



EPF position on Green Paper “Towards a new culture for urban mobility”

Revision: Pau Noy, PTP, Barcelona
Gent, march 11th, 2008

The Green Paper was adopted by the European Commission on 25 September 2007. The paper follows a period of public consultation. Among other bodies, many transport users associations participated in the consultation process in 2006. This Green Paper represents the second attempt by the EC to address the urban dimension of transport policy. The first one was led by Commissioner Kinnock in 1996, but received a hostile reception from the European Parliament's environment committee. In the meantime, the European Commission has developed some limited activities in the field of urban transport but has been restricted to programs supporting best practice such as CIVITAS or CURACAO.

From EPF's view, key issues in this Green Paper are: tackling urban congestion by promoting public transport and other eco-friendly means of transport, pollution and safety problems by promoting the so called “less car-dependent lifestyles”. The main focus of the paper is on passenger transport, but it seems clear that the Green Paper's authors have approached the subject from a motorist's point of view, not from the point of view of a person that needs to move or to ‘transport’. In EPF's view public transport need not be the mode of last resort but can be more attractive than driving one's self. Going by public transport is not necessarily a disadvantage to be suffered; it can bring real benefits to the user personally and to society generally: individual and social price, low or even zero pollution, the lowest greenhouse emissions –often zero emissions- and accident rates, highest social cohesion, it can represent excellent value for money and bring wider economic benefits and together with greater flexibility and utility (avoiding parking, jams, etc.). The picture of public transport that is painted by the Green Paper is imprecise and fails to emphasise its positive qualities.

In the Green Paper there does not appear a real policy in favour of public transport. On the other hand, it appears as well some subjects on urban freight logistics since it represents 40% of the total traffic.

Attractive alternatives to the use of conventional and individual private cars require more emphasis. Carsharing and carpooling are really good alternatives.

The aim of the paper is not to make proposals or define strategic directions but to define the fields where these propositions are to be made. In this respect, the GP asks 25 follow-up questions on different topics for another stakeholder consultation, running until 15 March 2008. This unusual procedure, with two subsequent rounds of public consultation, reflects the Commission's cautious approach towards urban issues which fall under national, regional or local subsidiarity or when these approaches present some difficulties since changes of behaviour are needed, especially with those that usually uses private cars in their cities that normally are the most influential ones. It is expected that a next stage is the Urban Mobility Action Plan to follow in autumn 2008. Until then any new action beyond extension of the current projects to exchange best practice cannot be expected.

This cautious approach could be understood against the background of the hostile reception that the Commission's 1996 proposals received from the European Parliament. Since then, the activity has been restricted to programmes supporting exchanges between cities, such as CIVITAS and CURACAO. But nowadays, the Parliament, in particular the Transport Committee, has changed its approach and seems to become favourable to such a European action.

The paper accurately sets out the challenges facing European cities and the severity of congestion and environmental problems including air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and noise: *"Urban traffic is responsible for 40% of CO2 emissions and 70% of emissions of other pollutants arising from road transport."* The resulting impacts on health and quality of life are also discussed.

GREEN PAPER

Towards a new culture for urban mobility

1. Should a "labelling" scheme be envisaged to recognise the efforts of cities to combat congestion and improve living conditions?

Yes, labelling attitudes or performances are always an interesting way to reward the local authorities that have a good behaviour in these issues and make them known to other cities. Indeed, labelling the own cities seems like a good idea. The EU should make sure that public transport gets the main role in such a system and that good public transport gets a high score. This labelling would have greater impact at the European level than at the national level.

2. What measures could be taken to promote walking and cycling as to car?

Walking is the first step on every trip in public transport. Promoting public transport needs also promoting walking and cycling as a part of a integrating view on sustainable mobility and public transport development. To achieve this goal, travelling on foot or by bicycle should be pleasant, safe and practical. Walking and cycling should be common-place activities. We recommend publicising specific practical examples drawn from different European cities to promote good practice at European level. Examples of measures are continuous cycling paths in cities without dangerous crossings with car traffic, protected garages for cycles, loan of cycles for short periods, etc.

