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Executive summary

Road transport is a significant contributor to greenhouse gases; and contributes to other problems such as congestion and ensuing health issues. Reducing road transport has been identified as a priority at a global, regional and local level. At the same time, tackling this problem in urban versus rural settings requires different approaches, as urban communities depend on car use more than their urban counterparts.

Community engagement plays a critical role in the journey to sustainability. Habits, behaviours and practices occur at community, neighbourhood and household level. At the same time, communities have the best understanding of local needs and resources; thus they should be the main focus and receive most support for implementing change. Although community participation is better supported now than in the past, behaviour change policies are still planned and implemented centrally. This report describes “Getting There” a Transition Bro Gwaun (TBG) community initiative research project to explore ways of reducing car use in the local area of Fishguard and Goodwick in the winter of 2011.

Community based social marketing was selected as a suitable approach for addressing this issue, with a local steering group to oversee and participate in project implementation. An independent researcher was also involved to guide the process and contribute more technical aspects such as expert advice, data analysis and report writing.

The first and most important step in behaviour change programmes is to understand the target audience, that is the people that will be impacted and need to be engaged with the initiative. Next, a relevant target behaviour is identified and targeted for change. To achieve this in this project, a combination of official data searches, local surveys –via a school and community samples- and focus groups were undertaken, with substantial contribution from TBG volunteers, in an attempt to map local movement habits, destinations, and reasons for travel.

Commuting to work by car was identified as the main reason for driving, and Haverfordwest was identified as the primary destination in our sample. Several important problems with local public transport, such as confusing timetables and lack of appropriate infrastructure were also identified. These problems act as barriers which prevent passengers from using public transport more frequently. On this basis, and because contextual change must underpin any behaviour change intervention, exploring a lift sharing scheme while engaging local players in public transport improvements was chosen as a possible route of action.
Lift sharing is gaining in popularity in the UK, as it is flexible, user engaging and user friendly, and has great potential for reducing carbon footprint and congestion. Existing schemes were approached and approximate guidance was developed for the next steps of addressing the barriers to engaging with lift sharing in the local area. This should take place in many levels, and include drivers, employers and potentially local authorities and retailers and similar actors.

Addressing public transport problems, although not in the immediate powers of a voluntary group, must also be pursued in parallel so as to support reduction in car dependence and provide a feasible alternative to lift sharing. This can take the form of informing the public of existing public transport options and, in parallel, lobbying the public transport companies and local authorities for targeted, focused changes, with potential sponsorship from local retailers and similar players.

The above potential routes to action need to be explored further in a follow up project for which indicative implementation timelines and required resources are proposed. TBG has in the meantime learned valuable lessons from this exercise, and are already applying them to other projects in their portfolio.
1. Introduction

Road transport is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, which are accelerating climate change. Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) is one greenhouse gas, which is strongly linked with industrialisation and human activity (Pachauri & Reisinger, 2007). Globally, road transport is estimated to be responsible for approximately 17% of all CO₂ emissions.

Nearly 80% of these emissions come from private cars, which for the UK amount to 91.5 million tonnes of CO₂ for 2008 alone (Graham-Rowe, Skippon, Gardner & Abrahams, 2011) with increasing tendencies over the past several years (SEI, 2008). Wales contributes an estimated 5% to the total UK CO₂ emissions in direct correspondence to its population size (4.9% of the UK population, WAG, 2008). Local anecdotal evidence from January 2012 indicates a similar trend for the Fishguard area, West Pembrokeshire, the local focus of this report1.

However, greenhouse gas emissions are not the only sustainability-relevant problems caused by road transport. Other issues, which are also unsustainable in the long term, range from congestion, health issues stemming from stress, immobility and noise pollution, to traffic accidents (European Environment Agency, 2006). The Welsh Government has identified congestion as a growing problem, responsible among others for unreliable journey times, which in turn result in increased stress levels, appointments being missed, vital services being delayed, and costs for Welsh businesses which amount to several million pounds per year (WAG, 2008).

Given the above cited issues, sustainable mobility is becoming an increasing priority in Wales, the UK, and internationally. There is currently no single, universally accepted definition of ‘sustainable mobility’; one of many converging approaches defines it as ‘the ability to meet the needs of society to move freely, gain access, communicate, trade, and establish relationships without sacrificing other essential human or ecological values today or in the future’ (World Business Council for Sustainable Development, 2004, p.12).

The Welsh Government has recognised the importance of prioritising sustainable mobility, and that an integrated approach is necessary to tackle congestion issues effectively,

---

1 83% of traffic movements represented by private cars, light vans and motorcycles, with the remaining 17% shared among public service vehicles (5%), heavy goods vehicles (2%) and large vans/light trucks (10%).
including public transport improvements and ameliorating slow mode (walking and cycling) infrastructure (WAG 2008).

The above issues highlight that the achievement of low carbon transport is a complex but necessary objective. In addition, and crucially for Wales, the implementation of any relevant measures varies greatly between an urban and a rural setting.

Rural communities have at times very different needs, resources and issues compared to urban centres. For example, rural communities rely on private car use more than urban areas because the population is more dispersed, provision of basic services such as employment and healthcare are more remote, and public transport infrastructure is poor (Camarero et al., 2009; House of Lords, 2011). Moreover, public transport in a rural context has additional value in keeping communities alive, allowing residents to reach basic services outside their locality, without having to relocate. Where a private car is not accessible and public transport is poor, residents become isolated and distanced from essential services (Welsh Observatory, 2008).

This has detrimental effects for the community as a whole, and most notably for vulnerable members, adding to other centralization strategies, such as the recent closure of rural post offices (Ipsos/MORI, 2008). The vast majority of residents of rural areas in Wales feel that the provision of public transport services (mainly buses) has remained unsatisfactory or deteriorated further in recent years (Welsh Observatory, 2008).

At the same time, although local communities are impacted most by centralisation measures, they must also be most supported in their journey to sustainability, because everyday practices and habits occur at local and individual level. For this reason, a meaningful understanding of barriers to sustainable behaviours at community level is crucial (Marsden & Hines, 2008) if sustainable policies and measures are to succeed. Therefore, the inception and implementation of travel behaviour change measures must take into account the particular needs of local and rural communities, as well as the broader sustainability context.

One route of addressing sustainability issues, especially at community level, is the emergence of the grassroots transition towns movement, which aims to facilitate the passage to low carbon, more resilient communities and specifically to “inspire, encourage, connect, support and train communities as they self-organise around the transition model, creating initiatives that rebuild resilience and reduce CO₂ emissions” (Transition Network, 2012). The transition network is rapidly expanding around the world in 36 countries,
including Wales, at the time of writing. Transition Bro Gwaun is one of the Welsh transition towns participating in this movement.

The inclusion of a travel behaviour change project in the TBG portfolio was relevant in this context, in terms of TBG’s remit, but also in terms of tackling the issue from a community perspective. Compared to a broad government campaign, or similar measures, a “bottom up approach” such as the one afforded by the involvement of TBG volunteers in reducing car use, has additional value in informing successful measures by eliciting citizens’ opinion and participation (Whitmarsh, Swartling, Jager, 2009). This is important because it increases the meaningful upstream engagement of local parties on local issues, in a participatory fashion (Xenias & Whitmarsh, in preparation). Therefore, it also increases the likelihood of adoption of such measures, as they are proposed by the same public that is requested to enact them.

Transition Bro Gwaun (TBG) is a community group which came into being in 2008. Its aims are to increase the resilience of the local community in and around the twin towns of Fishguard and Goodwick in North Pembrokeshire in the face of fossil fuel depletion with its attendant issues of food and energy supply. TBG also aims to build greater community confidence and capacity in addressing a wide range of associated challenges. TBG has some 300 members who receive a monthly emailed newsletter. The various focused activity groups which include allotments, composting, credit union, surplus food use and renewable energy, provide at least one person each to compose the core group of TBG. At the end of 2011 TBG Ltd was created as a company limited by guarantee to handle financial management for TBG.

Moreover, the behaviour change agenda is becoming increasingly popular with central and local government, as it is regarded as an efficient way of influencing the society in a variety of issues, from diet to transport (House of Lords, 2011). Part of this approach is to effectively address specific barriers for adopting alternative behaviours, provided that the options for alternative behaviours are available.

