EVALUATION OF THE REAL ESTATE ON ITS SOCIAL CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP IN URBAN MOBILITY

EVALUACIÓN DEL MERCADO INMOBILIARIO SOBRE SU CIUDADANÍA CORPORATIVA SOCIAL EN MOVILIDAD URBANA

AVALIAÇÃO DO MERCADO IMOBILIÁRIO SOBRE SUA RESPONSABILIDADE SOCIAL EM MOBILIDADE URBANA

Jorge A. Martins/D.Sc.
Milena Bodmer/D.Sc.
Simone Costa R. da Silva/M.Sc
Izabela K. Lentino/M.Sc..
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil
Mail Box: 100.424, CEP 24.020-971 RJ, Brazil

THEMATIC AREAS:

THE REAL ESTATE COMPONENT IN MASTER PLANS

EDUCATION IN REAL ESTATE - TEACHING, ETHICS AND CULTURE

ABSTRACT

The main focus of this work is based on concept – presented in international papers and conferences – on transport service quality and social responsibility oriented to articulate stakeholders' interests of the specific productive chain involving transport-land use relationship in sustainable way (that is: encouraging green transport alternatives - collective modes, cycling or walking).

It intends to introduce two arguments. The first one justifies the adoption of public policies for stimulus, at the managerial level, of new design and arrangements of social responsibility to foster green transport use. The second presents the research results developed with the real estate companies, members of developers' union of Rio de Janeiro, concerning to their opinion and expectations with regard to the concept application in a proposal for accessibility provision by collective transport alternatives for traffic generators.

The central idea that the paper intends to clarify is that, coherent with the principles of an effective and competitive multimodal policy, traffic generator buildings should internalize costs of special collective transport services for their demand, converting a part of the compulsory parking lots in useful area for urban enterprises with social and economic activities, justifying this way higher densities without any negative impact on the environmental quality.

The data for this research were collected in a survey whereby managers of real estate companies indicated 14 main criteria, clustered into four decision factors (managerial, marketing, social and legal), that would confirm the feasibility of the proposal. Through the use of hierarchy multi-criterial analysis, applied to all the criteria, it concludes that, from a managerial perspective, large urban enterprises demonstrate a 26% superior performance when they offer collective services to handle the demand instead of parking lots for automobiles.

An application of this concept to shopping centres, replacing 50% of parking lots, could produce an increase up to 20% of the their useful area without any expansion of the total building area, increasing land productivity around 44 times and jobs generation 76 times.

Consulted about their interest in investing in this proposal, the developers answered to have intention to double their investments in social policies, representing nowadays 1,3% of their revenue, since attended some criteria, regarding which, from their point of view, the proposal developed by Mobile Group demonstrated very good performance.

The V Lares International Meeting presents other paper of Mobile Group (Martins and Bodmer) on the economic viability of its proposal and the conceptual approach, that is complementary reading to this and has a good argument to stablish the real estate role in Master Plans.

INTRODUCTION

The main focus of this work is based on the concept (*"Mobile Concept"*) developed by BODMER & MARTINS (2005a) and published by Elsevier of transport service quality and social responsibility oriented to coordinate stakeholders' interests in the specific productive chain involving transport-land use in a sustainable manner (that is: encouraging green transport alternatives - collective modes, cycling and walking).

The intention is to introduce two arguments. The first one justifies the adoption of public policies to encourage, at the managerial level, new design and arrangements of corporate citizenship to foster green transport use. The second presents the results of research carried out among the real estate companies and members of the developers' union of Rio de Janeiro, concerning to their opinions and expectations with regard to the application of the concept in a proposal for accessibility provision by collective transport alternatives to serve traffic generators hubs.

The central idea that the paper is intended to clarify is that, coherent with the principles of an effective and competitive multimodal policy, big traffic generator buildings should absorb the costs of special collective transport services meeting their demand, converting a part of the compulsory parking lots into useful areas for urban enterprises with social and economic activities, justifying in this way the higher densities, reducing negative impact on the environmental quality.