A charter for pedestrians should be developed by the EC.

3. What could be done to promote a modal shift towards sustainable transport in cities?

The main promotion is giving incentives to those who use sustainable means of transport. But it appears from experience that it should go with measures restricting the use of cars such as tolls, diminution of the street areas available, parking restriction and payment, etc.

In addition to what has been listed in §2 we seek:

1. Investment priorities that reflect an integrated approach to spatial and transport planning, ensuring linkage between homes, services and transport thereby reducing the rate of growth in the need to travel and promoting more sustainable forms of travel.
2. A step change in the quality of public transport, thereby ensuring that its use is attractive to users and potential users
3. Efficient and cheap offer of public transport through a wide network of PT that strengthens the network effect.
4. To facilitate access to public transport in a way that reflects the needs both of persons with reduced mobility and those of an aging population
5. To promote cycling and encourage walking.
6. To limit the use parking of private cars establishing, at the same time, the principle of payment for parking in any circumstance
7. To establish calm traffic areas
8. To promote the sharing of private car, in the modality of carsharing or carpooling. These mobility systems favour less car-dependent lifestyles.

9. To promote the development of integrated public transport hubs and access to them.
10. Compact urban schemes will reduce the need of motorized trips.

These types of measure could be labelled and financially encouraged at the European level.

On the other hand, there is a real need for a handbook of the “best-practice-kind”, explaining when and why the different means of public transport should be used. This handbook has to give examples why certain solutions were chosen, not telling everybody to do the same.

4. How could the use of clean and energy efficient technologies in urban transport be further increased?

The most efficient way to get it is through prices. That people who bring a clean vehicle into the city will pay less, or will not pay. Someone who brings a dirty vehicle will pay more or, even, will not be able to enter into the city. These are the models that cities like Milan have just introduced this January.

(see www.lowemissionzones.eu)

Particular attention should be attached to the emissions of motorized 2-wheel vehicles, which can be more polluting than cars. The same is true for noise.

The use of bio-fuels should be promoted where it can be demonstrated that their procurement and use is sustainable and that their production is without detriment of those whose welfare depends on access to affordable food products.

Of course, the increased use of public transport, cycling and walking is the main source of cleaner and more efficient transport in cities.

5. How could joint green procurement be promoted?

Green procurement should be compulsory on some key issues.

6. Should criteria or guidance be set out for the definition of Green Zones and their restriction measures? What is the best way to ensure their compatibility with free circulation? Is there an issue of cross border enforcement of local rules governing Green Zones?

Free circulation does not mean free circulation in private cars. According the European rules free circulation means free access to any place of Europe with the most appropriate mean of transport in each case. The most appropriate mode has to be understood under the point of view of the general interest of the community. The principle of subsidiarity obliges us to accept the charging or mobility schemes that the local or regional authorities establish.

7. How could eco-driving be further promoted?

In fact, in the current scheme those who drive their vehicles in an ecological manner pay less than those who drive inefficiently. The tax on the hydrocarbons is proportional to the consumption and the level of payment too.

But in the future it seems that the best way to modify attitudes is to install an electronic device on board that allows establishing a system of bonus-malus (financial incentives) that are based on monitoring the behaviour of the driver. *The French president, Mr. Sarkozy has launched this proposal based on the conclusion of the meeting La Grenelle.*

8. Should better information services for travellers be developed and promoted?

Undoubtedly, the lack of an integrated system of information to the user of public transport is a serious disadvantage and obstacle to modal shift, if it is compared with the amount and quality of information that a user of the private vehicle has on the road, especially when the mobility chain forces a passenger to use more than one means of transport. Whereas normally drivers receive the information in continuum on the entire road network, passengers of public transport receive partial and fragmented information relating to the different options for the various legs of a trip that they may be considering. EPF has underlined many times the example of the great difficulties that may exist when trying to gather information and buy a ticket for an international journey. Private cars work on a whole network whereas public transport normally works as a constellation of individual networks.

