



EMTA

Workshop

Valencia, 27th April 2009

Round table 1

Aurelio LOPEZ

Good morning dear EMTA members, welcome to Valencia. I must introduce our table of today: our President, Mr. PENTTILA, whom all of us know, and Vicente DOMINE Vice-President of eTM [Entitat de Transport Metropolità de Valencia] and Director General of transport in the regional government - Generalitat Valenciana he is responsible for all the transport and logistics in the regional government. So Vicente will introduce a little bit about our work and about Valencia.

Vicente DOMINE

I am very happy to see everyone here. The Valencian community has made a big effort with their public transport. There are three very important transport systems which are being developed in Valencia as well as Alicante. Alicante which is a city in south of Valencia has got train-tram, which is a combination of train and tram. Valencia has got a more conventional metro system and the tram system. And there is a rather innovative mode in Castellon which is in the north of this community which we will be visiting later today and which is using an optic guide system and an electric portion and this is functioning very well. Due to climate change, these transport initiatives are important for the Valencian government. EMTA is very much facilitating these processes. EMTA really achieve two things in my opinion, they really put to forefront some of these transport issues before a political government within Europe. EMTA is an excellent platform for the spread of these new technologies and between the different European cities and it means that the time horizons to get these projects going, are much shortened by common experience shared in group. I must highlight also the contribution by Amsterdam with their innovative transport solutions ten years ago and how they are now being studied and carried out actually in Spain at this moment and that is part of the benefits of the EMTA-type organization. I feel that it is very important that this interchange of information allows transport to be one of the main pillars of the 21st century society. We often talk about a highly hypothetical situation saying: “imagine if none of the hundreds and hundreds of transport networks in Europe worked for one day, what would happen to the continent?” They would be paralyzed and nothing would work. The work of it is fundamental for the economic development of Europe. I think that there is a full program awaiting you for today. I hope that everything works today and apart from the meeting here in Valencia, I really hope that you can all have a look around the city; it has very much changed in the last 10 or 20 years and it is one of the cities that really well combines a very modern architecture with a very well preserved old district. Valencia is about 2 000 years and I hope that we are here for another 2 000 years. The transport projects are a

big part of that future. Just to finish the presentation, we have prepared a short presentation with a few of the touristic sites here in Valencia that you can enjoy. Thank you very much.

(A film is being broadcasted see : [Valencia city presentation](#) - this is an amazing clip)

Hannu PENTTILA

I will first thank you Mr. the General Director DOMINI for your words concerning EMTA and our importance. I will also thank our local host. We see that the sun is shining and everything will be ahead of us concerning public transport and interesting cases in Valencia. So we will learn a lot during these two days. But some words concerning EMTA first, somehow we have no written reason but our reason is in our name already: EMTA which means European Metropolitan Transport Authorities. Metropolitan areas of our members -cover more or less more than one million inhabitants - (our capital areas) and we are a European organization, our concern is transport, especially public transport and our special concern is that we are not only operators; in some cases we are operators as well, but in every case we are the Authority which has the public task to make that service available for citizens. Our name somehow concentrates our aim. So our message and reason is to speak -from the voice –of the Authority and I hope also from the citizen side, concerning public transport –to make our metropolitan areas better to live. During these twice-a-year meetings we have learned a lot and I am sure that today and tomorrow we will learn more concerning especially Valencia. One of our tools in our networking is benchmarking; we learn from each others and we can benchmark good and bad cases from each other. We share our knowledge through our publications like Barometer and Directory and our Web page services as well. Little by little we have had courage to share our knowledge also -with the wider audience. I am sure that every time when we have shared our information, our data concerning 32 authorities around Europe, more or less, knowledge and information has been so valid that the wider audience, interested about how to arrange and how to operate public transport in metropolitan areas; did really share that information and acknowledge its value.

But at the same time - nowadays, - we have started to lobby; we have noticed that almost everything which is done by public transport authorities –is more or less controlled or guided from Brussels and EU, directives - legislation and funding. That means that we have to be better in the long-run for lobbying our message so that our voice will be heard. This is making level as well and we have the first experiment on that and maybe today and tomorrow we will hear more about that but I feel that in next years we have to be strong -ones on that question. In today's world, we have two big challenges; we have climate change and we

have the financial crisis as well at the same time. I feel that for that discussion we need to give our answer as well. It is partly mobility plans, it is also better public transport, better services and better urban areas. We have to have in our head the longer sight; not only tomorrow or next month perspective. We have to look as Mr. General Director said at least 2000 years ahead and maybe we can do something for that and in that case, I am sure that public transport authorities around Europe are needed, and especially their common network; and where there is free networking, EMTA is needed. Once again - I am happy to see so many friends here - and I am sure that during these two days we have still and once again more benchmark and - information to share, -more than yesterday. Thank you.

