



**WORKSHOP**  
**WARSAW 5 NOVEMBRE 2009**

## MORNING SESSION

### I- THE IMPACT OF GROWING MOTORIZATION IN THE NEW MEMBER STATES

Chaired by Wojciek Suchorzewski University of Warsaw.

**Presentation were made by Ropid Prague, BKSZ Budapest and ZTM Warsaw, they are available on the website [www.emta.com](http://www.emta.com) /members only/general meetings Warsaw**

#### ➤ **Main remarks from the presentations:**

##### **PRAGUE** Filip Drapal:

Every problem in Prague transport network is linked to a lack of infrastructure.

The integration of PT should cover the whole Bohemian region instead of the present close suburbs only

The development of the regional railway doesn't properly serve the city centre, thus fails to really take part into the urban transport. Prague is still looking for the "diameter line" that will reach all radial lines.

##### **Budapest**

Zsolt Denke underlines strongly the problem of the lack of administration between central Government and municipalities.

##### **Presentation Warsaw** Piotr Izdebski/ Tamàs Dombi

The main challenge is the suburban development of public transport (PT) (modal share is in favour of PT in main City).

Coverage by fare revenues is 33% , the rest is brought by Warsaw municipality of which it represents the major spending in the whole budget.

Ticket integration results from a patient building up from 2005 to 2008.

Main problem is one of governance: the main city Warsaw has bilateral agreements with 30 surrounding municipalities and yet must act as the leader of the whole group as if it were a consensual entity.

##### **Peer review: W. Schroll VOR comments on local situation in Vienna with regards modal share.**

Vienna is a city and a province in itself this means the city next door is already another province over which Vienna Transport Authority has no competency, although a great part of the traffic is induced by out of Vienna citizens, and whereas in the city centre the modal share is in favour of PT it drops to 11% in the surroundings.

The competent authority for rail is the Federal (not regional) government. For buses it isn't so clear.

There is now a clear need for new rules and for setting up PTAs to comply with Regulation 2007/1370.

##### **Peer review: H-W. Franz VBB comments on local situation in Berlin-Brandenburg**

Although passengers are very supportive of the development of Public Transport as a way to improve life in urban areas, and so are the media and journalists, there are still strong efforts to be made to bring politicians to consider more seriously the concept.

This happens especially with mayors of smaller cities outside of Berlin; it should be reminded that it took 10 years to the metropolitan Transport Authority Berlin-Brandenburg to be really effective.

However to achieve the modal shift goal, the priority is to keep raising the level of Quality in PT and never forget that PT will never provide the door to door trip as does the car.

➤ **Debate**

**A question was raised about the fare level:** it is noticed that fares are kept low in Warsaw. Would a higher price send the right signal and bring in more revenues to cover PT operations?

On the one hand (says P.Izdebski) it seems difficult to raise the fares as PT is an essential public service and fares shouldn't be compared to western levels because average incomes in Poland are much lower as well.

On the other hand (says W.Suchorzewski) car ownership represents 1.5 to 2 times the weight they represent for households in western Europe, *hence it is really a question of preference.*

**J. Viegas introduces in the debate a concept of fairness of price** in transport policy emphasizing that public subsidies after all are stemming from income taxes meaning from the citizen's pocket. If 1/3 only of the actual cost of PT is covered by the fare, then 2/3 have to be paid from the tax payer-citizen. Why not re-balance towards a fairer price?

On the other hand says T.Dombi the higher taxes are paid by those citizen with higher incomes who actually are also the car owners. Besides the fare level is a question of policy priorities, here in Warsaw priorities are clearly Education and Transport.

➤ **Conclusions wrap up by W.Suchorzewski:**

On the institutional/governance question:

- It is clear that there isn't one only solution to bring about a strong and effective collaboration between the different sectors (road administration, land use administration and PT administration) and between levels of responsibilities from local to central.

- It is hoped that extensive and in depth exchange of information among EMTA network and with other actors should help clarifying the best way to go.

On the level of the fares:

- Again we have to explore and know more about preferences of electorate; more surveys would certainly help enlightening this aspect.

-----

## AFTERNOON SESSION

### II- PRESENTATION OF ECONOMIC PAPER ON URBAN TRANSPORT PROF. JOSE VIEGAS Technical University of Lisbon

The Challenge of the study is to show the economic value of good urban mobility and how to capture it.

2 goals are pursued: first is the highlight of the role of PT for competitiveness, well being of citizens and reduction of CO<sub>2</sub>, the second is to show what is necessary to do to have this come to reality. Here, 3 areas are researched: the configuration question, the financing question and the institutional question.