The application of this concept to shopping centers, replacing 50% of their parking lots, could produce an increase of up to 20% of the their useful area, without any expansion of the total building area, increasing land revenue around 44 times and job generation by 76 times.

Consulted about their interest in investing in this proposal, the developers expressed their intention to double their investments in social policies, representing nowadays just 1.3% of their revenue, as long as certain criteria are met, regarding which, from their point of view, the proposal developed by the Mobile Group/UFRJ performed well. The V LARES presents other paper (MARTINS & BODMER, 2005) that are complementary reading to this one.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS TO CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

Towards the end of the twentieth century, a new business attitude could be observed, which led the private sector to begin assuming social and environmental responsibilities. A brief account of the state of the art and practices will help to remind us of the principal occurrences that marked these business endeavors aimed at something more than mere economic concerns.

Public perception of environmental problems and the drawing up of environmental legislation were the two key reasons for the environment to become an important issue for corporations (BANERJEE, 2002).

Many advances came about, such as cleaner technology and reduced gas emissions, from the interface between economics and the environment. These benefits are considered more measurable, in relation to the interaction with society, because, for the companies, the impacts on the local communities are still uncertain. Popular dissatisfaction led major corporations to make a more serious commitment to society. The growing public awareness of the social and environmental impacts of economic growth and the development of legislation in the areas of social welfare and environmental protection have led many companies to estimate the social and environmental impacts of their business operations (BANERJEE, 2002).

This new style of business management, attentive to environmental and social questions, has been given the names "corporate citizenship" or "corporate social responsibility", because it brings together the companies, civil society and the state, in order to aid the development of society as a whole, through action aimed at eliminating or attenuating the greatest deficiencies (MCINTOSH *et al.*, 2001; OLIVEIRA, 2001).

Recent business engagement has reexamined the relationship and come down in favor of the social benefit and environmental conservation and has earned the companies the valuable support and approval of consumers and workers (PINTO, 2003).

In PELIANO (2001), according to business people, the reach of many of the activities is not sufficient to bring about changes in the general state of inequality of certain groups, leaving them forever dependent. Whatever the extent of the private sector contributions and social projects, it is wrong to create the expectation that this could take the place of the public authorities in providing social welfare. Take an extreme case; that of a state of siege or war. With regard to the social and environmental demands, the company may perform better than its competitors if it is able to absorb the costs of these negative external effects in a strategic manner.

Some authors, such as HALAL *apud* PINTO, 2003, and HILLMAN *et al.*, 2001, interpret the concept allowing the possibility of satisfying the two aims, that of profit and that of social performance, by involving all its primary stakeholders: capital suppliers (shareholders), employees, customers, suppliers, community residents and environment. The relationship between the company and its stakeholders then becomes a partnership, which can be economically productive, because value is created through the collaboration. This partnership can employ the abilities of the various participants to the mutual benefit of all, with activities carried out not with the purpose of being socially responsible, but to ensure that each stakeholder remains a wealth and valuable part of the productive chain and, consequently, to distinguish it from the competition.

In trying to implement management models that are mindful of these social and environmental issues, many municipalities, through their administrative bodies, implement ISO 14001, the environmental management standard that applies to the environmental factors that an organization controls and influences. The city of New York, in the USA, uses the standard in order to meet the regulations regarding natural resources, community problems and building air quality (KRUT *et al.*, 2000). The city of Hamilton-Wentworth, in Canada, uses the standard for the treatment and collection of water, the distribution of the services, waste management and regional planning. City authorities in New Zealand, the United Kingdom and Australia have also adopted the standard for their procedures (BEKKERING *et al.*, 2000).

THE ROLES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS TO PROMOTE ACCESSIBILITY WITHOUT URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Various undertakings with regard to managing urban mobility have been tried in a number of countries. These are frequently aimed at the employees in large traffic generating hubs. However, it is often noted that, without incentives or an adequate legal basis, it is impossible to sustain these initiatives or achieve a commitment to them.

