#### **Outline of Information and Consultation Process & Timescale**

# Joint Trade Unions Group (15<sup>th</sup> January)

*Essential User Car Allowance* - Noted: Employer concerns over the level of car use amongst this group after analysis of 2 years data. Intention to develop a solution based on mileage threshold for allowance and mileage/trips constraints for car parking. Agreed to set up meeting with Unions to take consultation forward.

## Union Meeting (28<sup>th</sup> Jan)

No minutes. Detail of the historic claims were shared. Broad support was received for principles of review (i.e. equity of allowances), although this did not extend to the individual outcomes.

# DMT Meetings (Fin 18<sup>th</sup> Feb; E&P 19<sup>th</sup> Feb; Com 19<sup>th</sup> Feb; City 25<sup>th</sup> Feb)

A paper was taken to each of the affected DMT meetings to outline the principles for the review and proposed process and timescales.

# HoS Meetings (26<sup>th</sup> Feb – 17<sup>th</sup> March)

All Heads of Service reviewed historical mileage claims for 2006/07 and 2007/08 for all existing Essential Users in the service. On the basis of individuals claimed mileage, comparison of post holders in the same post, and management knowledge and understanding of the role demands, decisions on classification were made against the 1000 miles eligibility criteria. This process has been replicated for all staff at all levels of the organisation (i.e. NJC and JNC posts).

# Joint Trade Unions Group (12<sup>th</sup> March)

*Essential Car User* - DS stated further to the outline brief given to the TU's in January 2009 and data reviewed since that time. Meetings were now scheduled with affected users over the next two weeks to discuss the next stage of the review and for an opportunity to discuss feedback. TU's would attend meetings as scheduled. TU's requested equality analysis of review CF to provide

# Employee Meetings (24<sup>th</sup> March – 7<sup>th</sup> April)

Employees were informed of the background and drivers for the review; the process undertaken to date; the proposed processes to inform affected staff formally and notice period; and the process and grounds to request a review of the decision to remove the allowance. Union representatives were invited to all meetings and were present at most meetings.

# Union Collective Disputes Request (Received 8<sup>th</sup> April)

The Unison Branch Secretary submitted a written request to raise issues with the review of the essential car user allowance under the Collective Disputes Procedure. In line with the Collective Disputes Procedure both sides agreed that this would be taken to the Joint Staff Employer Forum (JSEF) for resolution, and the implementation of the review was delayed to allow this process.

# Union Meeting – Wash Up (16<sup>th</sup> April)

To review items raised and outcomes of employee feedback (see Appendix C). It was agreed following discussion with the Executive Councillor to take this item to JSEF.

# JSEF (28<sup>th</sup> April)

The review background and proposals were outlined and Unions presented their response, highlighting perceived problems with the process and unintended consequences and that the review had omitted links to the green agenda. Members of staff present were also allowed to make points.

Members sought clarity on the proposals and debated the impact of the changes on staff. Points discussed included: Staff currently not taking up available green options (e.g. streetcar); Role duties requiring travel (e.g. out of hours calls; short notice; carrying equipment); personal cars could still be used for work and mileage reimbursed; staff were no longer contractually required to provide a car; the Single Status travel arrangements provided for a review every two years, with staff becoming ineligible being given 6 months notice; other authorities have made similar changes and staff have adjusted to them; and that there is no formal right of appeal, staff would be able to request a review at which their circumstances would be considered. A review would also be available if a post changed significantly.

Cllr Cantrill stated that he is comfortable with the changes and the safeguards included such as the right to a review. He suggested that, without measurable criteria, such as mileage, any scheme will be open to subjectivity and allegations of unfairness. In response to suggestions that a fixed mileage target is likely to result in increased car use, Cllr Cantrill stated that a green travel plan is in place and any suggestions for improvements would be welcomed.

# Union Meeting (30<sup>th</sup> April)

Following JSEF, the Executive Councillor held a further meeting with the Unions to discuss their concerns further and explain the next steps following consideration of the issues raised.

At the meeting, it was agreed to investigate additional transport options the Council may be able to establish, to expand the provision of suitable alternatives to the use of private cars. Where feasible, the intention was to have these in place as soon as reasonably practicable in 2009/10.