The definition and promotion of integrated information systems for rail, bus, metro should be made at the European level. Three kind of integration relating to public transport progress are needed. The first one is integration of the charges; the second one is the integration of the information; and finally, the third one, is the physical integration of the network nodes.

9. Are further actions needed to ensure standardisation of interoperability of ITS applications in towns and cities? Which applications take priority when action is taken?

ITS are tools to ensure the goals described in the prior item

10. Regarding ITS, how could the exchange of information and best practices all involved parties be improved?

Improvements could be achieved from the definition of standards of ITS on mobility issues. The EU should favour via financial support the creation of these standards of communication (like for example that one presented in the case of carsharing in the project MoMo carsharing, that has been submitted to the Program Intelligent Energy Call).

EPF urges development of a common smart card system that is compatible over all Europe. Passengers should be able to use their chip card anywhere. The chip cards themselves don't really need to be identical, as long as they use the same interface. When a passenger charges his smart card with a certain amount of money, he should be able to spend it anywhere in the EU.

Likewise, if a passenger allows it, he should be able to use any smart card system that charges afterwards, possibly using a "best price" method. Moreover, this could help passengers to use public transport in a foreign city, because they are not to worry about buying the right ticket. Many passengers might decide to purchase a card loaded with prepaid trips, but passenger with higher expectations should also be able to use the card for travelling first and paying afterwards, just like a credit card system. Those

passengers could be scrutinized like any bank customer, but they all should be accepted, just like car-drivers buying petrol by credit cards and paying later on.

11. How can the quality of collective transport in European towns and cities be increased?

The basic rules to increase quality of collective transport are.

1. From an infrastructural view, as a general rule metros are only viable in major conurbations and particularly in the centre of the big city. It is more difficult to attract passengers to a 'metro' based model. 91% of European cities are of a size that might be defined as 'intermediate'. Intermediate cities could be called those which have more than 200.000 inhabitants and less than 1.000.000 inhabitants. In these cities the development of a light rapid transit network (ranging from tramways to simpler priority measures to ensure the efficient operation of bus networks) is encouraged. The investments in its construction are lower; the time of its construction is also less and at the same time has the advantage that allows public transport providers to stake a claim to that part of the public space that was previously the hegemony of private vehicles on the public space. Public space has to be dedicated to public activities as a priority.
2. Public transport needs the clear priority over that of private vehicles on the streets. The most effective system for moving around a city is efficient public transport. The attached document demonstrates the enormous superiority of the public transportation in relation to the private one in all the operating parameters. If this priority is given, public transport is also faster or in other words, more economic. Higher speeds and lower costs permit more attractive prices. Attractive prices and faster speeds generate more passengers and smaller deficits. This is for example the case of the city of Freiburg as it is shown in the attached file. The Freiburg in Breisgau system annually carries 72 million passengers with a deficit of only 8.1m € in a city with 215.00 inhabitants. This gives an average of 340 trips annually for each inhabitant and a deficit for each trip of only 0.11 cents,
3. Public transport has to be seen by the users as a single system of transport working as a network. An integrated fee system and excellent correspondences in the nodes are necessary.
4. This basic ideas plus these one that have been showed in §3 completes the vision on the more appropriate mobility policy.
5. There should be additional investment available for a public transport system if it is necessary to increase its capacity. Cross-subsidy arrangements such as those which were successfully developed in London, where financial resources from private cars go to public transport (buses) through congestion charge, shows clearly a right way to finance this new transport offer.

In the annex a summary on transport infrastructure in European cities is shown

12. Should the development of dedicated lanes for collective transport be encouraged?

For the previously mentioned reasons the bus lanes and the construction of tram and other LRT rights of way are indispensable.

13. Is there a need to introduce a European Charter on rights and obligations for passengers using collective transport?

This idea is also essential. Passenger's rights and obligations have to be promoted and harmonised in the EU.