Specifically in the context of car use, we know, for instance, that many citizens enjoy the comfort, autonomy, and flexibility afforded by car travel (King et al., 2009). These qualities are not available in car-sharing or public transport. Consequently, potential alternatives must provide at least some of the qualities of existing behaviours before they are perceived as viable alternatives by the user. A locally inspired behaviour change approach would therefore be more likely to be tailored to the actual needs of the target audience, whose behaviour we aim to change; thus it would be more likely to succeed than a generic “top-down” (e.g. government led) campaign.
In addition, it has recently become clear in the research literature, as well as from implemented behaviour change programmes, that only if people are acting within a consistent, supportive infrastructural, financial, legal, cultural and social context, can they translate new decisions into action (Richter, Friman & Gärling, 2009; House of Lords, 2011); therefore any proposed approach to the issue at hand must be an integrated rather than a partial solution or a “nudge” (House of Lords, 2011).

Unsurprisingly, given the complexity of the matter, a literature review suggests that there are no clear cut results on what works, and in what context, for reducing car use (Richter, Friman & Gärling, 2009). Graham-Rowe, Skippon, Gardner, & Abraham, (2011), in a review of available studies on interventions to reduce driving, concluded that the available studies were difficult to compare. In addition, only a handful of them were deemed methodologically robust; consequently, the authors could not summarise and digest the results of just a few comparable studies and extrapolate which factors and interventions are effective in reducing driving, and for what reasons.

Moreover, there is no system currently in place to ensure adequate dissemination of lessons learnt from the application of existing and previous behaviour change programmes (House of Lords, 2011). In the absence of a known and proven pathway of intervention for the focus of this project, an exploratory approach was deemed appropriate.
2. Local context and approach

“...at its heart, Social Marketing is about understanding the people that you are trying to help...to develop a programme that is built around their needs”

John Bromley, Director of the National Social Marketing Centre

Fishguard and Goodwick are at the end of the road and railway line from the East which terminate at the ferry dock to Ireland. The population of the twin towns of Fishguard and Goodwick is c5000 with a further c5000 in the immediate surrounding areas. The age of the population is above average, even for rural and coastal areas.

Local bus transport, provided by Richards Bros, offers services connecting to Haverfordwest, Cardigan and St David’s. There are also some less regular services connecting to the coast path, and to Maenchlochog in the Preseli Hills to the East.

The surrounding area is well known for prehistoric sites and natural beauty, which is well safeguarded by the Pembrokeshire Coastal National Park which wraps around the built up areas of the twin towns.

While Fishguard is seen by Pembrokeshire County Council as the hub for the development of North Pembrokeshire, investment by the county council has been unpredictable in recent years and not always with the agreement of local people.

There is a modern secondary school with adjacent leisure centre and three primary schools. The nearest hospital is at Haverfordwest, the county town, 15 miles to the south. The next town, 20 miles to the north, is Cardigan. The port provides the largest single employer, and tourism is now the main industry, although the sheltered bay has provided a base for trade and fishing over many centuries.

Early in 2011 TBG identified travel behaviour and behaviour change as an area relevant to its agenda with the encouragement of Environment Wales. TBG was offered help from Environment Wales (EW), which had earlier provided small scale funding to assist TBG with an awareness raising project, to explore how the amount of CO₂ emissions from car use could be reduced by encouraging car users to make less use of their car.
EW’s programme of funding for 12 month projects was coming to an end, and by the time TBG made the final application in mid 2011, it was clear that a maximum of 6 months would be available to run a research project.

The project would identify reason(s) for addressing car use, and ways of doing so. Some members of the TBG steering group had an understanding of *Community Based Social Marketing* (CBSM) as a tool that helps identify particular behaviours that could be subject to change by persuasion and increased awareness, and selected it as their preferred methodology.

As a result of this process, this project was conceived as a CBSM programme for behaviour change, focusing on travel behaviour. It was conceptualised by core members of the TBG steering group, with the help and support of Environment Wales, as a community based behaviour change project to be implemented under the guidance of a researcher familiar with CBSM. The project aimed at investigating potential ways of changing travel behaviour and encouraging alternatives to driving and in doing so to scope the potential application of this methodology in other projects in the future. In other words, the immediate benefit for the local group would be to effect behaviour change relevant to driving, whereas the longer term benefit would be to expand the knowledge and experience of community run initiatives with their acquisition of CBSM methodology, for use with future projects.

### 2.1 Community Based Social Marketing

Community based social marketing (CBSM) was developed in the 1990’s in Canada as a method of linking environmental programme planners with relevant knowledge in social sciences, such as social and environmental psychology (McKenzie-Mohr, 2000). It is not a theoretical model in itself. Rather, it is a structured method of moving from theory to practice, which aims at broadening awareness of existing relevant knowledge from the social sciences and applying it to “real-life” behaviour change projects with an environmental focus. It is meant to be a more efficient alternative to current practices such as mass media campaigns, which are shown to be costly and incapable of effecting behaviour change (McKenzie-Mohr, 2000; 2011).

CBSM core steps apply whether the issue at hand involves home energy conservation, travel behaviour, household composting or similar topics. These steps comprise (and must be followed in this order):

1. **Needs Assessment:** Identify the specific needs and goals of the community.
2. **Strategy Development:** Develop a strategy that targets the identified needs.
3. **Implementation:** Implement the strategy through various means.
4. **Evaluation:** Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy through monitoring and feedback.
5. **Feedback and Adaptation:** Use feedback to improve the strategy and adapt it as needed.
(a) **Identification of a valid target behaviour** - that is, that the behaviour actually exists and is defined clearly enough so as to be manageable.

(b) **Identification of barriers which prevent citizens from engaging in the target behaviour and benefits arising from engaging with it.**

(c) **Development of a strategy which uses methods proven to work with comparable contexts, and which is possible to implement with the resources available to the community.**

(d) **Piloting the strategy with the sample it is likely to involve in its final application, and within the relevant context.**

(e) **Evaluation of the strategy after its implementation, and incorporation of lessons and potential improvements for further implementation.**

(McKenzie-Mohr, 2012)

For example, assume a local community decides to address poor recycling rates in their area. Following the CBSM model steps, (a) “Improve household recycling” is a very broad target; whereas “increase domestic glass recycling and/or household composting” are better defined and easier to manage targets; assuming there is a recycling and composting programme in place, and that citizens do not recycle or compost as much as they could.

In the next step, (b) the barriers for and benefits from engagement are identified in this particular context (e.g. the recycling collection points may be at inconvenient places).

Once the core issues that need to be addressed are identified, a search (c) for similar interventions in comparable contexts will provide a selection of alternative actions which are expected to be effective for the selected behaviour and context. This should be decided in conjunction with the resources available to those responsible for implementing the intervention; a small group of volunteers and a large local authority will have access to different means and should modify their approach accordingly.

Piloting of the chosen strategy (d) with the actual stakeholders in the targeted community will expose any weaknesses in the approach design and help improve the strategy, before consequently rolling it out to the wider community.

Finally, a follow-up evaluation (e) of the intervention will provide valuable feedback and lessons learnt on the strong and weak points of the chosen strategy.
Given its theory-free viewpoint and context dependent adaptability, CBSM seems suitable, in principle, for a range of potential community projects. With adequate time and resources, such projects could work where distant government policies and targets may not filter into people’s everyday lives and habits, and where, therefore, an information campaign would not be expected to succeed. Based on the principles of CBSM, this TBG project set out to explore mobility practices in Fishguard and Goodwick, identify reasons for car dependence, propose a potential intervention to help reduce driving, and in doing so familiarise with the CBSM model itself.
3. Design and data collection

The project formally started in September 2011, when the grant award was officially confirmed. As a first step, familiarisation with the local population and their lifestyles was necessary: before deciding what behaviour to target, it must be established that this behaviour exists and that it is possible to address it.

In the case of travel behaviour, the key to understanding what really happens and what can be done, is to understand who travels where, for what reason, and by what mode. In other words, it is important to understand whether citizens mainly travel for one or multiple reasons (e.g. work, shopping, taking children to school or combinations of these), how they travel there, why they prefer this mode of transport, and what alternatives are in place, if any.

Additional demographic information would help prioritise certain approaches or de-prioritise others. A mainly elderly population will differ significantly to a population that is composed mainly of young families; a generally affluent area will differ significantly from an area with high unemployment.

Combining the above demographics with mobility can then help focus on a target that is sensible in that particular context. For instance, if very few children live in the area, and very few parents drive their children to school, it becomes apparent that the school run is likely to be a behaviour of low priority. Conversely, if a particular travel behaviour or destination emerges as common among local residents, then this needs to be explored further in order to identify possible ways of addressing it.

As a first step, then, considerable effort was dedicated to initial background searches which were conducted both online, from existing literature and by personal contact initiated by the researcher and willing TBG members. The results were generally not helpful mainly due to data being out of date, or covering different areas or aggregates for large regions, or because of general data unavailability. For instance, census data was ten years old and data on car ownership and car use was not available.