## Alternative Travel Options Meetings (5<sup>th</sup> April to 4<sup>th</sup> June)

Discussions were held with relevant stakeholders to research and understand the viability of different potential alternative travel options. Stakeholders were invited to form a working group to take this forward.

#### Notice of Change to Essential User Classification (11<sup>th</sup> May) [Appendix A]

Letters informing affected staff of the change to the car user classification and process/data used to make this decision were issued to staff. The letter confirmed the eligibility criterion, the impact of the classification on car parking passes and about the process to request a review of the classification decision.

# Joint Trade Unions Group (21<sup>st</sup> May)

*Essential Car Users* - Noted deadline for staff to request a review is Friday 29 May. Many responses received appear to raise objections rather than request a review. LB requested that the Casual users also be reviewed to see if any have reached the 1000miles per annum limit. CF stated that data not received as 1000 miles on original criteria. CF to investigate. DS to provide a response to letters received after the deadline.

# Request a Review Process (29<sup>th</sup> May)

Employees intending to request to review were asked to submit their intention to request in writing (e-mail accepted) to Deborah Simpson, Head of Human Resources prior to 12 Noon Friday 29<sup>th</sup> May 2009. This request should indicate the grounds under which the request was made. 39 responses had been received, 11 of which had asked for a review. The remainder stated objection to the changes and raised issues similar to those raised at the April JSEF meeting. All responses received an individual e-mail response, responding to the particular points raised in their evidence and stating the mileage claims records on which the decision was based (e-mail sent 19<sup>th</sup> June – template response in appendix B).

# Travel Plan Steering Group (3<sup>rd</sup> June)

Update on Essential Users - CF reported that letters had gone out to employees and DS and CF are now dealing with the responses. It may be that we need to provide pool cars and Streetcar may be an option for this.

# Meeting with Unison (10<sup>th</sup> June)

Unison requested a further meeting with Human Resources to discuss concerns. At the meeting they proposed to hold further discussions with members which may lead to suggestions for supplementary criteria to the 1000 miles criterion and to produce a statement of ongoing concerns. HR agreed to consider any further points Unions may raise as part of the review process.

# Alternative Travel Working Group (18<sup>th</sup> June)

A working group was set up to consider alternative travel options for affected members of staff. At the first meeting the group established terms, discussed the issues and agreed to utilise a survey to affected staff to understand their travel intentions.

# Joint Trade Unions Group (25<sup>th</sup> June)

*Essential Car User* - Noted letters sent in May with 38 responses. DS to review evidence submitted after 26 June deadline. Noted two posts already moved back to Essential User status. Officer group considering alternative travel options. LB to report back on Union staff consultations on alternative criteria.

# **Request a Review Process (26<sup>th</sup> June - present)**

The original deadline for supporting evidence was the 26<sup>th</sup> June. All evidence was considered by the Head of Human Resources. A flexible approach was taken and those that had been declined had been able to provide more information so that the decision could be looked at again. Since June a stream of additional requests have been received and have or are being considered. Alternative Travel Options Survey (15th July) [Appendix C]

The Travel Intentions survey was distributed to all Heads of Service of staff affected by the review, to enable local distribution and approaches to completion.

The survey was also used to recognise concerns regarding entitlement to car parking. In order to satisfy these concerns about car parking passes, a clarification note from the Executive Councillor for Strategy and Resources on this matter was included, this read:

"In response, the Executive Councillor indicated that while it is not possible to give an absolute guarantee, that there certainly was not any intention to immediately review or remove employee car parking provision, and there would be a commitment not to undertake a further corporate review of role based employee eligibility to car parking pass entitlement prior to April 2013. However, this assurance is given with the caveat that a review of how car parking is organised and charged corporately to services (not individuals) may occur or commence within this period."

# Joint Trade Unions Group (23<sup>rd</sup> July)

*Essential Car User* - Noted there had been 11 requests for a review currently 3 approved, 3 declined having not met the criteria and 5 requested to supply further information for assessment. Noted: Working Group had been set up to investigate alternative travel options in line with commitments made to unions. Group developed intentions survey distributed to all affected users at local level.

# Travel Plan Steering Group (14<sup>th</sup> August)

Update on Essential Users - CF reported that a survey had been sent to all relevant staff to ascertain their future transport needs if they are not willing to use their cars as casual users. The next steps are developing alternatives.