On the other hand, it is necessary to take into account PRMs policies. A PMR EU directive should be implemented.

14. What measures could be undertaken to better integrate passenger and freight transport in research and in urban mobility planning?

As CO2 emissions and noise and pollutants –particularly PM-10- from delivery goods in cities are important, urban strategies to decrease these bad effects should be implemented. In some cases vans and lorries distributing urban goods account for 40% of total traffic movements, especially in city centre, and causes conflicts with public transport. The principles of the Directive of the Eurovignette should be also applied to urban goods distribution. As the implementation of the new Directive of the Eurovignette has shown in European countries where has been applied, these schemes reduce empty-vehicle trips and encourage fleet renewal with lower-emission vehicles.

On the other hand, the delivery of goods with the help of public transport vehicles (the so-called co-modality also in urban freight transport), such as it has been developed in Amsterdam, should be considered as a real option.

A kind of handbook where the successful experiences from diminishing emissions and increasing of the efficiency on urban freight delivery should be developed.

15. How can better coordination between urban and interurban transport and land use planning be achieved? What type of organisational structure could be appropriate?

The best way to co-ordinate urban and interurban transport is to remove barriers between both systems. The different systems need to operate in a coordinated way, ensuring a seamless experience for passengers as if part of a single, integrated system. A single transport authority is likely to be required to oversee this activity in each major conurbation and its associated travel to work area. In the future, there has to be a single network of public and sustainable transport. One only authority is needed for the whole area where daily transports are produced.

16. What further actions should be undertaken to help cities and towns meet their road safety and personal security challenges in urban transport?

The road safety strategies in cities always are part of national strategies. The EU has its own strategy that aims to reduce to half the number of deaths on road and cities in all the Union. Promoting public transport as the main mean of transportation and traffic-calming policies in cities leads to fewer deaths and injuries amongst road users.

17. How can operators and citizens be better informed on the potential of advanced infrastructure management and vehicle technologies for safety?

There are several strategies to inform on the potentials on technologies. Normally the best way to increase the awareness of local authorities and operators in cities in this issue is to spread out the best experiences and to establish a line of funding them but

only in the case of convinced replication of those projects that have succeed. There is also a case for developing a technology research platform at EU level with the specific task of advising on EU investment in R&D on urban mobility issues as proposed by EUROFORUM with EPF's support. This would be similar to the EU's existing Research Advisory Councils (such as ACARE, ERRAC, ERTRAC and WATERBORNE ^{TP}) and EARAC) but with a remit to address its work from a strategic rather than a specifically sector industrial stance.

18. Should automatic radar devices adapted to the urban environment be developed and should their use be promoted?

Undoubtedly, radar devices help authorities to assure compliance with speed limitations. Less speed also means less pollution, fewer greenhouse gases emissions, less noise, fewer accidents with lower level of injuries, and less congestion since the traffic laws establishes very clearly that the maximum capacity is reached in the interval 60-80 km/h.

19. Is video surveillance a good tool for safety and security in urban transport?

Yes.

20. Should all stakeholders work together in developing a new mobility culture in Europe? Based on the model of the European Road Safety Observatory, could a European Observatory on Urban Mobility be a useful initiative to support this cooperation?

Yes. The stakeholders' associations should be participant of this observatory.

21. How could existing financial instruments such as structural and cohesion funds be better used in a coherent way to support integrated and sustainable urban transport?

Changing the priorities. Many countries of the European Union, for example Spain, have built extensive highways networks thanks to European funding, in many cases with support from "social" funds. If these funds had been applied to public transportation infrastructure development, the panorama would now be a lot of more favourable to the public transport. Until now, European funds have done little for city mobility. Taking into account the serious situation due to the climatic change and the exhaustion of cheap oil, the mobility policy of the UE should be urgently reoriented to give support only to the development of the public transport. This is in fact the mobility sector that needs more help.

This rule should apply to subventions but also to credits (EIB).