MAXIME, 2004, criticized[1] the fact that the management of employee mobility is not specifically addressed in ISO 14001. The criticism is pertinent, because it raises questions as to the very interpretation and application of the standard. Unfortunately, at present, all understanding of the management of environmental impacts is at the discretion of the companies themselves, with no legal obligations applying.

Many European companies have already attempted to implement, or have implemented mobility plans for their employees (*green commuter plan* or *green transport plan*). Their reasons for taking such steps range from the need to minimize environmental impacts, saving energy and avoiding congestion, to the question of image, ensuring the continuity of their ISO 14001 certification and benefits to the internal and external atmospheres, leading to improved relations with the employees and with society in general.

The problems caused by the need for car parking space in order for the functioning of corporate activities to become viable are not limited to Europe. In Brazil, many civil inquiries and lawsuits have arisen in the city of Rio de Janeiro owing to problems of mobility, particularly since 1997. The city's

[1] "*Standard ISO 14001 should be completed by the need to incorporate personal mobility, including that of employees, in actions to control environmental impacts*".

leading construction and real-estate companies have encountered difficulties in getting approval for, and in the functioning of large-scale urban undertakings, particularly in relation to the urban communities of the city's Southern Zone, a region of great density of traffic generating hubs, because of the saturation of the existing road infrastructure that would result. The enterprises in question are generally shopping centers, hospitals, luxury residential condominiums, leisure complexes, etc.

The urban legislation in Brazil itself helps to promote the separation of roles and the gap between the land use and transport policies. This is because, despite the structure of the traditional transport planning model being defined by four stages (trip generation, trip distribution, modal split and the traffic allocation), the laws governing the use and occupation of the land induce exclusive dependence on the highway mode, with emphasis on the use of the automobile. It is impossible to build in Brazilian urban centers without incorporating parking space within the useful area of the building.

Indeed, large urban undertakings, major traffic generating centers that they are, represent a form of land use that typifies the urban environmental problem. A center that is an attracter/generator of trips can impose economics of location and agglomeration on an urban space, attracting other enterprises around it. But, on the other hand, it can generate negative externalities related to the quality of the environment. SANJAD (2003) illustrates the case of a shopping center in Rio de Janeiro/Brazil, after studying the alterations in the shopping center area of influence for almost 20 years: the indirect traffic, generated by the buildings that have been located at this area, is of the same scale of the direct traffic generated by the shopping center (if it could be considered the importance of the shopping center as location attribute to these buildings). Nevertheless, when it comes to the laws governing land use and occupation, the responsibility imposed on the developers of traffic generating centers, in order to minimize these negative externalities, is limited to the mere construction of parking space.

When a law governing land use and occupation mandates the provision of parking spaces, in order that a traffic generating center does not affect the local quality of circulation, in this case, only the static capacity (the need for physical space in which to store the vehicles attracted is being taken into consideration). There is no requirement on the part of the entrepreneur with regard to the dynamic capacity; the need for road space to accommodate the expected demand, the burden of which falls upon the public authorities.

Maintaining stock (or, in this theme: vast areas for parking) was one of the Ford-inspired pillars of the last post-war economic cycle, which ceased long ago, though its influence still prevails in urban policy. One cannot bring competitiveness to our urban centers if these still live by outmoded rules and thinking that have no future. The urban legislation, by making parking space obligatory for traffic generating centers, ends up transferring to the public the responsibility for mitigating the potential impacts (supply of accessibility). And in so doing, it also disengages land use policy from transport policy, or rather, it reduces the relationship between them to a single commitment: it is up to the entrepreneur to construct the parking space; it is up to the authorities to provide the road space and transport services that make the undertaking and its parking space functionally viable. Looked at from another angle, every automobile on the Brazilian city streets carries an average of less than 1.5 people, occupying the place of 12 people who could be seated in a collective transport mode (for the mass transport modes, this ratio is greater still).