# Joint Trade Unions Group (20<sup>th</sup> August)

*Essential Car User* - Update provided on progress of review and 'requests to review' outcomes. Travel intentions survey distributed - working group will consider responses. Noted:

- 'Request a review' process is not an appeals process under Grievance Procedure
- Employers have not received any submission to consider alternative allowance criteria from Unions.
- Unions agreed to support completion of the Travel Intentions Survey by employees

# JSEF (25<sup>th</sup> August)

Update provided on process and progress since April JSEF meeting (as above). Points of clarification were confirmed and Unions restated their position that mileage should not be the only criterion, and that a meeting would be arranged with HR to feedback information.

# Alternative Travel Options Working Group (4<sup>th</sup> Sept)

The working group considered the results from the Travel Intentions survey. A summary found that:

- Response rate of approximately 40%;
- 50% would continue to use their own cars;
- Personal bikes, pool bikes and pool cars were popular alternatives.

Based on the analysis and consideration of the response rates, the group agreed travel requirements and generated business cases for potential options. Comparing the costs and benefits of the options, the group recommended that the Council:

- purchase a single cargo pool bike and monitor use
- hire two 'sole use', (i.e. Council employees use only) Streetcars for a trial period of 6-months at Queen Anne Terrace.

Note: Streetcar was selected on the basis that it provides a number of benefits over and above the use of lease cars. These were that the Council will have two cars available with an established booking system and process already in place. The 'sole use' provision is backed up by the 'public use' provision that already exists within Cambridge, which can deal with any peaks in demand and is booked through the same system. The streetcar system can also provide in-depth management information on levels of usage and occupancy to better inform future provision.

The group recommended a 6-month trial period, as the survey response rate (40%) meant that while the information gathered provided an indication of travel intentions, we could not make any precise conclusions on levels of demand. To establish long-term car lease deal could have resulted in commitment to over provision and hence unnecessary cost. The usage data over the 6-month period will be monitored to ensure a better understanding of the Council's actual requirements and pattern of use to inform decisions on future provision.

# Joint Trade Unions Group (22<sup>nd</sup> September)

Minutes not available. Unions were informed of the working groups recommendations and that the provision would be funded by the Employee Travel Plan for the 6-month trial period, although mileage over 30 miles which incurs an additional cost will be recharged to services. Ongoing provision would be recharged. Confirmed that 6 staff that have been put back onto Essential Car User Allowance have all done so by meeting the 1000 miles criterion.

# Alternative Travel Options Working Group (18th Sept)

The group were informed of the acceptance of their recommendations. Then discussed the practical arrangements of ensuring the provision was in place (i.e. agreeing delivery of the cars with Streetcar; ensuring car park spaces available, with appropriate signage; consideration of equipment lockers on the car park site).

# **Travel Plan Steering Group (5<sup>th</sup> October)**

The travel plan group were updated on the progress (as above). The group agreed the existing 'cargo bike' could be moved to Hobson House courtyard to meet the demand established. The Cycling Officer would monitor usage to inform if further provision was required, and if other cargo trailers would be appropriate to feed into the 6-month review of provision.

# **Current Status (6th October)**

Further requests to review have been received and are in the process of being considered. Delivery has been agreed with Streetcar. Communication about the alternative travel options for staff is being prepared.

11<sup>th</sup> May 2009

<Name> <Service> Hand Delivered

Dear

Human Resources

#### Change to Essential Car User Classification

Further to the recent employee briefings, I am writing to inform you of the outcome of the Essential Car User Allowance Review and the impact on your post.

The recent employee briefings raised a number of pertinent issues and these have been discussed further with the Council's Trade Unions. The Unions raised these issues with Members through the Joint Staff Employee Forum (JSEF).

The JSEF meeting was held on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2009. The Executive Councillor for Customer Services and Resources attended the JSEF meeting. Following consideration of the points raised, a further meeting was held with the Trade Unions. Human Resources have now confirmed that the review criterion will be as set out below.

Post holders must be reasonably expected to undertake at least 1000 business journey car miles every financial year to deliver the duties of the role (and the duties could not be effectively and efficiently achieved using other transport means).

As part of the review process, Heads of Service considered mileage claims data for two financial years claims (2006/07 and 2007/08), alongside knowledge of post duties against the 1000 miles criterion to determine post classification.<sup>1</sup>

In the review process, your post was identified as not meeting the required mileage criterion to continue to be eligible to receive the Essential Car User Allowance. Your post has therefore been reclassified as being a Casual Car User.