Similar scarcity of available data emerged for most information that would have been useful for this project -including population composition, employment, traffic movements, main travel destinations, preferred travel mode, among others. The geographical area for research was also difficult to identify as there is no common area on which census and similar data is collected. In addition, in some cases potential data
sources were not able to share their data or were unresponsive, when time pressure was already mounting. TBG also convened a meeting of potential partners who would be able to contribute time, information or expertise to the research. In the event, some of the partners were not able to come up to expectations.

3.1 School questionnaire

TBG was, at that time, forging a relationship with Ysgol Bro Gwaun which was about to create a curriculum for year 10 for the Welsh Baccalaureate. The purposes of the research necessary for “Getting There” seemed to fit closely with the aims of the curriculum. It was thus agreed to use a questionnaire approach which would be taken by the year 10 students to their neighbours, to record travel patterns of local people; to explore where they travelled to work, shop and socialise.

After deliberations between TBG and the researcher, a questionnaire was developed (see Appendix 8a) for use with the school; that is data collection to be conducted by the students, under the guidance of their teacher, but otherwise independently. As a further step, these findings were to be validated against focus groups of local residents.

The original intention was to triangulate the school questionnaire data with official background population data which was to be collected in parallel, as explained above. However, given the issues outlined above, it became apparent that TBG was only left with the option of gathering background information via the school questionnaire and follow up focus groups.

A number of iterations were circulated between the lead researcher, TBG members and the school and there was some confusion regarding the final version of the questionnaire. Once the materials were returned by the school, it became clear that the form of the questionnaire which was eventually administered by the school, failed to live up to the requirement to gather data which could be analysed effectively.

However, more importantly, there were serious additional problems with this approach which affected the quality of collected data which in several cases were clearly unusable. These included frequent occurrences of clearly invalid responses. In retrospect, it might have been too optimistic to expect good quality data to be collected by unsupervised students. Thus, by mid-October the project still lacked any base data on which to make reasonable assumptions about the local population composition and travel patterns.
3.2 Community Questionnaire

At that point, discussions took place on whether the project should deviate from its original scope and chosen methodology, but in the absence of a concrete alternative it was decided to continue with the original course. To compensate for the lack of background information and time pressure, it was decided to approach a less representative but more accessible sample, with an improved version of the questionnaire (see Appendix 8b), and its main findings were planned to be triangulated and expanded by follow up focus groups.

3.2.1 Participants and data collection

The survey was performed by TBG volunteers to a convenience sample (i.e. a selection of community groups to which TBG had access) of local residents. The overall sample approached by TBG was approximately 250 local residents, in November 2011, and comprised participants recruited from the following groups:

- St Mary’s Church (a congregation of approx. 40-50 people, typically aged between 50 and 90, mainly female, with a number of younger families);
- Brass Band: (mixed sex with a broad range of ages, mostly between 16 and 50 years and significant representation of teenagers);
- Theatr Gwaun (adult members of the public who attended a film or event in the Gwaun theatre);
- Point (young adults aged between 18 and 25);
- Mums and Toddlers Group; (mainly aged between 18 and 35).
- A local choir (mainly aged between 40 and 70).

A total of 103 completed questionnaires were returned and data was cleaned and coded by a TBG volunteer with an MSc in social and environmental science.

3.2.2 Results

The results of this survey provide a first understanding of the local population travel practices as at November 2011. Overall, there were clear trends in terms of primary destinations and reasons for travel. There were also clear reasons expressed for transport mode preference or avoidance.
The main two reasons for travel emerged as commuting to work and shopping, representing 71% of our participants’ responses, with the remaining 29% shared among education, leisure, socialising, medical appointments and other reasons with rare occurrence (see fig. 1).

The use of slow modes (namely walking and cycling), although present in the questionnaire, were very rarely selected, with the main reasons for this being the local terrain - which can broadly be described as Fishguard and Goodwick built on two opposite hillsides, with low lying land between them – and lack of relevant infrastructure.

In terms of modal choice for the reported journeys, a breakdown by mode of transport within travel category reveals, not surprisingly, the dominance of private car for the work commute as well as for shopping, with approximately 80% of the total share in each category.

Table 1. Breakdown of transport mode share and destination for work².

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for travel</th>
<th>Mode of transport</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car as driver or passenger</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Haverfordwest</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishguard/Goodwick</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus, walk</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Haverfordwest</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishguard/Goodwick</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Breakdown of transport mode share and destination for shopping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for travel</th>
<th>Mode of transport</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>Car as driver or passenger</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Haverfordwest</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishguard/Goodwick</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus, walk</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Haverfordwest</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fishguard/Goodwick</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² NB All figures rounded to the nearest whole percentage point.
There is a growing number of supermarkets being provided in Haverfordwest although at the current time the County Council are hoping to attract a major supermarket to invest in a central site in Fishguard. If retail choice in Fishguard were expanded, trips to Haverfordwest could be reduced.

In terms of primary destination, 59% of all trips appear to have their main destination either in the immediate vicinity of Fishguard and Goodwick, or Haverfordwest. The latter is the single most reported destination outside the Fishguard area.

The remaining 41% of destinations being scattered to almost any destination from nearby towns in Pembrokeshire, to central or South Wales, including Cardiff and Swansea (see fig. 2).

Participants’ travel behaviour is dominated by car use, for eight out of 10 journeys; participants’ most frequently stated reason for travel is work, and their most frequent single destination outside the local area is Haverfordwest. Therefore, in terms of identifying a behaviour for an intervention, work commute by car to Haverfordwest would be a good candidate.

That is also because although nearer destinations represent a higher proportion of trips, their patterns are also more irregular. Even if local journeys were equal in numbers to those for Haverfordwest, the latter contribute 10-15 times more CO₂ emissions per trip (given a 1-2 mile typical car journey in the local area, compared to a 15 mile typical car journey to Haverfordwest).

Furthermost destinations would be clearly more valuable to target in terms of CO₂ emissions; however they are spread across Wales. Therefore planning an intervention for such a diverse area (and subsequent possible reasons for travel) would be outside the scope and resources of this project.
The candidate intervention focus should also be work related trips, as shopping and other leisure trips would be more irregular in terms of times and destinations; and more private including e.g. trips with the whole family.

Finally, open ended questions were also included in the questionnaire. In these, participants were asked to describe the main reasons why they choose the travel mode they reported; for economy we do not report these findings here as they resemble those emerging from the focus groups, revolving around the issues of unavailability of feasible alternatives to the car and the current state of public transport.

### 3.3 Focus groups

While TBG volunteers were delivering the community questionnaire, they also invited survey participants to participate in follow-up focus groups. These were planned to explore the reasons and alternatives for moving about the local area. The focus groups approach would allow a deeper understanding of the local transport situation reality and experience, as well as barriers and opportunities to using alternatives to the car.

In addition to recruiting via the survey, an additional method of inviting participants to the focus groups was employed: TBG volunteers conducted house to house visits with a relevant invitation. Certain streets were selected in an attempt to attract a socially balanced sample on the basis of local knowledge; a random method of house selection was applied, until enough participants were recruited to conduct two focus groups.

Volunteers who engaged with this activity were pleasantly surprised at the general interest in the issue of transportation. This may have been contributed to by both the start of additional train services connecting the area to the wider rail network and also by the sudden closure of some of the town service bus services, effectively cutting some parts of the community off during evenings. There was also a local programme of creating safe routes to school to encourage children to make their own way to the various schools in Fishguard and Goodwick of which some residents were aware.

Twenty two participants thus finally accepted the invitation for two focus groups scheduled for 26th November. This sample featured an almost equal representation of sexes, and ages ranging from 19 to 85 years old. Six TBG volunteers acted as hosts and scribes for the event. Unfortunately, just over half of those who had expressed interest

---

3 That is approaching every fourth available house in their assigned street.
turned up on the day, thus limiting the desired impact of our learning from the local community, in an event which was otherwise very well received both by participants and TBG members.

### 3.3.1 Procedure and Results

Focus groups participants described their daily lives in terms of mobility habits; what is their preferred mode of transport for their various activities; why they prefer that mode; what alternatives they perceive available; whether they use them and why (or why not); what does mobility mean to participants. Two issues that were hypothesized by TBG, local congestion and the school run, did not spontaneously emerge during the discussions. The researcher probed deliberately for these two issues, but they did not appear to be important for our sample.

Participants gave their consent for discussions to be transcribed anonymously as occurring, in *intelligent verbatim*\(^4\) format, by two dedicated scribes per focus group; this gave the scribes the advantage of resting frequently, but also allowed to help each other with better comprehension of the live dialogues, and correcting any mistakes as they went along.

