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Research Objectives

- The objective of this study was to conduct a baseline survey about Transportation Demand Management (TDM) practices along Thika Super Highway corridor to enhance TDM strategies (alternatives to driving).

- Specific objectives were to assess strategies for:
  - managing traffic congestion and improvement of people moving capacity;
  - improving business performance and livability in the corridor.
  - developing stakeholder participative process for large projects;
Research Methods

- The study primarily used a descriptive research design to document existing patterns and preferential practices
  - *Exploratory in nature on issues for consideration.*

- The population of study was the Ruaraka Business Community (RUBICOM) and Kasarani area Neighborhood

- The data collection included a combination of a survey method and focus group discussion (FGD).

- The ultimate goal was to identify, analyze and interpret patterns that inform to policy making, regulations and practices that promote TDM practices and livability along the Super Highway corridor and potential for scale up.
About Thika Highway
Preliminary Findings

Both employees and employers are satisfied with Thika Road with respect to:

- Pedestrian Crossing
- Crossing on Bridges
- Crimes on Bridges
- Major challenges.

- One way directional local service roads.
  - *RUBICOM location??*
- U-turns on local service roads.
- Major challenges.
About Thika Highway.

Employees

The pedestrian cross bridges have been very useful.

The pedestrian cross bridges have been troubling to cross.
About Thika Highway.

Employees

I have witnessed a crime on pedestrian cross bridges.

I have heard of a crime on pedestrian cross bridges.
About Thika Highway.

Compared to before, there are now major challenges on Thika Highway.

Compared to before, there are now major benefits on Thika Highway.
Challenges and Benefits: Employees

**Challenges**
- Accidents especially vehicles at high speeds
- Alighting points for matatus, road exits and incase of breakdowns
- Bridges are far apart
- Bumps should be removed, street lights and floods when it rains
- Buses do not follow service lane
- Cars being driven at very high speeds beyond the limits
- Crime
- Cross bridges far from residential areas
- Jam during rush hours
- Crossing bridgs are not enough.
- Drainage issue, some areas not clearly marked
- Exit is far away
- Floods when it rains
- Hawkers causing congestion on cross bridges
- Hazard where broken down vehicles are left on the side of the road
- The motorist do not strictly observe the road safety measures

**Benefits**
- Reduced accidents
- Reduced Traffic Jam
- Business Boom
- Effective transport services, saves time and low cost in transport
- Growth in business along the highway, improved infrastructure
- Ease of crossing the road
One way directional side road lane has been destructive to our business.

Availability of U-turns on side road lane would be of value to our business.
About Thika Road

Compared to before, there are now major challenges on Thika Highway

Compared to before, there are now major benefits on Thika Highway
Challenges and Benefits

Employers

The Challenges Faced
■ Congestion
■ Accidents
■ Potholes
■ Traffic jam
■ Crime cases
■ Poor Drainage
■ Lack of overpass and crossing for pedestrians
■ No space on side for broken cars
■ Over speeding and carjacking.

Benefits of Thika Road
■ Discipline on the roads improved
■ Eased traffic during day time
■ Easy flow of traffic
■ More organized
■ Fast transportation
■ More people reach us now
■ No overlapping of cars and matatus
■ Reduced travel time & high customer turn out.
TDM Framework
Preliminary Findings

Both employees and employers not keen on TDM Strategies with minor exceptions

- Low on working from home by phone or computer.
- Low car/van pooling
- Low long hours few days work
- ¼ Km from Matatu stage from work and home.
- High on matatu/high on BRT/low drive

- Transportation not a challenge
- Not provide transport
- Most not Applicable for RUBICOM Shuttle from: Downtown, Thika, Kiambu, Kayole, any other location.
- Interest in RUBICOM Shuttle mixed – Applicable/somehow
- High on RUBICOM been helpful on Transport
I do most of my work from home using the phone

I do all of my work from home using the phone
TDM Framework.

Employees

I do most of my work from home using the computer

I do all of my work from home using the computer
I go to work using the bus or matatu

I drive to work
TDM Framework

Employees

I ride in someone's car to work

I ride in a private van paid for by the employer to work
I come to the work place fewer days per week but longer hours per day

If there were dedicated lanes for buses/matatu I would not drive to work
TDM Framework: Employees

Distance from the workplace to matatu stage:

- 1/4 km: 49
- 1/2 km: 13
- 1 km: 8
- more than 1 km: 25

Distance from my residence to the matatu stage:

- 1/4 km: 43
- 1/2 km: 21
- more than 1 km: 23
EMPLOYERS
Transportation has been a challenge to my employees.

I provide transportation support to my employees: please specify type of support.
RUBICOM has been of help with respect to transportation problems? Please specify

I would be interested in a RUBICOM shuttle to ferry employees between Town and my business site.
I would be interested in a RUBICOM shuttle to ferry employees between Thika and my business site: specify which times.

I would be interested in a RUBICOM shuttle to ferry employees between Kiambu and my business site: specify which times.