Under the terms of the Council's Travel Allowances Policy (Appendix 6 of the Single Status Agreement), you are entitled to 6-months notice of the change to travel category after re-assessment. You will continue to receive the Essential Car User Lump Sum Allowance (currently £906 per annum) for 6 months from the date of this letter, until 10<sup>th</sup> November 2009<sup>2</sup> and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In case of multiple post holders in posts, decisions were based on all post holders mileage claims and consideration of differences in the nature and duties of the roles that may explain any variation in mileage claims.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Subject to remaining in your current post.

reimbursement for business journeys by car will be at the Essential User mileage rate (currently 37.1 pence per mile)

The change to your car user classification will take effect at the end of this 6month period. From 11<sup>th</sup> November 2009 you will no longer receive the Essential Car User Allowance lump sum. This will be reflected in your November pay (24<sup>th</sup> Nov 2009). In the future you will be reimbursed for all claimed business journey mileage undertaken by car under the Casual Car User mileage rate (currently 47.7 pence per mile).

#### Car Park Passes with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> November 2009

The requirement to be an Essential Car User to obtain a car-park pass is being removed as part of the review. Provision of car-park passes will be based on separate criteria relating to the duties of the role. At present we are drafting separate qualification criteria for Car Park Passes to ensure consistent and fair application across the Council. These criteria will likely include criteria relating to: the need to make regular multiple short trips in the day on most working days; a regular need to promptly attend the site of incidents or emergencies; regular late or lone working requirements of the post; the frequent need to carry heavy equipment or passengers; and where alternative travel options are not available or suitable [The final criteria will be communicated once these have been finalised].

Employees that continue to provide a private car for work to undertake duties, which meet the car park pass criteria will receive a car park pass, subject to Heads of Service agreement that the private car use is a more effective operational method of undertaking the role.

Please note: Indications from discussions with Heads of Service based on the provisional criteria listed above, have indicated that the impact of this change will not affect many former essential users affected by this review, based upon current role demands and alternative travel options available. Once final criteria are agreed, any employees affected will be informed and provided with reasonable notice.

Further to issues raised during the review, I am currently working with some Heads of Service to investigate additional transport options the Council may be able to establish, to expand the provision of suitable alternatives to the use of private cars. Where feasible, the intention is to have these in place as soon as reasonably practicable in 2009/10.

While the Travel Allowance Policy allows no right of appeal, the review has included a process by which employees may request a review of the reclassification. Details of the process are outlined in the attached document **'Right to Request a Review'**.

Yours sincerely

Chris Fagan Pay and Reward Manager

Copies to: Personal File

#### Essential Car User Allowance Right to Request a Review

As part of the review consultation, it was noted that some employees had not necessarily claimed all business journey car mileage, and in other cases the duties of the role and hence travel requirements had changed significantly since the reference claims period. To recognise this and ensure consistent application of the criteria, it was agreed that employees affected by the review in such a situation would be provided with an opportunity to request a review of the decision to reclassify their post. A request will be considered where an employee affected by the review either:

- Option 1. Requests that the level of claimed mileage in 2008/09 should be taken into account where this is will demonstrate that they have met the 1000 miles criteria); or
- Option 2. Supplies evidence of monthly car mileage undertaken alongside relevant additional information to demonstrate that they have sufficiently met the 1000 miles criteria.

In both cases the Head of Service must certify this evidence as being an accurate and realistic record of travel requirements of the post.

#### Notes on Evidence:

- Requests under option 1 should include all submitted mileage claims in 2008/09, with a summary sheet of total business journey car mileage.
- Evidence provided under option 2, should indicate journeys undertaken by car, distance, purpose, date and time of journeys (i.e. equivalent of monthly travel claim, with additional supporting information).
- Where evidence of mileage is supplied under option 2, the evidence should normally cover a period of two consecutive financial years (either 2006/07 & 2007/08; or 2007/08 & 2008/09). Where this is not possible, clear reasons should be stated.
- Where there have been significant changes in the duties of the post that have affected travel requirements of the post, the date and nature of the change should be outlined and mileage clearly evidenced from this date.
- As the allowance is post based, multiple post occupants will be considered together. An individual that feels that their case is different to other post holders in the same role should clearly indicate this rationale in their evidence.