Added to the transcripts were the participants’ own answers to three questions asked by the researcher, aimed at summarising important sections of the discussion; that is, parts of the discussion that generated much interest and interaction – not necessarily in terms of length, but more importantly in terms of intensity and engagement.

The transcripts were then thematically coded by the researcher and an independent assistant; this was the product of three successive iterations and convergence between the two coders. The most prominent emerging themes are presented here.

- *Good transport provision is key for sustaining a rural area*, including work, social life and commerce.

- *Local public transport is generally problematic*: unreliability, inaccurate information provision, inadequate space provision for pushchairs, insufficient management of peak time services, high prices.

\(^4\) That is, transcribing participants’ contributions without linguistic fillers, repetitions or interjections.
• **Reliability of public transport and information is more important than frequency**\(^5\); given a reasonable spread of services during the day. That is, one service per hour would be preferable if it was punctual, compared to two services per hour which may run within a significant margin of the stated time. Good public transport is also associated with freedom and independence.

• **Driving** is seen as the only transport alternative and a necessary evil. It is perceived a default choice, and is also associated with freedom, independence and convenience.

• **Slow modes** (walking and cycling) are not currently perceived as viable alternatives to driving and public transport –unless for very short distances– due to the local terrain and lack of adequate cycle lanes or footpaths and pavements.

Local bus services in particular, which dominated the discussions, attracted not only criticisms but also suggested solutions by citizens. These included:

• Improved reliability of available service time information; the real time display provides a mix of live times and scheduled service times resulting in confusion. It also does not provide extra services such as the summer shuttle and the Tesco services.

### Table 3. Selected citizens’ quotes and corresponding themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good transport provision is key for sustaining a rural area</td>
<td>“Lack of transport means shops close”; “It is a service to the community” (participant D1; female 50s). “Social life is constrained in the evening; no return buses from Haverfordwest” (participant F1, male, 60s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of transport and information provision</td>
<td>“If you don’t have information, you can’t make choices”; “There is an issue about services not being advertised” (participant F1, retired male). “They put up the [real time display]; it would be great if it worked and if it was at strategic bus stops” (participant D2, female, 50s). “Fishguard town service just drive around at will” (participant A2, young mum). “Should be sticking to the timetable” (participant E1, male, teens).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local public transport is generally problematic</td>
<td>“A quick drive turns into nightmare by bus” (participant A2, young mum).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) This point is mentioned separately to the remaining public transport issues, as it dominated the discussions and seems to be very poignant for local bus users.
• Improved timetables for evenings and weekends (at the time of this focus group, an important evening route had just been cut).

• Installation of a bus shelter in the town centre, and improvement of existing bus shelters, as several of them are made of brick and do not allow visual contact with an approaching bus resulting in either missing the bus or having to stand outside the shelter.

The results provide a deeper understanding of the situation “on the ground”. It is interesting that the focus groups’ findings confirmed, largely, the results of the open ended questions contained in the community sample questionnaire. This serves as a triangulation point of our data, adding validity to our findings. However, the focus groups’ findings have additional value in bringing us genuine insights from the very individuals affected by the issues under investigation. This is an important and useful feature of this research.

The school run and local congestion, although anecdotally mentioned by community members, did not emerge in the questionnaires or focus groups. This may be an artefact of our inability to access a truly representative sample via our resources. Due to the unavailability of up-to-date local population demographic data, we were also unable to establish the contribution of young families to the local population and therefore to estimate the extent to which the school run was expected to be significant among local car users. This subject could have been explored separately, by employing a targeted sample, for example by recruiting via parents groups, had there been more time and resources available.
4. Potential for Interventions

The results of the questionnaire and focus groups were discussed in a mid-December meeting between TBG and the researcher. We concluded that there were two potential ways of intervening to reduce driving: lift sharing and improving public transport; and that these needed to be pursued in parallel in order to maximise car use reduction, which was the primary objective of this project.

This would include the exploration of barriers to lift sharing and a strategy to address them, as well as engaging the local public transport company and potentially other partners to pursue targeted improvements in public transport provision.

Lift sharing would be to address those car trips to a fixed destination and with a fixed schedule, that is mainly work related rather than shopping and family related trips.

Since we identified Haverfordwest as the primary destination for work related trips, optimisation of car use on the Fishguard to Haverfordwest route would be advantageous: for every return car trip cut, there would be a reduction of 1 tonne CO\textsubscript{2} per year (Liftshare, 2012), in addition to financial benefits. Therefore a car sharing scheme, especially targeting those regularly commuting to Haverfordwest to work, was deemed worthwhile for further exploration.

A significant finding from this research was the perception of local public transport as an unattractive alternative to the car. Given the lack of other realistic alternatives to car transport, addressing the identified public transport problems –therefore making bus travel a more attractive option- can be the second possible intervention to reduce car use. Ideally, however, the two interventions should take place in parallel, although this may require more resources and longer timescales than currently available.

Considerable additional effort was dedicated, in the end of the project period, to searching for relevant information on implementing these interventions, with focus on lift sharing. Despite our enthusiasm at the start of this process, it soon became apparent that there was not much information readily available in terms of how to implement lift sharing – especially in a context comparable to that of “Getting There”.

However, several main components of such intervention were identified during our search, and we could map the basic building blocks of this process in order to help implementation in the future. One possible way of implementing this option, in the space of one year, is outlined in table 1. Although it would be premature to assess the necessary resources and exact timescales, this indicative timetable shows the steps that could be taken towards implementing these interventions.
**Timetable 1  Indicative timetable for ways of reducing local car use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Month 4</th>
<th>Month 5</th>
<th>Month 6</th>
<th>Month 7</th>
<th>Month 8</th>
<th>Month 9</th>
<th>Month 10</th>
<th>Month 11</th>
<th>Month 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Exploring ways to achieve lift sharing</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on barrier 1</td>
<td>Implement action 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on barrier 2</td>
<td>Implement action 2</td>
<td>Maintain structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on barrier 3</td>
<td>Implement action 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning on lift sharing</td>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>Campaign maintenance</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
<td>Remind event event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning on lift sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning on lift sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with local public transport stakeholders</td>
<td>Exploring ways of improving local public transport</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
<td>Next steps (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicising existing public transport options</td>
<td>Publicise existing public transport options</td>
<td>Campaign maintenance</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
<td>Campaign reminder event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of lift-sharing and Public transport</td>
<td>Baseline of travel mode use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Monitoring and report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Please refer to the text sections for a breakdown of these actions).*
4.1. Lift sharing

Regular car sharing is gaining in popularity in the UK; the AA in a recent survey found that 1 in 5 of their members now car share regularly (AA, 2011); a Pembrokeshire County Council survey in November 2011 found that 45% of their respondents thought that it is “important” or “very important” to car share (Pembrokeshire County Council, 2011); and liftshare.com, one of the largest car sharing websites, now has half a million members nationwide (Liftshare, 2012). Thus, an exploration of the possibility of local car share arrangements, barriers to and benefits from engaging with it, could be performed as a meaningful next step of this project. This could be done by understanding the local residents’ perceptions of the main benefits and barriers from engagement with a car sharing scheme. Direct engagement with a targeted public would be necessary, for example via the TBG market stall, to recruit participants for further discussions, potentially similar to the focus groups already run as part of this project. Once the relevant barriers and benefits were identified, TBG could design an appropriate strategy to address them, involving the users themselves in the inception and application of such initiative.

Depending on the outcome of engagement with local users and potentially employers, alternatives for lift share implementation could be developed which could include a website for local people willing to share lifts. Barriers to this process should then be explored further; one example could be trust and familiarity with the potential lift sharer. For instance, 21% of potential car sharers mentioned that they would car share with someone they know (AA, 2010).

If these were confirmed via local focus groups, then TBG could organise events aiming at local car sharers getting to know each other. This would be beneficial for increasing trust and building connections between participants who regularly drive to the same destination. Perhaps there is room for a blog to enable drivers to log into a lift-sharing system. Other measures, identified from similar surveys have pointed in the direction of providing facilities such as free parking for car sharers (e.g. see AA, 2010).

We developed a brief questionnaire and invitation form (see Appendix 8d) to explore the feasibility of a lift-sharing scheme in the local area –that is, interest from local commuters, reasons for and against participating, and recruitment for the next round of focus groups, to be implemented from mid-December to mid-January via the TBG.
market stall, and the focus groups were scheduled for 21 January 2012, to explore barriers and opportunities of lift sharing, and how TBG could implement this.

However, poor or nil responses from those who may hold some of the keys to accessing commuters was disheartening for TBG and lack of knowledge in how to gain access to that sector meant this final survey was not implemented; in addition, Christmas time occupied the two most critical weeks for participant engagement; consequently the scheduled focus groups were cancelled due to lack of recruitment.