TDM Framework.

Employers
I would be interested in a RUBICOM shuttle to ferry employees between **East side (Kayole)** and my business site.

**TDM Framework. Employers**

I would be interested in a RUBICOM shuttle to ferry employees between my business site and **any other specific origin**:
### Traffic Congestion and Mobility

#### Employees vs Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Vehicles Needed to Carry 45 People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vanpool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8 people per van)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carpool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 persons per carpool)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carpool</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 persons per carpool)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Occupant Automobile</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 person per automobile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Findings

Planners seemed more focused on non TDM strategies (automobile)

Employees Perspectives
- Very high on vehicle flow (lanes and speed)
- Somehow low on open to alternative options
- Somehow high on keen on drive trip reliability
- High on interest for number of vehicles going through.

Employers Perspectives
- Somehow high on vehicle flow (lanes and speed)
- Somehow low on open to alternative options
- Somehow low on keen on drive trip reliability
- High on interest for number of vehicles going through.
Traffic Congestion and Mobility.

Road planners seemed more interested in how vehicles flow (lanes and speed) than how people get to the destination (alternative to driving)
Traffic Congestion and Mobility.

Planners were open to many alternative travel options besides driving (such as carpool, vanpool, bus/matatu, biking, pedestrian etc)

Employees

Employers
Traffic Congestion and Mobility.

Planners were mostly keen on drive trip reliability (consistent travel time)

**Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Congestion and Mobility.

Planners seemed interested in the number of vehicles going through a highway rather than the number of people going through the highway.
STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATIVE PROCESS
Preliminary Findings

People were informed but not engaged

Employees

■ High on people were informed about the project before
■ High on people were informed about the project during
■ Very low on people were invited to give opinions before
■ Very low on people were invited to give opinions during
■ Low on ideas by community were implemented
■ Very low on explained to people why ideas were not implemented

Employers

■ High on people were informed about the project before
■ High on people were informed about the project during
■ Very low on people were invited to give opinions before
■ Very low on people were invited to give opinions during
■ Low on ideas by community were implemented
■ Very low on explained to people why ideas were not implemented
Stakeholder Participative Process.
Before Thika Rd improvements, people were informed about the project.

**Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Participative Process.
During the Thika Rd improvements, people were informed about the project

**Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Participative Process.
Before Thika Rd improvements, people were invited to give opinions.

Employees

Employers
Stakeholder Participative Process.
During the Thika Rd improvements, people were invited to give opinions

Employees

Employers
Stakeholder Participative Process.
The majority of ideas by the community about Thika Rd were implemented.
Stakeholder Participative Process. Planners explained to us why suggested ideas were not implemented.

Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Findings

Planners seem to have focused on public relations instead of involvement

- Low on proactively seek affected stakeholders
- Communicate with respect to affected stakeholders.
- Inclusive decision making process
- Transparent decision making
- Continuous contact
- Interested in input than just meeting

- Low on proactively seek affected stakeholders
- Communicate with respect to affected stakeholders.
- Inclusive decision making process
- Transparent decision making
- Continuous contact
- Interested in input than just meeting
Distinguishing Public Involvement from Public Relations.

Planners always proactively seek out to inform affected stakeholders.

### Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distinguishing Public Involvement from Public Relations.

Planners always communicate with respect to stakeholders

**Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distinguishing Public Involvement from Public Relations.
The decision process was inclusive (effort made to reach out to neighbors).
Distinguishing Public Involvement from Public Relations.

The decision process was made transparent (open communication).

**Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of the respondents</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planners had continuous contact with stakeholders throughout the project.

**Employees**

- Not Applicable: 18
- Very low: 40
- Low: 41
- High: 6
- Very high: 7

**Employers**

- Not Applicable: 6
- Very low: 7
- Low: 7
- High: 2
- Very high: 2
Distinguishing Public Involvement from Public Relations.

Planners were more concerned about our input than simply meeting

Employees

![Bar chart showing number of respondents by response level for employees.]

- Not Applicable: 22
- Very low: 35
- Low: 28
- High: 12
- Very high: 14

Employers

![Bar chart showing number of respondents by response level for employers.]

- Not Applicable: 5
- Very low: 9
- Low: 4
- High: 3
- Very high: 4
Conclusions

Preliminary Research Findings

1. Both employees and employers are satisfied with Thika Road Performance.
2. Planners seemed more focused on non TDM strategies (automobile).
3. People were informed but not engaged.
4. Planners seem to have focused on public relations instead of involvement.
Q&A

Ahsanteni Sana: Kiswahili
Ashe Oleng: Maasai
Cam on: Vietnamese

(Спасибо) Spaceedo: Russian
Danke Schön: Germany
Dhaniwad: Punjabi
Kamsamida: Korean
Merci beaucoup: French
Muchas Gracias: Spanish

Nasima: Luhya
Shukran: Arabic
Shukria: Hindi

Thank You Very Much: English
Trimkassi: Malaysian
Xie Xie: Chinese