- Employees should clearly outline any factors that may have additionally affected mileage claims during the reference period chosen (e.g. significant periods of leave or absence (i.e. long-term absence; maternity leave).
- Employees may wish to additionally indicate any further material factors that they feel may apply.

#### Process

Employees intending to follow a request to review should submit their intention to request in writing (e-mail accepted) to Deborah Simpson, Head of Human Resources prior to 12 Noon Friday 29<sup>th</sup> May 2009. This should indicate which option '1' or '2' the request will fall under. *Note: at this time no evidence for the request is required*.

Employees should ensure that their supporting evidence is clearly documented and certified by their Head of Service prior to 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009. This should be sent to the Head of Human Resources by this date.

All requests will be considered before 31<sup>st</sup> October 2009.

#### Appendix B – Template Response to Requests/Objections Received

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the review of the Essential Car User Allowance.

In response to the points you raise:

You indicated the Unions were not involved in the review or consulted. Unions were initially informed of the review and the intention to undertake a mileage based review at the Joint Trade Unions Group (JTUG) meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2009. A follow-up meeting (28<sup>th</sup> Jan) with Unions representatives was held to outline the review principles and mileage claim details on which the review would be based were shared.

Further to these meetings, Unions have been: regularly informed of progress of the review at monthly JTUG meetings; provided with equality analysis of the impacts; and invited to all employee briefings. Throughout the process all comments, concerns and suggestions raised by the Unions and individual employees have been considered.

A request under the Collective Disputes Procedure was received from the Unions following the conclusion of the Employee Meetings. In line with the Collective Disputes Procedure both sides agreed that this would be taken to the Joint Staff Employer Forum (JSEF) for resolution, and the implementation of the review was delayed to allow this process. Following JSEF, the Executive Councillor held a further meeting with the Unions to explain the next steps following consideration of the issues raised.

Since implementation of notice, we have continued to inform Unions of developments and aimed to ensure an ongoing dialogue.

Unison requested a further meeting (10<sup>th</sup> June), following which they propose to hold further discussions with members which may lead to suggestions for supplementary criteria to the 1000 miles criterion and to produce a statement of ongoing concerns.

HR have agreed to consider any further points Unions may raise as part of the review process.

The process of the review was undertaken within the remit and terms of the Travel Allowances Policy, agreed as part of the Single Status Agreement in 2004. The agreement provides for the City Council to give 6 months notice to remove the Essential Car User Allowance after reclassification of the post.

"All travel categorisations will be subject to a review every two years or when the post changes," and "Changes to travel category after review or re-assessment will be implemented by giving at least six months notice to the postholder of the change. There will be no travel protection payments for those moving from essential to casual user."

As a collective agreement, the Single Status Agreement forms part of employees' terms and conditions of employment. There is no requirement under the Single Status Agreement to undertake consultation on the change to classification of a post and employees affected by reclassification of the post will automatically be transferred to the new travel classification. There is also no right of appeal against this change to travel categorisation.

However, we have undertaken to ensure employees are informed about the review through group meetings and additionally introduced a mechanism for employees to request a review of the classification. Where a post is reclassified as a Casual Car User under the terms of the Single Status Agreement, the individual's contractual obligation to provide a car at work for work purposes is removed. The Essential Car User status is replaced by the Casual Car User Status, this states:

"This post has been classified as a Casual car user, you are sometimes required to travel on Council business to undertake the duties of your post and that it is deemed desirable for you to provide a vehicle for this purpose.

If you are successfully appointed you will be required to inform your insurance company that you will be using your vehicle for business use and to provide us with copies of your current insurance and driving license."

While this Casual Car User categorisation may 'sometimes' require travel by car on business, Casual Users are not contractually obliged to continuously provide a car at work for these purposes. Alternative arrangements may be used on the occasions where travel is required.

Many Local Authorities operate their Green Book Essential User Schemes based purely upon mileage criteria, and the national scheme is based upon calculations at 8500 miles. While the review considered other mileage thresholds, the 2003 scheme review established that a 1000 miles criterion was appropriate for an authority the size of Cambridge City Council, that determination was not altered by this review. You suggest that as a single criterion the 1000 miles will now represent a target and a disincentive to greener travel options.