How can one expect urban property to fulfill its social function if the very way that the urban legislation provides for accessibility to these buildings works against the use of public transport modes?

By tying garage space to the right to build, the "modal allocation of trips" stage of the transport planning process goes unheeded: it determines exclusive access via the highway mode, with emphasis on the automobile, thereby attaching usage value to the entire production chain of this item, from the manufacturing of fuels to the construction of buildings with garages. In this way, it also ensures the low competitiveness of public transport in comparison with the automobile.

TRANSPORT-LAND USE INTEGRATION WITH CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

The UFRJ (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro) Mobile Research Group has, with the support of the CNPq (National Council for Scientific and Technological Research and Development), developed a proposal for the integrated production and management of transport and land use that will render the minimization of the problems of storage space that so affect business expansion, and the implementation of new urban undertakings that meet the principles of ecological efficiency.

This proposal, applied in a study engaged by the Brazilian Development Bank (BNDES) (MARTINS *et al.*, 2002), provides entrepreneurs with large-scale urban undertakings the possibility of networking with the other stakeholders in the production and consumption chain, for the provision of special urban logistics services, instead of having the obligation to just provide parking spaces (MARTINS & BODMER, 2000; MARTINS *et al.*, 2002 and BODMER & MARTINS, 2005a). This proposal will allow urban undertakings to increase the percentage of the building area utilized, by converting part of the space allocated to storing automobiles to other uses, and offering means of access to the undertaking other than the automobile.

The strategic importance of the concept developed at the UFRJ lies in the fact that, in liaising with the other stakeholders (the local community and complementary enterprises within the network, i.e.: the complementary mix of land uses within the undertaking's area of influence), an urban undertaking expands its relations with the city and its potential customers, thereby fulfilling a function that is of public interest; that of accessibility. As a result, instead of the image presently associated with a traffic generating hub (an environmental polluter), the undertaking that becomes part of a network assumes the effective role of a public transport station or terminal, turning itself into a *Nucleus of Efficient Traffic* (NET), and is thus perceived as a socially responsible enterprise.

The Mobile Concept is, therefore, a relationship marketing strategy to make the local community loyal to their partnering establishments (BODMER & MARTINS, 2005a).

Adoption of the concept promotes the effective participation of indirect beneficiaries (real-estate capital) in financing urban transport. The yield on the real-estate capital, from the offer of accessibility and the constructive potential defined in the Master Plan and in the laws governing land use and occupation, is partially returned to the community when, in compliance with its corporate citizenship, the real-estate developer makes the commitment to bind sustainable public transport accessibility into the overall undertaking, thereby serving the community within its area of influence or market area. The parties who could work in synergy with the transport-land use logistics chain have already been identified in various works by MARTINS & BODMER (2000, 2002, 2005, among others), wherein the authors highlight the interaction between the "citizens-customers", transport providers and real-estate capital representatives.

Thus, a useful partnership is established between the stakeholders: the transport companies provide their services; the entrepreneurs can convert part of their garage space to better use when they offer alternative transport services, as well as mitigating the environmental impact and thereby gaining a better image; the public authorities put the services out to tender; and the urban communities get exclusive transport services and improved quality in the environment and in the transport. The model keeps coordination of the network in the hands of the public authorities and ensures the continual realignment of the transport services to the amount of built up area, since it is the responsibility of the entrepreneur, when the project is approved, to take on the commitment of converting part of the mandatory parking space to commercial use, as long as there is the proportional provision of public transport services (for equivalence parameters, see: BODMER & MARTINS, 2005a).

The incorporation of mobility management into large-scale urban undertakings will meet the need for business expansion, because it is not restricted to the provision of transport services by the state and can also stimulate new areas of its own interest by promoting accessibility. This links the network's enterprises and the stakeholders with the image of the corporate citizen, avoids conflicts (because it identifies and seeks to deal with potential conflicts before they become critical), spreads the costs and the responsibility by playing a more prominent role in society, improves the quality of the environment, by minimizing the highway traffic impact, and creates ties with the "citizens-customers", among other advantages.