On the other hand, as it is observed in the Green Paper, from 35 billion € that went to transport projects in 2000-2006 only 2 billion € went to city projects. Whereas, as can be read in the introduction, 85% of the GNP of the EU comes from urban environments and over 60% of the Europeans live there. So the EFRO-division is distorted and this amount of money can surely make a difference.

We propose therefore:

- a. that a larger part of the EFRO funds should be allocated to urban areas;
- b. that the distribution of the money should be based on new sustainability criteria such as:

- air quality;
- energy consumption / CO2 emission;
- the amount of discomfort/nuisance;
- use of space;
- traffic safety;

On this basis, at urban and metropolitan level the most efficient project, in other words, projects based on eco-mobility, should receive a larger part of the EFRO money automatically

22. How could economic instruments, in particular market-based instruments, support clean and energy efficient urban transport?

23. How could targeted research activities help more in integrating urban constraints and urban traffic development?

24. Should towns and cities be encouraged to use urban charging? Is there a need for a general framework and/or guidance for urban charging? Should the revenues be earmarked to improve collective urban transport? Should external costs be internalised?

Yes, of course. The experience of London, Stockholm, Milan, Durham and many Dutch and German cities, such as Berlin, shows clearly the high interest of urban charging policy in order to get a more sustainable, socially united and competitive mobility. A Directive framework, based upon the existing cases, should be developed. Incomes for charging systems have to be applied in public transport or mobility policy (as it has been made for example in the city of Barcelona where incomes from public parking fees are used to pay the bike public system).

We cannot talk about a fair and competitive mobility if external costs are not included. The inclusion of external cost in the normal cost structure is an obligation taking into account the principles of a real free market as established by the foundational laws of the EU.

25. What added value could, in the longer term, targeted European support for financing clean and energy efficient urban transport, bring?

Public transport uses less energy than private. The attached document demonstrates that a trip made in suburban electric trains consumes one-twenty-sixth of the energy consumed by a private car. These figures are valid for the area of Barcelona but also apply to most similar trains throughout Europe. It then appears very clearly the huge benefit of promoting and finance the public transport due to their low level of energy consumption. Moreover, electrical supply has the opportunity to be provided through renewable systems. Nowadays, we know how to produce all necessary electrical supply from renewable sources. On the other hand, from the efficiency point of view it is very clear that electrical engines are clearly superior to those based on internal combustion (Otto and Diesel cycles) since their performance is up to five times more efficient.


Offer of PT in European cities over 200.000 inhabitants

	Number of cities Inhabitants		Metro		Tram		Planned Tram	Planned Metro
			Number	%	Number	%		
> 1.000.000	17	38.156.797	17	100%	15	88%	1	0
1.000.000 - 500.000	36	31.114.606	19	53%	33	92%	0	2
200.000 - 500.000	130	45.039.680	14	11%	79	61%	4	2
Total	183	114.311.083	50	27%	127	69%	5	4

Source: PTP from data of UrbanRail.net, Citypopulation.de, Eurostat and LRTA.


Levels of efficiency of public transport in relation to the private one in all the operating parameters.

Urban accidents for each million of circulation hours



Source: Rhein Consult, Germany


AT URBAN SCALE, BUSES AND TRAMS ARE THE BEST CHOICE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE SURFACE SINCE THEY OFFERS A VERY EFFICIENT MOBILITY



As far as width is concern, train is the lowest consumer of space




Source: PTP, Barcelona, Spain




Source: PTP, Barcelona, Spain

- Cars are extremely inefficient as far as passengers occupation is concern.
- 14 times higher in the case of the bus and more of 100 times in the case of railways
- El 80% of cars only carry 1 people



Source: PTP. Barcelona. Spain

The total cost of operating



[Source: real costs of transport. Metropolitan Transport Authority. barcelona

- Having not into account the time, public transport is 4 times more economic.
- Counting out the time, 1.7 times more

Freiburg in Breisgau. World record of passengers

