

CiviTAS

Cleaner and better transport in cities

MIMOSA

D11.6 - Fourth Policy Statement

"Collective Passenger Transport"

Organisation: ISIS

Date: 31st January 2012

Version: Final Version







DELIVERABLE KEY INFORMATION	
Document Code	D11.6
Title of Document	Fourth Policy Statement "Collective Passenger Transport"
Reference Workpackage	WP11
Reference Measure	N.A.
Contractual Date of Delivery	15 th August 2012 (M46)
Actual Date of Delivery	31 st January 2012 (M40)
Dissemination Level	Public
Date of Preparation	May 2011
Author(s)	Stefano Proietti (ISIS), Christien Rodenburg (CUT), Frank Samsen (CUT), Armando Ribeiro (FUN), Cristina Gironimi (COBO), Andres Harjo (TLN) Małgorzata Ratkowska (GDA)
Editor(s)	John Porter (INTR)
Project Coordinator	Cristina Gironimi Piazza Maggiore,6 40126 Bologna - Italy +39.051.2195163 cristina.gironimi@comune.bologna.it





1. General Overview

Public transport is an essential factor, together with bicycle and walking, for sustainable urban mobility strategies. It helps to reduce energy consumption, accidents, congestion, air emission, noise, use of ending resources, use of space. It also produces relevant benefits on the social and economic side (social inclusion, economic development, accessibility, etc.).

Collective passenger transport concerns different aspects and dimensions, like improved quality of service through clean and energy-efficient vehicle fleets; non-conventional public transport systems; innovative organisational, financing and management schemes; improved security and safety; integration with walking, cycling and other modes; attention to accessibility for people with reduced mobility. These elements have to be dealt with not only by local authorities, but they also need support from national and European layer.

From a citizens' point of view, the implementation and management of a collective passenger transport system is beneficial for the following reasons:

- it decreases congestion due to the use of private transport in urban areas and on major arteries;
- it uses less energy than private transport;
- it reduces air and noise pollution;
- it also allows mobility to those not owing a private vehicle;
- costs may be lower than those of private transport (depending on how the public authorities intervene to subsidize infrastructures and other components for private transport and / or public transport);
- no need for travellers to concentrate on the route and driving, thus making it possible to devote time to other activities (reading, conversation, other);
- the risks associated with travel are usually lower than those of private transport because the
 driving of the vehicle is entrusted to a professional, and because many public transport vehicles
 operate on their own path (on rail or road lanes), significantly reducing the risk of accidents with
 other private means;
- when running on reserved lanes, collective vehicles, such as trains, trams and metro, are less subject to traffic delays;
- reduced need to own a private car, with the consequent reduction of living costs.

Among the possible drawbacks for the use of the collective passenger transport are:

- high cost involved in building infrastructure (e.g., rail), which will usually pay off after a medium/long time;
- it is vulnerable due to possible lack of capillary feeder services;
- defect of integration with spatial planning, making difficult to reach different points of a city;
- risks of overcrowded transport vehicles;
- lack of cleanliness and comfort (e.g., lack of air conditioning, inappropriate winter heating);
- stations and public transport vehicles can be perceived as insecure, especially during peak off hours;
- limitations due to costs versus use/service (i.e. cost reductions vs increasing quality and use of service);
- inadequacy of operating schedule, not allowing the use of public transport for those having atypical hours;
- non competitive journey times, partly because of the need to make many stops along the route and / or insufficient frequency of transport vehicles.





2. Statement on Collective Passenger Transport

Economics of collective passenger transport

- 1. Costs of collective passenger transport should include costs saved in terms of public health (pollution related diseases, accidents, etc.). Often the typical financing sources of collective passenger transport (fare collection and public funding) do not reflect the full commercial costs of the service. In order to guarantee and to measure "best value for money" of public financing for collective passenger transport, public service contracts between the authority and the operator can be introduced with quality parameters (among others, accessibility, security, reliability, availability, etc.) as criteria for assessment of the service for financial support.
- 2. For a fairer comparison between (individual) private transport and (collective) public transport, a life cycle analysis should be made. Often the private transport does not pay the **full costs** it generates for society (infrastructure, wear and tear, noise, congestions, and accidents) and it is not accessible to all. According to that, the weight of financing collective passenger transport can be **shifted**, also with the help of ITS systems for control and monitoring, towards private cars users, for example with parking fees, access control, road charging fees (tolls), fuel taxes and reduced subsidies for certain professional categories and activities. This could achieve the double objective of discouraging the use of private vehicles and finding new resources for collective passenger transport.