BUSINESS EVALUATION OF THE "*MOBILE CONCEPT*"

Research methodology

The Hierarchical Analysis Method (HAM), developed by SAATY (1977a, 1977b, 1991) *apud* MARTINS & BODMER (2003), was utilized in order to analyze the criteria structure to the decision making process of the real-estate developers in opting to construct garage space or to provide transport services under the *"Mobile Concept"*. Briefly, the methodology for obtaining the data, applied by SILVA (2005) and LENTINO (2005) comprised:

1) carrying out a survey, by means of a questionnaire, of the seven largest shopping centers in city of Rio de Janeiro, located in central areas and in urban expansion areas (urban periphery) that represent 43% of the total built area of State of Rio de Janeiro's shopping centers, to obtain data on the physical and economic aspects of the undertakings and the operational aspects of the parking lots (number of spaces, number of stores, average area of garage space, percentage of garage space in relation to the total building area, gross revenue, number of jobs created, etc.);

2) carrying out a structured survey, by means of a structured questionnaire, of a representative sample (significance of 95% and error of 5%) of the companies in the real-estate sector, so as to identify the chief decision making criteria, and their respective weightings, to be adopted in putting together the "Decision Tree" used in the Multicriteria Hierarchical Analysis. The criteria were organized in 4 groups: “Productive Efficiency”, “Market”, “Social” and “Legal-Bureaucratic”. These four decision making areas (groups of criteria) were applied to the two alternatives ("Parking Space" and *"Mobile Concept"*), with the fourteen principal criteria, of a total of twenty-six, accounting for 80.27% of the weighting in the decision making process (*Table 1*);

Table 1:The weights of social responsibility criteria

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY CRITERIA	WEIGHT (%)
Productive Efficiency	**21.90**
Operating / maintenance costs	7.30
Implementation cost	6.57
Revenue	4.38
Easiness to sell / lease	3.65
Market	**44,51**
Company image	8.39
Customer satisfaction	8.39
Product differentiation	6.57
Product value enhancement	6.20
Value added for the customer	5.84
Technological innovation	4.74
Generating new business	4.38
Social	**9.48**
Quality of life	6.93
Jobs	2,55
Legal-Bureaucratic	**4.38**
Legal incentives	4.38
TOTAL	**80,27**

3) focused research, involving a semi-structured questionnaire given to the companies that participated in the earlier survey, for the comparative determination of the objective variables (performance indicators) of the alternatives for each decision making criterion. The

questionnaire adopted a standard rating of "5.00" as a performance indicator for each of the criteria under the "Parking Space" Alternative, with the developer awarding a relative performance rating for the same criteria under the *"Mobile Concept"* Alternative. The developers' pessimism regarding the *Mobile Concept*'s performance under the criteria of implementation and operating costs is noteworthy. For all the other criteria, the assessment of the performance of the *"Mobile Concept"* compares favorably with that of the "Parking Spaces";

4) complementary field research data regarding the implementation and operating costs, revenue and number of employees[2] under each alternative. The performances of the quantitative criteria were calculated in relation to the physical parking area (m²), considering the area of parking space constructed in the case of the "Parking Space" Alternative and considering the area of parking space replaced by the transport system in the case of the *"Mobile Concept"* Alternative, as can be seen in *Table 2*.

Table 2 – Results for the objective variables for the quantitative decision making criteria, according to the field research data

RESULTS	REVENUE (US$/m²)		IMPLEMENTATION COST (US$/m²)		OPERAT. AND MAINT. COSTS (US$/m²)		JOBS (Nº/ m²)	
	PARK.	MOBILE	PARK.	MOBILE	PARK.	MOBILE	PARK.	MOBILE
WORST	2.71	117.47	183.84	125.92	0.77	2.69	0.000727	0.065387
AVERAGE	**4.26**	**172.20**	**183.62**	**100.00**	**0.77**	**2.26**	**0.000833**	**0.065510**
BEST	5.80	226.94	183.46	89.34	0.77	1.98	0.000975	0.065675

Note: Under the criteria relating to cost – "Implementation Cost" and "Operating and maintenance Costs", from the business point of view, the priority is inverted, so that the highest costs represent the "worst results" and the lowest costs are the "best results"; US$ 1.00 = R$ 2.50 (May/2005).