It is recognised that there may initially be an increase in mileage claims, as many employees have indicated during the review that they have not claimed all or any mileage previously. The request a review process was introduced to deal with individuals that may have met the 1000 miles criterion with such claims.

Many employees are committed to greater sustainable travel and the Council has already established a range of incentives for greener business travel to support this. We are continuing to investigate and introduce new options, and through the Employee Travel Plan, may be able to fund further expansion of these alternatives.

Mileage claim levels and working practices will be monitored on an ongoing basis, at an individual level by managers, to ensure that existing good practice is maintained and built upon and to ensure against potential overuse of the car user schemes. You mention that the review should be widened to include additional criteria relating to post travel requirements (e.g. carrying equipment; lone working; health and safety) as opposed to the single mileage criterion.

The review recognised there were role requirements, including those you have stated, which are facilitated by the provision of a car at work and can't always be undertaken easily and/or safely by foot or bike. It was determined that it was also important to ensure that where such duties existed, employees were not disadvantaged operationally or placed at additional risk.

As a result, the review considered both car parking criteria and alternative travel options. To support the continued delivery of tasks using cars, with minimal changes to individuals work practices, the review proposed to establish agreed criteria to allow posts with such requirements to retain car park provision after removal of the allowance, where the post holder uses their car as a casual user. Previously passes would have been removed upon reclassification of a post as Casual User.

Employees continuing to use their own personal car for work purposes will be reimbursed at the Casual Car User mileage rate. This rate is considered to be reasonable reimbursement for the costs of running a car, while maintaining the organisations commitment to an affordable and sustainable cost of travel that supports environmental objectives. Analysis of motoring costs to support this view was undertaken for JSEF in August 2008.

The analysis undertaken in this review identified a large number of existing essential users with low mileage claim levels. This revealed potential issues of equity and fairness in reward when compared to other groups of workers (i.e. Casual Car Users) who also undertake some duties using personal cars.

These findings suggested it would become increasingly difficult to justify the continued recognition of such travel requirements through the provision of a substantial financial allowance. Therefore it was hard to validate continued classification of such posts as an Essential User with provision of an allowance, on grounds of equity.

It is recognised that the provision of a personal car at work may often be a very effective method to deliver aspects of the role, but that it is not necessarily always the most efficient option for the organisation corporately, especially where the Essential User Allowance is in payment and mileage is low.

Likewise, continuing to 'require' individuals to provide a personal car at work and to decline access to alternative schemes (e.g. season ticket loan), where changes to working practices and low mileage indicates this is not as essential, does not fit with the Employee Travel Plan and reinforces car use.

The review has drawn attention to the appropriateness of the existing alternative travel options and their ability to meet work certain demands. This information is being used to inform what further provision is required to meet these role requirements for employees choosing not to use a personal car for work purposes.

In addition to the existing alternatives:

- Provision of Pool Bikes
- Personal Bike Mileage (42.9 pence per mile)
- Streetcar membership

The Employee Travel Plan Steering Group is currently considering additional options that meet identified gaps in this current provision. These potentially include:

- Improving the accessibility to pool bikes;
- Introducing new pool bikes with equipment storage facility (currently one bike available for trial by services, contact David Bradford for further information); and
- Investing in sole use 'Streetcar' to ensure greater availability; or
- Investing in a Council owned fleet of Green Pool Cars.

It is hoped that development of further options will allow all employees affected by the review to continue to perform their duties effectively and efficiently.

Your claimed mileage for the years 2006/07 and 2007/08 were xxxx miles and xxxx miles respectively.

Your claimed mileage for the year 2008/09 was xxxx miles.

If you wish to progress with a review you will need to supply documented evidence of monthly car mileage undertaken alongside relevant additional information to demonstrate that you have sufficiently met the 1000 miles criteria. Please read the 'Right to Request a Review' document (see attached). You should ensure that all evidence supporting your request is certified by your Head of Service and that you send it to the Head of Human Resources prior to 26<sup>th</sup> June 2009.

Please note: As the allowance is post based, multiple post occupants will be considered together. If you believe your travel requirements are notably different to other post holders in the same role as you, you must clearly state this in your evidence and provide rationale for this view in your evidence.

The review process will aim to complete assessment of your claim as soon as possible. All requests will be considered prior to 31<sup>st</sup> October 2009. If you have not received a response by this date, please contact me immediately.