- **Prof. Viegas made a slide presentation, for more: [www.emta.com](http://www.emta.com) /members only/general meetings Warsaw.**

About the first goal: the Cost Benefit Analysis has been developed for years under different approaches, to evaluate the economic weight of transport, it should however be completed, Viegas says, by a *reference class* review (cost of similar projects but weighted differently according to circumstances-which is the privilege of politicians who in fact make the final decision).

In times of economic crisis, PT is the way to provide mobility for all and at the same time it can be a quick job activator.

As regards the contribution of PT to combating climate change adverse impact, through the monitoring of new mobility patterns and the boost of quality in the services, PT could reach the level of the "second best choice" (after the private car) and achieve the desired modal shift.

About the second goal, How to get there?, several recommendations are made:

- Change mind-set and consider **modal alternation**: my day to day travel patterns aren't exactly the same so responses are different every day. Let's make a sound decision each time instead of going by the routine
- Raise the quality of PT so as to bring it to the **second best choice**
- Have the cars pay for using infrastructure on two grounds: one is because they benefit larger space when PT is good and popular the second is because of externalities. The best/cheapest way to have them pay is when they are parked so **raising the parking fees** would be efficient.
- Set up an **overarching Urban Mobility agency** to cover all departments/ aspects of mobility (road, parking, cycle lanes, pedestrian lanes, taxis, PT) in fact thanks to PTAs spatial coherence is there however **intermodal -at large-coherence is still needed.**
- Get more information on mobility: a good policy on mobility needs to **know about the ambitions or needs of all actors/ stakeholders** of Urban Mobility (there should be indicators related to that too)
- This additional information is important to start building the case for the decision makers; then it will **belong to politicians to say when to move and how fast.**

Remarks from attendance

- We should talk about accessibility rather than mobility. Public Transport Authorities provide accessibility and in the long term people have (or haven't) mobility. In fact mobility can be considered as the addition/combination of accessibility and individual choices.
- The question of the pricing of Mobility is really a delicate/sensitive one

➤ **Report on the survey on economic crisis Carmen Sanz:**

Two main points:

- 75% of EMTA members have declared being impacted by the crisis
- most of them have had implemented adaptation measures

**For more see report on website [www.emta.com](http://www.emta.com) /members only/general meetings Warsaw.**

➤ **BRAINSTORMING IN SUB-GROUPS**

The attendance was split into 2 groups working on the following questions

- Do you think possible to move forward to another direction, somehow away from the classical subsidies stemming from public money only to cover transport costs in addition to the fare revenues? This question relates to the configuration/institutional question in Viegas paper.
- How do you see the things occurring? What are the possible sources of money Which steps should be taken? Relates to the financial question in Viegas paper.

○ **Notes on the configuration discussion** (*CENTRO representative*)

*Background: Grasping the (new) total concept of Mobility is to bring about changes: in people's mind-set (real time decision for each trip) in the delivering of PT (get away from conservative services and let operators bring innovation) in decision makers point of view (PT should be a priority over private car)*

Group believed that Governance was the key to delivering Jose Viegas Proposal.

At first the group felt that a model for the whole Metropolitan Area similar to TfL transport for London which was responsible for:

- all modes
- direct funding from Government
- a strong political mandate e.g. a Mayor
- self-sufficient
- revenue raising power

However some members felt that one organisation as large as TfL could be difficult to achieve. Therefore the group concluded that the key was one plan or strategy that all stakeholders are agreed and signed-up to, was the way forward

○ **Notes on the financing discussion** (AMT Montreal Daniel Bergeron):

*Background: the fear of the increasing scarcity of public funding should lead to increase self sufficiency of PT; in other words How to get Urban mobility to cover most of its cost ?*

Should we review the financial framework of public transport to internalize its funding within beneficiaries (customers, land owners, car users) rather than subsidies from the city or the state?

Already taxes dedicated to PT exist on gas or on cars DE, CND, on the total salaries paid (VT) in FR.

What distribution of pricing Spain raises?, help the people most in need and let the other pay higher price?, but getting the social sector to contribute transport costs would be a strong political decision

The assumption underlying this question, that Public Transport can be considered in a different way than other public service like health care, is not obvious for everyone (FIN surprised).

But despite the agreement or not on this assumption, the importance of a good understanding of public transport costs is a first step through the process. Then the question about who should pay is asked. On first hand, having subsidies from government or contribution from beneficiaries isn't a short-term issue.

But having access to dedicated funding sources rather than recurrent arbitrary political decision is clearly an issue.

And in a long term perspective, the internalization of costs may provide to Public Transportation a much more sustainable way of funding as well as an efficient tool of mobility management.

-----