The Results of the Hierarchical Analysis

According to the companies, they already make an investment in social practices of around 1.3% of turnover, and that this could go up to 2.7%. The criteria for this social investment (1st stage) and the evaluation of the *"Mobile Concept"* performance in comparison with the obligation to build garage space (2nd stage) in the case presented, as carried out by the construction companies can be seen in *Table 3* (next page).

Thus, when one analyzes the criteria of entrepreneurs from the construction sector in Rio de Janeiro, one can note a tendency in favor of the *"Mobile Concept"* Alternative, with 52.6% of the preference, or an 11% advantage over the "Parking Space" Alternative.

Moreover, when one analyzes the decision based not only on the entrepreneurs' perceptions, but replacing the quantitative criteria with objective variables calculated according to data obtained in the field, one can see that the average performance tends even further in favor of the *"Mobile Concept"*, from 52.6% to 55.7%, or an advantage of almost 26% in relation to the "Parking Space" Alternative (44.3%).

In their evaluation of the "*Mobile Concept*", the building entrepreneurs were receptive, recognizing it as being innovative, as was their assessment of the positive impacts: an option to mitigate the problems of traffic circulation that allows an increase in the gross leasable area and the provision of transport services for the public one wishes to attract. These observations were based on the

[2] The criterion "Jobs" was not assessed by the companies in the second part of the survey, as it hadn't been initially identified as a chief decision making criterion, but was included during the data treatment phase. Nevertheless, as a quantitative decision making criterion (subject to field verification), the performance of the "Jobs" criterion was evaluated in accordance with the treatment of data collected in the field for each of the alternatives.

proposal's good performance in relation to the traditional parking space option, particularly under the criteria "company image", "quality of life", "product differentiation" and "technological innovation ".

Table 3 – "Mobile Concept" according to social performance criteria

	1st STAGE	2nd STAGE						
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY CRITERIA	**WEIGHT (%)**	**RATING**				**LEVEL OF CERTAINTY**		
		AVER.	**STAN. DEV.**	**MIN.**	**MAX.**	**LOW %**	**MEDIUM %**	**HIGH %**
Company image	8.39	6.27	1.19	5	8	10	30	60
Customer satisfaction	8.39	5.55	1.29	4	7	20	10	70
Operating / maintenance costs	7.30	3.55	2.58	0	8	30	30	40
Quality of life	6.93	6.18	2.04	3	10	13	25	62
Implementation cost	6.57	3.64	2.20	0	7	10	50	40
Product differentiation	6.57	6.36	1.21	5	8	10	80	10
Product value appreciation	6.20	5.64	1.50	3	8	30	60	10
Value added for the customer	5.84	5.27	2.33	0	8	30	40	30
Technological innovation	4.74	6.82	1.83	4	10	20	40	40
Revenue	4.38	6.45	2.25	3	9	40	20	40
Legal incentives	4.38	6.73	1.95	3	10	30	40	30
Generating new business	4.38	7.50	1.84	5	10	22	45	33
Easiness to sell / lease	3.65	5.36	2.16	3	10	30	40	30

However, the sector is aware that, due to ingrained habits in relation to automobile use, the consumers for their new undertakings may not display recognition of the transport services as a valid option to the provision of parking spaces. In other words, they might not identify competitive advantages that could induce a change in their mode of transport. For this reason, in the evaluation regarding to "customer satisfaction" the performance tends to be similar for both the alternatives. Hence, at best, in terms of acceptance, the sector is aware that the customer would retain the option of going by automobile or using the transport service, but is doubtful that there would be an effective change of transport mode.