## Appendix C – Travel Intentions Survey

#### **Essential User Survey**

#### Background

The Essential User allowance is being reviewed, and notice of reclassification of posts has been sent to employees in posts affected by the review. The consultation process has given valuable feedback, which is currently being considered by an officer group, which is looking at travel alternatives.

It is recognised that some employees have concerns regarding the affect of the changes on their ability to undertake their role. At an early stage it was recognised that car parking could form an important element of the review and the car-parking pass has been separated from the allowance. However, feedback has highlighted that some employees have concerns that the car park passes may be reviewed next.

In order to allay these concerns, clarification has been sought from the Executive Councillor for Strategy and Resources on this matter.

In response, the Executive Councillor indicated that while it is not possible to give an absolute guarantee, that there certainly was not any intention to immediately review or remove employee car parking provision, and there would be a commitment not to undertake a further corporate review of role based employee eligibility to car parking pass entitlement prior to April 2013. However, this assurance is given with the caveat that a review of how car parking is organised and charged corporately to services (not individuals) may occur or commence within this period. I hope this goes some way to satisfy any concerns you may have about car parking passes.

# The Survey

The working group have been tasked to identify and specify the alternative travel options required. It is clear that as part of this process we need to establish which travel modes are required and to what volume in order to estimate numbers of vehicles required.

The group therefore are seeking the help and assistance of employees in completing the following short questionnaire, to gain understanding of your travel intentions and preferences to establish level of demand for the alternative options if your Essential User allowance is removed. This information will be used to identify a volume and cost for each alternative.

Given the above information as an Employee affected by the review, we hope that you will actively engage in this process, and would appreciate your honest answers. Please respond before 17<sup>th</sup> July.

#### **Section 1: About You**

Name:	
Directorate:	
Service:	
Office Location:	
Post Title:	

#### **Section 2: Your Travel Intentions**

Question 2.1: If you are no longer contractually obliged required to provide a car for work, do you intend to continue to provide a personal car at work for business journeys and be paid at the casual user mileage rate?					
Yes		- Please continue to Question 2.3			
No		- Please complete Question 2.2			

Question 2.2: The working group have already identified a number of potential alternative travel options. In the section below, please identify those options that you feel are a viable option for you personally, to allow you to deliver your work efficiently, effectively and safely.

	Viable Option?	1	Level of Use
Travel Option	Use (travel within city) Use (travel outside city) Not Use Unsure		Please give an estimate on the average hours required per week
Personal Cycle			
Pool cycle (Provided by CCC) 'Cargo' Pool cycle (provided by CCC) Pool electric cycle (provided by CCC) Street Car (Public use – book)			
Sole Use Street Car (CCC use only – book)			
Electric Powered Pool Car (provided by CCC)			
Petrol/Hybrid Pool Car (provided by CCC)			

Question 2.3: Do you have any suggestions for further alternative travel options that the working group could consider?

# **Section 3: Out of Hours Working**

Please complete this section if you are regularly required to work out of your normal contracted hours - requiring you to travel into the City when you would not normally be required to do so and at times when public transport options are more limited.

Question 3.1: When you work out of hours, is this:	a) Pre-planned – pre-organised events related to work	
(Please tick all that apply)	<ul> <li>b) On call – designated to respond to specific role related incidents.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>c) Unplanned - In response to emergency planning incidents</li> </ul>	

Question 3.2: To provide an indication of the regularity, duration and nature of this working, please estimate the following: (Note: It is recognised there may will be variability in levels - please provide an indication of average monthly level across the full year).

	Mo-Fr Night	Sat Day	Sat Night	Sun Day	Sun Night	TOTAL
a) Instances per month attend these event						
b) Duration - total number of hours per month						
c) What is your one-way home to work mileage						

Question 3.3: If you are no longer contractually obliged required to provide a car for work, do you intend to continue to provide a personal car to undertake out of hours duties?

Yes No

Please continue to question 3.5

Please complete question 3.4

#### Question 3.4: Which of the following options would you use to complete your out of hours job requirements?

	Viable?			Rank
Travel Option	Use	<i>Use</i> Not Use Unsure		Indicate preference (1 high - 6 lowest)
Private Car (to pool car)				
Taxi (to site)				
Taxi (to pool car)				
Pool Car (taken home				
when planned or on call)				
Public Transport				
Other (please State				