It was therefore not possible to gather enough information from local commuters to form a clear action plan before the end of “Getting There”. This approach remains open for exploration by TBG, and could form the core of a proposal for a further project, for example the next stage of “Getting There”, assuming funding is secured, and enough time allowed for the project to flourish.

TBG also contacted employers in Haverfordwest, through the Chamber of Commerce to request their support for the lift sharing scheme. Such support would be negotiated on an individual basis, but could include specific privileges to employees who car share such as free parking, fuel subsidy, flexi-time or other incentives.

Several additional hours were dedicated to searching voluntary organisations, their websites, government reports and academic literature, in search of specific guidance on starting and operating lift sharing schemes, with minimal results.

Clearly, local lift sharing schemes do exist currently, for example in universities (e.g. Cardiff University, Heriot-Watt University) and they typically operate by embedding an existing lift sharing website within their websites, or informally e.g. with students self-organising trips via social networking websites. There are several key differences between such schemes and a rural community scheme, including: demographics, (single students vs families), population density (student campus and student residence are more compact and contain hundreds of prospective lift sharers within a few hundred meters radius), which do not allow a direct transfer of knowledge for the benefit of “Getting There”.

Several existing lift-sharing websites were individually trialled (i.e. by registering and searching for journeys relevant to Fishguard and Goodwick), to result to mainly two well functioning, accessible and easy to use websites: liftshare.com and gocarshare.com. Of these, the former appears to be the largest of its kind in the UK
with most available routes in Pembrokeshire; while the latter one seems to focus on younger audiences and large events.

Personal contacts with staff in both of these websites, as well as charities such as the Transition Network (https://www.transitionnetwork.org), Sustrans (http://www.sustrans.org.uk) and Carplus (http://www.carplus.org.uk) did not reveal additional information on how to initiate such scheme – adding to the paucity of information on schemes run by local volunteering organisations.

At least two of the organisations we approached, carbonheroes.com, gocarshare.com, offer help on setting up a scheme; they also offer more detailed help on a consultancy basis. Carplus also offers advice, and is working on a report for communities interested in starting lift sharing schemes. This was not available at the time of writing.

Carplus in particular, may be one of the most specialised sources on lift sharing information, as they describe themselves as “the national charity promoting a rethink in car use. Whilst recognising the benefits cars bring to society, Carplus is acutely aware of the financial, environmental, social and health costs of motoring today. Carplus works independently and in partnership to reduce over-dependency on private cars by promoting accessible, affordable and low-carbon alternatives.” (Carplus, 2012).

At the same time, strong advice was repeatedly given against starting up a new scheme altogether and in the direction of using existing lift-sharing websites.

Employers could also integrate lift sharing as part of corporate travel plan. This increases participation in a scheme, varying from 2% to 18% in different cases (Cairns et al., 2004), and should be explored further. Existing websites offer the option of catering for specific employers. For example, three Welsh transport consortia (SWITCH, SEWTA and TraCC) offer branded lift sharing schemes powered by liftshare.com (WAG, 2007).

For rural areas, Lifshare.com reports an expected 10% demand reduction in car park arrivals after a 12 month implementation of a car sharing scheme for employees (this effect diminishes in well connected urban areas). In the case of Addenbrooke’s Hospital Staff Travel Survey, single car occupancy was reduced more than 50% between 1993 and 2003 (http://www.lifshare.com/nhs/businesscase.asp, accessed 2 March, 2012). Lift share also reports that 34% of all their lift requests are matched (regular lifts success rates will be higher or they may not appear in the website if regular car-sharing partnerships have been formed).

This, at the time of writing, constitutes best accessible evidence on planning the next steps for the implementation of our initiatives, in the absence of specific existing guidance. Timetable 2 shows a possible path for exploring barriers relevant to lift sharing.
## Timetable 2  
Indicative timetable for ways to address local lift sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation / resources logistics (incl venue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise lifts sharing to potential audience / TBG members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential for participation in car sharing scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit participants for focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups to capture barriers and enablers to car sharing &amp; transcripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Focus groups discussions to identify main barriers to car sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise meeting on possible next steps on the basis of focus groups evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting to decide next steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop potential alternatives outlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of alternatives outlines (e.g. speed dating event, company schemes, website selection etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare for focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit participants for focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups to evaluate proposed solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of Focus groups discussions to evaluate potential solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-12 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is crucial to emphasise that these are not “one-size-fits-all” suggestions, but, rather, an indicative timetable of processes, covering important steps to be followed, and a possible estimate of necessary resources. Actual project proposals should tailor these to their individual needs and particularities, and allow for deviations depending on their individual circumstances.

Nevertheless, further steps are proposed here, to expand and be used in conjunction with timetable 2. These concern potential outcomes of the exploration process, i.e. possible barriers for engaging with lift-sharing in the area. These are identified in relevant research (e.g. AA, 2010; Cairns et al., 2004) and are exemplified here as (a) lack of trust, (b) lack of access to the internet (c) lack of employer engagement, and (d) campaigning, as a support structure for an ongoing lift-sharing project; and are summarised in timetables 2a, 2b, 2c and 2d respectively. Other issues and incentives identified in previous research include the provision of alternatives to guarantee a lift home (e.g. by ensuring improved public transport), the provision of small gifts, such as vouchers, for joining a scheme (Cairns et al., 2004) and so on.

Clearly, identified barriers could differ greatly, across time and space. In addition, provided timelines/implementation are highly indicative and depend on response from other partners (e.g. employers, if they are involved). Detailed guidance cannot be provided as it requires assessment of available resources at any given time. Therefore included timelines should be used very cautiously and for guidance only.
## Timetable 2 a. Potential barrier 1 - lack of trust: indicative timetable for organising a "meet a lift sharer" event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organise a familiarisation event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solution development, e.g. <strong>speed dating event</strong> to match interested parties and to publicise lift sharing website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event planning and publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organise event logistics, incl. venue;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event publicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Publicise event widely incl. local retailers, TBG website, market stall, email etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timetable 2 b. Potential barrier 2 - access (i.e. no internet): organise a contact point (e.g. to organise lifts over the phone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify appropriate person(s) to act as contact points to book liftshares over the phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria (e.g. potentially CRB checks?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on how to use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer(s) act as contact points to book lift shares over phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact TBG volunteers to identify appropriate person(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer procedure selection details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on using the lift sharing website (quite easy!)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timetable 2 c. Potential barrier 3 - employers: indicative timetable for employer engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation / resources logistics (incl venue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential support for lift sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. include it to their websites, provide free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car pak etc...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of possible options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify possible solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement agreed actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate relative short term actions and plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for longer term actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Timetable 2 d. Potential barrier 4 - lack of information: indicative timetable for provision of information campaign & support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design publicity materials for lift-sharing scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design materials (incl. posters, flyers, blog, include lift-sharing in TBG website etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement materials for lift-sharing scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement charges (i.e. get flyers printed, start blog etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll out campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roll out campaign (i.e. distribute flyers, door to door and at market stall, place posters at shop fronts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-60 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign maintenance (check posters, mailing lists, update blog and website etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 person/hrs/week (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigate other possibilities, (e.g. a smart phone application for lift sharing ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Public transport improvements

Public transport improvements can be both at the level of the users, and that of transport planning and management. Several issues with local bus services were identified in this project; e.g. confusing information provided by the town centre real time display. This appears to be a significant barrier for local residents to bus use; TBG verified with the local bus company that only one of their buses is currently equipped with GPS tracking.

Therefore in a typical day, the bus stop device displays a mix of real time information and scheduled timetable—with the users confusing which is which—and excludes temporary (e.g. summer) and other operators (e.g. Tesco) services. This leaves much room for improving information provision for the average passenger, and justifies our focus groups’ participants claims that local bus services appear to be “random” and not according to schedule, as at November 2011. Moreover, participants in our research unequivocally mentioned that they prefer punctuality over frequency of service, provided that service times are spread reasonably across the day.

Thus, one level of TBG action and volunteer involvement could be to engage the local transport company and negotiate how to address this issue. The local public transport company as at March 2012 is considering an upgrade of their existing fleet, though no further information was available at the time of writing.

The need for bus shelters (e.g. in the town centre) or unsuitability of brick shelters (e.g. in Scleddau) which prevent visual contact between the passengers and the bus driver, could be addressed by a combination of meetings as described above, and the involvement of the County Council and local businesses which could help sponsor bus shelters.