The criteria that start to raise doubts, with good ratings (despite little disparity) and a balance between the three level of certainty, are "legal incentives" and "generating new business". The entrepreneurs believe that the transport services could open up the possibility of partnerships (with the public authorities, other undertakings, transport operators and suppliers), but they are not sure if they would effectively come about, because a dialogue would first have to be established in order to identify common interests.

Moreover, they perceive certain risks regarding the proposal, such as the identification and involvement in this new type of undertaking on the part of certain stakeholders: retailers, the target population (the local community) and the public authorities. This explains the poor performance of the "*Mobile Concept*" and the doubts regarding the criteria of "product value appreciation", "value added for the customer" and "easiness to sell or lease". Such risks could be minimized by the urban developers getting closer to the community, so that both can see the positive impact of adopting the transport services. Upon applying the "*Mobile Concept*", undertakings that tend to have a greater impact on their surroundings are more likely to be considered positive by the community that will benefit from the dedicated services and, consequently, they will tend to develop loyalty towards the range of activities on offer.

The most controversial criterion is "revenue". The evaluations show a high level of disparity, high ratings with a high standard deviation, and the level of certainty also varies considerably.

The "operating / maintenance costs" and the "implementation cost" are the criteria showing the worst results in the evaluation of the "*Mobile Concept*". Many doubts remain, not only regarding the cost, but also about the difficulty of maintaining a quality service. It was suggested that economic feasibility studies be carried out. In another paper presented at the V LARES, MARTINS & BODMER (2005) demonstrate the economic-financial feasibility of the "*Mobile Concept*", set against the provision of parking spaces.

CONCLUSIONS

The application of the "*Mobile Concept*" to shopping centers, replacing 50% of parking lots, could produce an increase up to 20% of the their useful area without any expansion of the total building area, increasing land revenue around 44 times and job generation by 76 times.

It was concluded that, although the construction sector is still not taking advantage of the generation of value provided by their social performance, there is a potential there, through the application of the "*Mobile Concept*", as long as the uncertainties can be minimized, both in regard to public authority intervention and to the receptivity of the local community. In other words: the construction sector entrepreneurs are aware that the potential effectiveness of the "*Mobile Concept*", in terms of inducing the substitution of the automobile by mass transport modes, depends to a large extent on the capacity of the final customer to perceive the competitive advantages of the proposal, and that public authority action is fundamental to this end. Indeed, without priority on the roads for the mass transport modes, it will be hard to perceive the competitive advantages of the services connected to the networks of activities within the community space (micro-accessibility).

The sector is calling out for public coordination or, principally, public commitment, regarding the definition of policies for both transport and urbanization. The public authorities need to foster partnerships among the stakeholders and reinforce the rules reducing the dependency of urban undertakings on stocks of automobile parking spaces, so that they can effectively exercise their corporate citizenship, by providing facilities for their employees and customers, and environmental responsibility, by minimizing traffic congestion.

With initiatives from the public authorities, the construction sector would be willing to double the amount it already invests in socio-environmental responsibility, from 1.3% to 2.7% of its turnover, with the gradual adoption of the "*Mobile Concept*", which would, at first, be applied strategically by the sector in expanding existing undertakings, redefining their lifecycles and their re-insertion into the chain of activities of the potential demand in their areas of influence.

It has been suggested that the adoption of the "*Mobile Concept*" be offered as an alternative to the provision of parking space for entrepreneurs planning new undertakings, with the possibility of a gradual adoption of the concept and the progressive expansion of the gross leasable area in the place of garage space, given the novelty of the proposal and the need to diminish the risks of these undertakings.

Finally, the real estate is also waiting for the economic-financial feasibility of the proposal to be demonstrated, which has been done in another paper from the V LARES (MARTINS & BODMER, 2005).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

BANERJEE, S. (2002). Contesting Corporate Citizenship, Sustainability and Stakeholder Theory: Holy Trinity or Praxis of Evil? In: *Academy of Management Conference*, Denver.

