for the identification and structuring of policy instruments for use in PROSPECTS. However, the list is not necessarily exhaustive and does not necessarily reflect the particular attributes of your city.

Therefore, we would like to use the interview to clarify

- whether the suggested grouping of policy instruments seems reasonable
- whether you have suggestions for improvements to the grouping of policy instruments
- which groups are seen as most important / receive most attention and why?
- whether there are important policy instruments which are not under your control?
- which policy instruments are not relevant to the city and why (conscious decision, never been considered etc)?
- what policy instruments are missing
- which policy instruments are seen as most important / receive most attention and why?

The instruments can be categorised in several ways. This NOTE considers them under the headings of

- land use measures;
- infrastructure provision;
- management of the infrastructure;
- information provision; and
- pricing.

Where relevant WE list in order, under these headings, measures which provide for the private car; constrain car use, provide for public transport; provide for cyclists and pedestrians; and provide for freight. Land use measures cannot in the main be focused on a particular mode, and are therefore considered together in this NOTE.

Land-use options

- Flexible working hours;
- Development densities;
- Transport corridor-based developments;
- Development mix;
- Developer Contributions;
- Commuted payments;
- Company Travel Plans;
- Parking standards;

- Telecommunications as an alternative to travel;

Infrastructure Measures

Improved provision for the Car

- New road construction;
- New off-street parking;

Provision for Public Transport

- Upgrades to existing infrastructure;
- Reopening closed rail lines;
- New rail stations;
- New rail lines;
- Light rail;
- Guided bus;
- Park and ride;
- Terminals and interchanges;

Provision for Cyclists and Pedestrians

- Cycle routes;
- Pedestrian areas;

Provision for Freight

- Lorry parks;
- Transshipment facilities;

Management Measures

Improved provision for the Car

- Conventional traffic management;
- Urban traffic control (UTC) systems;
- Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS,));
- Accident remedial measures

Measures to Restrain the Car

- Traffic calming measures;
- Physical restrictions;
- Regulatory restrictions;
- Parking controls;
- Car sharing;

Provision for Public Transport

- Bus priorities;
- High occupancy vehicle lanes;
- Public transport service levels;
- Bus service management measures;
- Quality Bus Partnerships;

Provision for Cyclists and Pedestrians

- Cycle lanes and priorities;
- Cycle parking provision;
- Pedestrian crossing facilities;

Provision for Freight

- Lorry routes and bans;

Information Provision

Improved provision for the Car

- Conventional direction signing;
- Variable message signs;
- Real-time driver information systems and route guidance;
- Parking guidance and information systems;

Measures to Restrain Car Use

- Public awareness campaigns;

Provision for Public Transport

- Conventional timetable and other service information;
- Real time passenger information;
- Trip Planning Systems;
- Operation information systems;

Provisions for Cyclists and Pedestrians

- Static direction signs;
- Tactile footways;
- Public awareness campaigns;

Provision for Freight

- Static direction signs;
- Fleet management systems;

Pricing Measures

Measures to Restrain the Car

- Parking charges;
- The Workplace Parking levy;
- Urban road Charging;
- Inter-urban road charging;

Provision for Public Transport

- Fare levels;
- Fares structures;
- Concessionary fares.

APPENDIX B - Supplementary Questions on Packaging and Priorities

1. Other than transport and land-use policies discussed on previous occasions, do you use particular policy measures to compensate losers either for
 - the negative impacts of transport and/or land-use policy measures which, whilst improving the overall situation for society, leave certain individuals or groups worse off; or
 - the perpetuation of negative transport-related impacts, where it is decided that it is not in society's interest to take steps to alleviate these impacts.
2. If so, what sorts of policy measures do you use to compensate for what sorts of negative impacts?
3. Our reviews suggest that policy measures can be packaged to achieve greater complementarity; to improve public acceptability; and to ensure financial feasibility. Which types of measure do you think can be packaged to achieve these benefits?
4. Are there other benefits from packaging measures?
5. Would you see compensating losers as a key element of an integrated policy package?
6. If so, why/if not, why not?
7. Which ten of the policy options listed do you currently view as being most likely to play a part in achieving your city's objectives and why.
8. Which ten of the policy options listed do you currently view as being least likely to play a part in achieving your city's objectives and why.

file: adm/prospects/task13