In terms of timetabling and fleet management, TBG could highlight the importance of re-shuffling existing routes and timetables, to match local residents’ needs. For example, it was clearly mentioned that the Haverfordwest bus service is full of schoolchildren at peak times, and there is need for a second bus. When this is the only service for a long time, a full bus prevents passengers from using it, and they seek alternatives as a result. Resolving such issues from within the community will also be a good start for the take up of the resulting services, as these are more likely to reflect the actual needs of passengers.

Once new timetables and reliable information are in place, a local awareness campaign can be conducted, and include the active involvement of volunteers to make the new services known to their fellow citizens. This could involve talking to local residents, design advertising posters and fold out versions of the new timetables, shop front advertising materials and similar activities.
### Timetable 3

Indicative timetable for engagement with local stakeholders on public transport improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>Week 10</th>
<th>Week 11</th>
<th>Week 12</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation / resources logistics (incl venue)</td>
<td>Prepare meeting with/ engage local stakeholders (incl. bus operator, local council, retailers, sports team, other sponsors...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore potential for addressing customer needs (e.g. bus shelters, service reliability, GPS, sponsorship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify possible solutions (incl. short term e.g. improved timetables; and long term e.g. more funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for agreed actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design publicity materials for lift-sharing scheme</td>
<td>Design materials (incl. posters, flyers, blog, include lift-sharing in TBG website etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20-40 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement materials for lift-sharing scheme</td>
<td>Implement charges (i.e. get flyers printed, start blog etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign roll out</td>
<td>Roll out campaign (i.e. distribute flyers, door to door and at market stall, place posters at shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-60 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign maintenance (check posters, mailing lists, update blog and website etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-4 person/hrs/week (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate alternatives</td>
<td>Investigate other possibilities, e.g. a smartphone application for lift sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of the above recommendations would be sufficient on its own to effect major shift in use of local bus services; however a combination of the above measures will markedly improve the provision and perception of local bus services. *This is a necessary condition for any improvement in passenger numbers.* At a current market share of just 7% of local journeys, according to our data, even a small increase to 10% will represent an almost 50% increase in passenger numbers, from which all sides could only benefit.

### 4.3 Evaluation of interventions

Once implemented, any intervention should be followed up. This is most important in order to assess the effectiveness of the intervention as well as to train TBG on how to track similar intervention projects in the future. The results would also be useful to the wider volunteering sector in terms of know-how as well as in terms of the effectiveness (or not) of the actual intervention.

One way to monitor the results of the intervention, is a follow up questionnaire, possibly the same one used with TBG volunteers at the early stages of “Getting There”. This should be able to detect at least some of the effected behaviour change especially with reference to the percentage of people reporting car sharing (see items *“What is the purpose of your most frequent journey? (include journeys to work, if appropriate)”, “Why do you choose this method of transport for this journey?”, “How do you normally make that journey?”* – Appendix 8b).

However, it is important that comparable samples be used for the evaluation / follow up of this project. Random application of the questionnaires before and after the intervention would not reflect actual change in participants’ habits because it would not compare comparable groups of people.

An alternative way of evaluating the success of the intervention could be an actual car occupancy rate count on a targeted route (e.g. Fishguard to Haverfordwest) before and after the intervention period.

Finally, a cautionary note on intervention evaluation. While we firmly believe in the importance of evaluating interventions, the exact effects of any social intervention may not be immediately visible in the results of a follow up measurement; or within a given (usually short) timescale. Social interventions, such as changing travel habits, involve several changes in thinking and behaviours, as well as in social relationships, which may take time to manifest.

Also, interventions such as “Getting There” have added value in terms of community cohesion and group confidence – parameters which cannot easily be measured, but
which are paramount for communities to flourish, especially in a rural context. Affording these communities the opportunity to act as a group and try to improve their surroundings is in itself a goal worth pursuing.

**Intervention evaluation: indicative timetable for baseline measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questionnaire design</td>
<td>Simple evaluation instrument design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>Data collection from local area (could be done by phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-60 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Data processing and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timetable 4 b. Indicative timetable for intervention evaluation and monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Week 26</th>
<th>Week 27</th>
<th>Week 28</th>
<th>Week 29</th>
<th>Week 30</th>
<th>Week 31</th>
<th>Week 47</th>
<th>Week 48</th>
<th>Week 49</th>
<th>Week 50</th>
<th>Week 51</th>
<th>Week 52</th>
<th>TBG Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questionnaire design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simple evaluation instrument design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection from local area (could be done by phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-60 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data processing and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-30 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150-200 person/hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4.4 The new transport hub

The current development of a new transport hub in the local area, highlights several aspects of the agenda to improve public transport. After decades of closure, Fishguard & Goodwick Station has been rebuilt and will reopen to passengers in May 2012. This will provide town centre access to the recently enhanced rail service to Fishguard.

Neither development could have been realistically predicted when this project was planned. In addition to a new rail service connecting Fishguard to the national rail network, the station will provide interchange with local bus routes, car park, storage for cyclists, disabled access and real time rail information. Cycle routes are being extended to the station and the station buildings offer opportunities for transport-related services to establish or relocate at the station. This provides the basis for a major reorientation towards public transport locally, and throughout the north Pembrokeshire travel area.

However, this development results from a series of unplanned events and unconnected decisions rather than signalling a new integrated approach by the transport industry and government. The improved rail service was originally rejected by the Welsh transport minister as 'premature' – a position he reversed closer to Welsh elections. The service commenced without a locally accessible terminus, and no Welsh Government funding for one. However the local authority had, several years earlier, purchased the old station site as part of the Goodwick Conservation Area. Despite severe financial constraints it was able provide a station within months of the service launching. Network Rail was also able to fund the unplanned relaying of the track through the station.

Goodwick will be the only station with public parking between Haverfordwest and Aberystwyth and is expected to attract car drivers from a substantial area. Rail destination priorities for local travellers are significantly far afield, with London and Cardiff the most favoured destinations. The current 24 hour parking restriction will exclude many of them from using the station car park, and therefore possibly the train.

The increasing financial constraints on local and central government now mean that there will be no funding to integrate existing bus services with the station. At the same time as the rail service launched, the local authority withdrew funding from the evening town bus service that could have met the evening trains. There may be no means for transport providers to build on the potential so suddenly apparent.

The hub therefore faces ongoing constraints to achieve its potential of reorienting local transport choices. It will require sustained local promotion and campaigning to do so.
5. What TBG has learned from *Getting There*

This project arose from discussions within TBG concerning the fact that while we were engaging with many local people who held views about sustainability and carbon reduction similar to our own, we were not ‘getting through to’ the majority of the populace.

A COIN (Climate Outreach and Information Network) training session enabled us to explore this further and, coupled with the timing of significant changes to the transport system in our area, TBG decided to undertake a project to explore what practical interventions might best encourage local people to make behavioural and lifestyle changes to reduce their car usage.

There was a high level of enthusiasm and motivation for this project, but as the project progressed, volunteers felt this diminished. Some difficulties which arose and contributed to this, and what we have learned from them, are as follows:

**Initial Preparation**

Funding made available at relatively short notice is a mixed blessing, sometimes encouraging a voluntary group to seize an opportunity for which it may not be ready. This project really needed a full 12 months for which the funding programme was intended. In retrospect, trying to deliver a 12 month project effectively in 4 months was unlikely to succeed. Enthusiasm should not be allowed to override hard analysis and management planning.

The concept and structure of the new Supporting Sustainable Living grant, with its three distinct stages, can be difficult to fully grasp and apply. On a number of occasions, volunteers who thought they had understood what was required, found themselves being reminded by our Development Officer that we were ‘going off track’. More input, both in the introductory and follow up sessions, could have helped us keep to the boundaries and requirements of Stage 1, of which this is a report.

Understanding and applying the chosen model also presented challenges. Some TBG volunteers had a basic knowledge of CBSM, but others did not. Our expectation was that by engaging a part-time researcher experienced in this field, volunteers would be guided through the practical implementation of this investigative model. Unfortunately we had not budgeted sufficient time and funding for this level of engagement, and the researcher
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was less available than would have been ideal during the first month when it would have been most useful to do this.

**External consultant and researcher**

Both our consultant and researcher were based a considerable distance from us and from one another, so liaison was not always easy. With the wisdom of hindsight, it would have been advantageous to engage a researcher, or knowledgeable research assistant, based closer to Fishguard and with more local knowledge, whose role would be to act as advisor and mentor to volunteers on a more frequent basis.

**Partners**

While some partners lived up to their commitment to the project, the failure of others to deliver what had been promised was discouraging. Why this was so has not been clarified.

**Desk research and data collection**

All involved were surprised and somewhat disheartened at the paucity of relevant and contemporary local data on key issues e.g. basic demographics, car ownership, travel patterns. Knowledge of what relevant data is available in advance of a project is essential.