BEKKERING, M. & McCALLUM, D. (2000). ISO 14001, a tool for municipal government to achieve sustainability: the experiences of Hamilton-Wentworth, Canada. In: *ISO 14001: case studies and practical experiences* (Hillary, R.), Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield.

BODMER, M. & MARTINS, J. (2005a). Transport Service Quality and Social Responsibility Through Relationship Marketing. In: *Competition & Ownership in Land Passenger Transport* (D. A. Hensher, Ed.). Elsevier Ltd. Amsterdam, 659-678.

BODMER, M. & MARTINS, J. (2005b). Conceiving competitive arrangements for public transport. In: *9th Thredbo – International Conference on Competition and Ownership in land Passenger Transport.* Lisbon.

HILLMAN, A.J. & KEIM, G.D. (2001). Shareholder value, stakeholder management, and social issues: what's the bottom line? *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 125-139.

KRUT, R. & STRYCHARZ, J. (2000). ISO 14001 and design for the environment: a strategy for proactive design in building design, construction and renovation. In: *ISO 14001: case studies and practical experiences* (Hillary, R.), Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield.

LENTINO, I. (2005). *Análise Multicriterial de Proposta de Gestão da Mobilidade para Grandes Empreendimentos Urbanos*. Tese M.Sc. COPPE/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.

MARTINS, J. & BODMER, M. (2000). New opportunities in land-use: transport business. In: *21st Century Transportation: International Conference 2000*, ACT, Orlando, 1-13.

MARTINS, J. & BODMER, M. (2002). *Acqua-Mobile - Estudo de Viabilidade Técnico-econômica de Serviços de Transporte Aquaviários em Dez Áreas Metropolitanas no Brasil. Relatório Final*, Publicação restrita. UFRJ/BNDES, Rio de Janeiro.

MARTINS, J. & BODMER, M. (2003). Decision theory and analytic hierarchy process for consumers´ transport service choice simulation. In: *8th Thredbo – International Conference on Competition and Ownership in land Passenger Transport*, Rio de Janeiro, 1-11.

MARTINS, J. & BODMER, M. (2005). Viability of Integrated Land Use and Transport Project to the BNDES in attention to the Real Estate. In: *V LARES*, São Paulo.

MARTINS, J., BODMER, M. & PORTO, D. (2002). Gestão da mobilidade para um pólo gerador de tráfego. In: *XII Congresso Panamericano de Tráfico y Transporte*, Quito, 1-12.

MARTINS, J., BODMER, M. & LENTINO, I. (2005). Joint development feasibility and viability study focusing on greening transport alternative. In: *9th Thredbo – International Conference on Competition and Ownership in land Passenger Transport*. Lisbon.

MAXIME, J. (2004). The legal, regulatory and tax framework of mobility management in France: residual difficulties and advantages to be made. In: *European Conference on Mobility Management*, ECOMM, Lyon.

MCINTOSH, M., LEIPZIGER, D., JONES, K., COLEMAN, G. (2001) – *Cidadania Corporativa: estratégias bem-sucedidas para empresas responsáveis.* Tradução Bazán Tecnologia e Lingüística , Qualitymark, Rio de Janeiro.

OLIVEIRA, A.A.V. (2001). *Responsabilidade Social Corporativa: Uma Revisão do Estado da Questão.* Tese M. Sc. COPPEAD/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.

PELIANO, A.M.T.M. (2001). *Bondade ou Interesse? Como e porque as empresas atuam na área social.* IPEA, Rio de Janeiro.

PINTO, W.G. (2003). *Responsabilidade Social e criação de valor para a empresa: um estudo de caso de uma grande organização brasileira.* Tese M. Sc. COPPEAD/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.

SILVA, S. (2005). *Gestão da Mobilidade como Estratégia para Responsabilidade Sócio-ambiental do Setor de Construção Civil.* Tese M.Sc. COPPE/UFRJ, Rio de Janeiro.