Attractiveness and quality of collective passenger transport

- 3. The security of travellers is a critical issue for collective passenger transport. By their nature, public transport systems are open and fully accessible. Attacks on personal security are not particularly high on most public transport services but perception of this factor is a major problem, especially for weaker categories of customer (women, elder and young people). As a consequence many people might decide to use their own vehicles instead of opting for 'insecure' PT stations and stops. A combination of design (safer waiting areas, improvements in the pavement, shelters and benches at bus stops) and technology (cameras at stops and on vehicles, better lighting), staff training and awareness can contribute to making collective passenger transport systems more secure in reality and in the perception of customers and therefore more attractive and being a competitor to individual private transport.
- 4. Comfort, reliability and travel time are fundamental criteria to allow collective passenger transport being competitive with individual private transport. In this sense, priority systems and reserved lanes, often complemented by ITS tools for monitoring, enforcement and information, play a key role to influence users towards shifting to PT. Otherwise, if PT appears always to be caught in traffic, it triggers a negative loop, with users abandoning PT and reverting to private car use thus once again increasing traffic jams.









- 5. An integrated approach of modalities like walking, bikes and PT (in terms of infrastructures, network layout, fares, information, maps, tickets, payments, timetables, investments and intermodality with cycling, car-sharing, etc.) supports the feeding of PT, eases accessibility and creates user-friendly services.
- 6. Awareness, communication and marketing and users rights' strategies deal with all customer relations activities like sales, advertising, branding, network design, product specification, lifestyle, customer charters, complaint management and customer service: they can help to increase revenues, to reduce costs and to improve the quality and the image of public transport. Firmly established procedures for dealing with complaints and claims for damages as well as measurement and publication of actual performance will strongly contribute to increase the actual as well as perceived quality of collective passenger transport.



THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE IS CO-FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION





7. **ITS** applications and tools allow optimising the management of traffic and passengers flows. They should be encouraged at all levels for control, monitoring, information and continuous evaluation.



8. The **environmental and energy challenge** of meeting the 20-20-20 goals set by the European Commission can be a driver for increased attractiveness: collective public transport can lead the process of adopting clean fuels and vehicles, decreasing the dependence of fossil fuels and thus showing the example to all the citizens to progressively remove conventionally-fuelled cars from the streets.

Urban planning and societal trends

9. Urban planning and mobility policies, in particular the design the urban area and the collective passenger transport network, can result in more accessible, sustainable an attractive cities. Appropriate **urban planning** can contribute to balanced modal split in favour of public transport. On the other hand, it needs a parallel policy on private cars (through parking policies, traffic calming, road pricing), priority for public transport vehicles and bicycles on restricted road space, creation or building of interchange points and park&ride facilities and attractive high density developments around PT nodes.









- 10. The trend of suburbanization and urban sprawl leads to low-density, spatially segregated land use. The resulting dispersal of home, work and leisure facilities results in increased transport demand. However, lower housing densities in peripheral areas make it difficult (financially) to offer collective transport solutions of a sufficient quality to attract substantial numbers of users. Public transport services should be developed to reach high density urban and working areas, shopping centres and leisure activities. On the other hand public transport services contribute to develop such areas and activities due to the accessibility provided by the PT. Thus integrated approaches can lead to shared financial responsibility between public authorities and real estate developers (both in the investment and in the operational phase).
- 11. The demographic change in the next decades will soon see a decline in the group of younger people, a smaller working-age population and an increase in older persons. These demographic developments will have a huge impact on the overall demand for transport, and the characteristics of the solutions that are offered. Tailored solutions (e.g., on-demand services) should be developed for people without their own transport and persons with special needs (disabled people, intellectual challenged, elderly people, mothers with children in buggies,) to maintain self sufficiency and independence so to comply with the social function of PT.





Signatures

City of Bologna - Andrea Colombo, Deputy Mayor for Traffic and Mobility - Municipality of Bologna

Date and signature

21/12/2011 ACD

City of Funchal - Bruno Pereira, Vice Mayor and Councillor for Transport, Mobility, Traffic, Public Works and Civil Protection

Date and signature

City of Gdansk - Maciej Lisicki, Vice Mayor (in charge of Public Transport and Infrastructure)

Date and signature

ZASTĘPCA PREZYDENTA MIASTA GDAŃSKA

09-12-2011

Maciej Lisicki ZASTĘPCA PREZYDENTA MIASTA GDAŃSKA do POLOTYKI KOMINALNEJ

City of Tallinn – Taavi Aas, Deputy Mayor for City Planning and Transport

Date and signature

16.11.2011

City of Utrecht – Frits Lintmeijer, Deputy Mayor for Mobility, Culture, Monuments and Archaeology, Regional and International affairs

Date and signature

13-12-2011

•