The local high school offered to help us gather data. Using the Welsh Baccalaureate programme to inform students about community consultation, they worked with us to develop a questionnaire and to get their year 10 students to undertake a survey of their parents and neighbours car usage. However, the results were less useful than hoped, due to an oversight in the questionnaire and us placing too much reliance on school students being able to deliver a sophisticated outcome of questionnaire surveying.

The second questionnaire, used by volunteers to survey various community organisations, was more effective, and volunteers found themselves discussing carbon reduction issues with members of the public with whom TBG had previously not engaged – this was very interesting and informative. Discussions with groups such as the Family Centre, Youth Club, Women’s Institute proved particularly valuable.

**Focus Groups**

Volunteers were initially hesitant about house to house calling to recruit for the focus groups, but most found it an interesting and sometimes very rewarding experience. While some householders were not very responsive, most were friendly enough and a surprising number were extremely welcoming and talkative. Nevertheless it can be an unpleasant
task for some volunteers, and this needs to be addressed. A pre ‘door-knocking’ session to discuss problems that may arise, and the opportunity for inexperienced or reluctant volunteers to be paired up with someone who feels confident to do this should always be offered.

While we recruited sufficient people to come to the first round of focus groups, a significant number of people, who offered to participate, did not turn up. TBG has no insight into why this happened. It was suggested that phone calls to the prospective participants the day before might have encouraged their attendance, although letters were sent a few days prior to the focus groups. Hopefully, an awareness of this might help future projects avoid this pitfall.

Once the target behaviour had been agreed (i.e. the engagement with a car sharing scheme for those working in the county town 15 miles away), recruitment for the second focus group was initiated. However, we found it much harder to do this, and failed to recruit people for the following reasons.

- Contact with employers in the county town was facilitated by the Chamber of Commerce asking for contact details of employees who might be interested in joining a focus group, but the response was extremely poor. Again, more time was needed for this protracted aspect. Perhaps we should have followed up the letters with phone calls or personal contact.
- Recruitment from the TBG stall in Fishguard Farmers Market elicited no response.
- The period we were trying to recruit in coincided with Christmas and New Year which lead to significant delays and us running out of time.
- In hindsight, we should have had a mechanism for identifying appropriate survey respondents which could have allowed the research team to renew contact with them.

### Choice of target behaviour

While the decision to focus on a car sharing scheme was the decision identified by using the CBSM model, it may have been too difficult an issue for our group - given our resources and the time scale we were working to - and for our rural community to take on board. For most drivers the main advantage of having a car is the independence and flexibility it provides in an area where alternative transport is so limited. The cancelled second round of focus groups was designed to explore precisely the potential and feasibility for engaging local residents with car sharing and help guide this process. Perhaps it would have been more effective to focus on those issues which arose out of
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discussions with local people e.g. better information about bus timetables; accessibility of buses – this might have led to a more positive response from our community.

Conclusions for TBG’s ongoing work

This project took TBG into new territory. TBG was simultaneously starting work in several other areas which diluted the time and energy available for this project. One main conclusion was that the attempt to reduce car use is a complex aim. The variety of actions that could be engaged in a pilot project was daunting. One feasible consequent action was nevertheless agreed; to add a page on the TBG website with a link to the most used car-sharing website so that those who might want to participate are enabled to do so.

This project provided us with a much improved awareness of the local transport issues and behaviours although it did develop ways of reducing car use in the local area. Partly due to our lack of resources, there is currently little enthusiasm for TBG to take it on to the pilot project of Stage 2. Valuable lessons have been learned in the process of this exercise. Probably the most important of these are:

• Getting out into the community and talking to a wide range of people can be challenging but the information we have gathered and the contacts made are very useful. We need to find easier ways of engaging our volunteers with this.

• We now understand the value of piloting new projects to ensure their relevance to our local community and to evaluate likely outcomes. We have already applied this knowledge to other projects.

• While many of the people we met knew about some of the projects TBG has initiated, many did not actually recognise the name Transition Bro Gwaun or were confused by what it meant, and most did not have a clear idea of our overall remit and what we stand for. We need to continue working on this.
6. General considerations for future projects

The progress of “Getting There” usefully highlighted some issues that need to be considered before undertaking a behaviour change project. CBSM is a flexible and adaptable model, powerful at effecting grassroots change at community level. Like all behaviour change models, it does require preparation before action; however this effort pays off in terms of designing an intervention that is more likely to be effective and deliver the desired results.

In the current project, although the extent of necessary background research was underestimated, partly because some of our assumptions on background knowledge did not hold true, CBSM led us to identify a target behaviour. This model also helped us narrow down to lift sharing for the commuting journey to Haverfordwest as a candidate action, as this regular journey was the greatest single contributor to carbon emissions. This seemed valid enough rationale, even at the risk of not reaching everyone in the community.

However the next step, matching target achievability with our available resources, was not taken as the second round focus groups were cancelled. Therefore potential interventions were planned but their feasibility requires validation.

What did become clear was that CBSM requires significant background work and monitoring. This, in turn, requires more structured support and/or more time than we had available. Given adequate planning and support, a CBSM project should be expected to achieve results in a local community and with volunteer organisations.

One of this project’s aims was to explore the possibility of employing CBSM within a voluntary context to effect behaviour change. Through the experience acquired with travel behaviour, we expected to design similar projects for different target behaviours.

Voluntary groups can be flexible, adaptable and willing to engage. They have great potential as their members are genuinely interested in their local areas. They also have the advantage of knowing their local area, population and habits. Naturally, volunteers will have variable backgrounds and levels of training, for any particular project. Therefore, additional guidance may be necessary for the particular requirements of a new project; this can be addressed by establishing a local support structure (e.g. someone familiar with the chosen method) to support the volunteers during the implementation of the project. For example, community volunteer groups may not be geared for unguided research as they may lack resources and relevant training. However, with appropriate local guidance
for research and implementation, they can still achieve quality research and evidence based intervention. This is both achievable and desirable as it can equip the group with useful skills for further projects.

“Getting There” would have benefited greatly if more time was available to spend on (i) discussing and understanding the CBSM model in more detail, and what the necessary steps entail, in terms of information, time, resources and commitment; (ii) identifying relevant local resources, such as numbers and expertise of volunteers, and distribution of duties; (iii) gathering background information to help understand the target audience, their composition and habits, in order to make better sense of what travel behaviours to target. These steps are fundamental for any behaviour change approach and therefore must be established before a structured pilot project could be designed.

Such issues are best discussed and defined at project design stage. Although time may not always be available, clarifying roles and expectations from all involved parties at project planning stage will best align volunteers’ contributions and project objectives. This allows for a better match between available resources on the one hand, and the behaviour change programme research and implementation needs on the other. In case of mismatch, the group may draft in additional resources, or modify the project focus.

Perhaps one way of facilitating this, would be to have a subject presentation by someone active in the chosen methodology, during the planning/design stage of the project, so as to clarify the scope, resources, responsibilities and roles. This way all parties would gain clearer understanding of the scope and possibilities of the project and outcomes, what needs to be done, and who can contribute what to the design and implementation of the project. This would also bring the group to a better position at the start of the actual project time, maximise partners’ contribution and involvement, and reduce potential confusion and uncertainties.

The key ingredient to resolve much of the above is time, and therefore an early start and good understanding of the project at planning stage is strongly recommended. The current initiative of EW to provide support for a preliminary project which explores the potential for a broader intervention is commendable and in the right direction.

Whatever the preferred approach, a successful structure and implementation of projects of the breadth of “Getting There” is possible, and positive results should reasonably be expected. Perhaps a useful way of approaching this is, not the cost -in time or other resources- of taking action for the implementation of a community CBSM project; but, rather, the cost of inaction in terms of accumulating problems, community breakdown and environmental impacts.
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8. Appendix

a) School Questionnaire
Designed for administration by school students as part of their environmental education and under guidance of the relevant teacher.

Are you in work? yes / no
Where is the workplace? ____________________________________________
How far is it to your workplace? (miles-estimate) _______________________
How do you usually get to work?
*Walking
*Bicycle
*Motorbike
*Car-as-driver
*Car-as-passenger
*Bus
*Train
*Other Public transport
Why do you choose this way of making this journey? ______________________
Where do you do your main food shopping? ______________________________
How do you usually get to your shopping destination?
*Walking
*Bicycle
*Motorbike
*Car-as-driver
*Car-as-passenger
*Bus
*Train
*Other
How far is it to your shopping destination? (miles-estimate) _________________
Why do you choose this way of making this journey? _______________________
Where do you do your day-to-day shopping? ________________________________
How do you usually get to your shopping destination?
*Walking
*Bicycle
*Motorbike
*Car-as-driver
*Car-as-passenger
*Bus
*Train
*Other
How far is it to your shopping destination? (miles-estimate) _________________
Why do you choose this way of making this journey? _______________________
Where else do you go regularly? _________________________________________
How do you make this journey? _________________________________________
*Walking
*Bicycle
*Motorbike
*Car-as-driver
*Car-as-passenger
*Bus
*Train
*Other (please write in)

**Why do you choose this way of making this journey?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use a car or van...</th>
<th>...as a driver?</th>
<th>... as a passenger?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-7 times a week</td>
<td>6-7 times a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 times a week</td>
<td>3-5 times a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less often</td>
<td>less often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often do you use a bus?**

- 6-7 times a week
- 3-5 times a week
- 1-2 times a week
- 1-2 times a month
- less often
- never

**How often do you use a train?**

- 6-7 times a week
- 3-5 times a week
- 1-2 times a week
- 1-2 times a month
- less often
- never

Name of village or postcode ____________________________  Sex ____________

Motor vehicle ownership: Do you own any of the following? (select all that apply)

- Car
- van
- motorcycle
- bicycle

**What is the car engine size?**

Less than 1000cc / 1000-1400cc / 1400-1800cc / more than 1800cc

Education level:

- *No formal qualifications
- * GCSE/ O-Level
- * A-Level/ Higher/ BTEC
- * Vocational/ NVQ
- * Degree or equivalent
- * Postgraduate qualification
- * Other (please write in:_______________)

RESEARCHER id (number or other identifier to be handled by supervisor)__________
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### b) Community Questionnaire

#### Getting There: Travel in the Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth is the top priority, even when it comes at the expense of environmental damage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **What is the purpose of your most frequent Journey? (include journeys to work, if appropriate)**

- **How far is that journey?**
- **What is the destination of that journey?**
  - Miles
  - Name of place:

- **How many times a week do you make that journey?**

- **How do you normally make that journey?** (tick)
  - Walk
  - Bicycle
  - Bus
  - Motorcycle
  - Car / van as passenger
  - Car / van as driver
  - Other (please specify)

- **Why do you choose this method of transport for this journey?**

- **What prevents you making this journey in other ways?**

- **Where do you normally do your main shopping?**
  - Town:
  - Shops:

- **Why do you choose to shop there?**

- **How far is the journey to these shops for you?**
  - Miles

- **How many times a week do you make that journey?**

- **How do you normally make that journey?** (tick)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Car / van as passenger</th>
<th>Car / van as driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why do you choose this method of transport for this journey?**

---

**What prevents you making this journey in other ways?**

---

**Where do you do your day to day shopping?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town:</th>
<th>Shops:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If different from above, why?**

---

**Where else do you go regularly?**

---

**How far is that journey?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many times a week do you make that journey?**

---

**How do you normally make that journey? (tick)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Motorcycle</th>
<th>Car / van as passenger</th>
<th>Car / van as driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why do you choose this method of transport for this journey?**
What prevents you making this journey in other ways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use a bus? (tick)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 times a week or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you use a train?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 times a week or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you own any of the following? (tick all that apply)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle engine size (main vehicle)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The environmental legacy we leave behind us is more important than our economic prosperity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postcode:

Do you consider yourself to live in a:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Rural location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Gender (tick)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
<th>80-89</th>
<th>90+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is the highest level of academic or vocational qualification you have attained so far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No formal qualifications</th>
<th>GCSE / O’ Level</th>
<th>A’ Level / Higher / Btec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational / NVQ</td>
<td>Degree or equivalent</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)

Would you be willing to take part in a discussion group as part of this study? If yes, please give your contact details to the researcher.

Yes

No

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire, your input is really valued and will help to inform efforts to make our community more sustainable for the future.

If you would like to become involved in the work of Transition Bro Gwaun, please give your contact details to the researcher.
22\textsuperscript{nd} Nov 2011

Dear […]

Thank you for agreeing to take part in our ‘Getting There’ project discussion group that will take place on

Saturday 26\textsuperscript{th} Nov at…………………………………………………………

The venue is upstairs at the West Wales Arts Centre (also known as Café Celf), adjacent to HSBC bank in Fishguard.

If you have any questions, please contact me on 078[…]

With thanks,

[…]
d) Market stall survey and invitation

Do you live in Fishguard/Goodwick? Do you travel regularly to Haverfordwest? Would you share a lift with someone from the local community?

We are looking into establishing a local lift-sharing scheme. We want to see what people who travel frequently think about:

- **offering lifts** to people from the local community or
- **accepting lifts** from people from the local community.

A Pembrokeshire County Council survey in November 2011 found that 45% of you thought that it is “important” or “very important” to car share. Sharing a return car journey daily could save you up to £858 and 1 tonne CO₂ per year (source: liftshare.com). The AA in a recent survey found that 1 in 5 of their members now car share regularly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever offered a lift to someone?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you be prepared to try offering a lift to someone to or from Haverfordwest area?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give one reason why you would:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give one reason why you would rather not:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would motivate you to start organising lifts to/from Haverfordwest?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are positive to the idea, what would be your preferred way of organising lifts? (choose one or more):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via a website</td>
<td>By telephone</td>
<td>Via smart phone application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With compliments,
Transition Bro Gwaun
SHARE YOUR VIEWS!

If you are interested in participating in a local focus group on 21 January to discuss these issues? If so, please leave your details with our volunteer and we shall contact you to confirm your availability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With compliments,
Transition Bro Gwaun
e) Experiential notes from involved TBG members

Several volunteers were motivated by and involved with the project; we thus thought it useful to include some of their personal reflections, to better understand their engagement with the project. These comments were collected anonymously around the middle stages of the project, and reflect a broad range of opinions; these are included below without further processing.

- Getting There has made a considerable impact on the developing transport debate in North Pembrokeshire. It has raised many questions, not always the expected ones, but always challenging. Whether or not the project achieves change in public attitudes and behaviour regarding transport, it is already achieving a higher profile for transport issues locally, which is very positive.

- I was daunted by the prospect of cold calling to invite residents to participate in focus groups. I was surprised at the level of interest in the topic, even though few knew of TBG.

- Good and easy communication between those active in any project is vital for the avoidance of confusion. The use of email as a main communication tool is fraught with difficulties, even though those involved are spread over 100 miles. Extra meetings have been necessary to gain clarity over tricky or disputed areas of work and responsibility.

- Partner organisations have not been able to contribute as much to the project as had been hoped; this may be because their contribution had not been adequately clarified at the outset.

- The timescale for this project had been squeezed because of the short lead time following the grant offer. This resulted in insufficient clarity on certain areas of the project proposal. A major new opportunity which emerged after the project had started, involving the secondary school, had to be rushed and did not therefore deliver its full potential.

- This research project would have benefited from a minimum of a six month preparation period, made possible by knowledge that a grant would be forthcoming, prior to any commencement which would then have needed a minimum of a further six months delivery time.

- I have been involved with this project since its inception. I am increasingly unsure as to whether it was a wise choice because I have no relevant experience or training, but wanted to help make it happen. In spite of guidance from Environment Wales I find, even at this stage, it difficult to form a clear picture in my mind as to how it will be drawn together by the researcher. Perhaps this is inevitable in doing something which is quite new to most of us. Recently, it has become apparent that [...] is not confident that the project is meeting the needs of the funders and this is obviously unsettling to us all. Obviously, we want to feel confident that the time that we devote to the project is well spent, and our partners need to be similarly confident. We have hitherto had a successful relationship with Environment Wales, and we should not put that at risk. I think it is important that all of the TBG sub-group members be copied in to all email messages relating to planning and strategic issues. I welcome the decision to extend the time available for the project.
• I will be interested to see how the interventions pan out. I think the targeted behaviour is valid and the intervention makes perfect sense, but I wonder if, when it comes to it, people will find convenient excuses to carry on as they are. Maybe that's a little too cynical.... I certainly hope so.

• It was at times difficult to align one's desire for academic integrity in a research project with the reality of what could actually be achieved by a small, though highly committed group of volunteers. I have a nagging doubt that we may have somehow failed to capture some segments of our community in our surveys and focus groups - the school runners being the obvious example. On the other hand, it could genuinely be that people don't see the school run as a discreet journey, but rather, tie it in with the trip to work.

• All that said, it was heartening to meet and work with people locally who are so committed to making a difference in their community. Too many people these days criticise 'the way things are' but never lift a finger to change them. Hats off to the group I say for having a go!

(anonymous comments by TBG volunteers and members of the steering group)