Thomas AVANZATA

Good morning to all of you. I am Thomas AVANZATA, I am the moderator for this morning two round tables. Talking about the first round table, I will ask because I am not gone remain alone on this table, do not worry, I will ask Mr. Marc GARCIA, Mr. Tamas DOMBI, Mr Enzo CORRADO BASON, Mr. David BROWN and Mr. Olivier NALIN to join me on the floor for this first round table on Mobility Plans. I will ask also the chairman of this session, Mr. Thierry DUQUENNE to join us.

A few words of introduction: various names exist to refer to an already ten-year old practice of transport authorities members of EMTA. Ile-de-France talks about urban mobility plans while Barcelona has a mobility master plan and in the UK, Sheffield delivers a local transport plan. Whatever the name, the practice emerged as a comprehensive roadmap reflecting real concerns on how public transport should develop as a sustainable activity in itself but also support economic activities and reinforce social cohesion. Those local comprehensive strategies signaled the evolution of the public authorities themselves through the process of decentralization across European countries. Actually in the 80s and at the beginning of the 90s, a majority of central governments decided to hand over to local administration whether at the regional or at the sub regional level, the competency and the responsibility for urban transport with the view to a better efficiency. As a response to the devolution of new roles, new competences, new duties, public transport authorities started to build the strategy for improving transport services based on the existing transport networks including advanced technologies and new services related to mobility. They also included a variety of actions such as tariff integration, green zones and the promotion of soft modes among others. Finally we could describe a practice of mobility plans as the way to best find the appropriate, I would say the local balance between mobility needs on the one hand and health and environment protection on the other hand. Of course this balance has to be found, taking into account, local contexts, various local policies but also sometimes national vision and the national

frame. The European Commission even noticed the success of this new approach and in turn through the green paper called *Towards a new culture for urban Mobility* questioned - how best to ensure the promotion and maybe the take-up of this new approach by the European metropolises.

In this first round table, we will see the different experiences of transport authorities from Barcelona, Warsaw, Torino, Sheffield and Ile-de-France, we will see through these experiences that -there are different ways of handling plans. We will see that while sharing similar goals, mobility plans use different means to achieve locally agreed objectives. The result will probably be that there is not one sole and only magic recipe. This session will be shared by Mr. Thierry DUQUENNE, Chief engineer at Brussels Capital Administration; he is in charge of Brussels Mobility Plan since 1991. So he is what we can call very experienced expert. Mr. DUQUENNE will of course be able to react to the different presentations that will be given. At the end of our five presentations, the time remaining will be dedicated to your question but I will try to make sure that the presentations are kept short enough in order to leave you a sufficient time to ask your questions. I will now give the floor to our first speaker, Mr. Marc GARCIA. He is the technical Director for ATM Barcelona.

Marc GARCIA (Barcelona)

[\[Marc Garcia presentation\]](#).

Thank you Thomas, good morning to all of you. That is a long presentation, I will get rid of most of it because I have only ten minutes and actually I brought with me several CDs in which the full Mobility Master Plan is included, I will leave them on the desk, if you wish. There is also an executive summary included in these CDs. I am afraid that this is in Spanish. I hope you are able nevertheless to grasp most of it. Why a PTA gets into the task of drafting a mobility plan.

The answer is because the law says that. Our PTA was established in 1997; six years after that, the Catalan parliament approved a law which is called the Mobility law, that is the official name of the law, saying explicitly that in the Catalan territory, territorial mobility authorities should be established and also specifying in the Barcelona metropolitan region, ATM – formerly PTA – would be the territorial mobility authority. So the Mobility law entrusts us [ATM] as mobility authority for our region which was a real surprise for us because we guys, are supposed to know a little bit about public transport but about mobility, it is not so certain that we are so performant.

We had to do a lot of accelerated courses on mobility management to reconvert ourselves into a mobility authority. So ATM on the basis of this Mobility law and that is a very important piece of our legal body at the moment acts as regional mobility role and has drafted the PDM. The PDM is the acronym I will use Mobility Master Plan. The PDM was approved by the board of ATM in late 2007 and it was finally approved by the regional government in September 2008. The law says that the original government has to approve these pieces of planning. What is the framework for the development of PDM? Is it that we developed that from scratch? The answer is no; between the law and the PDM, there is the national mobility directives. What is the national mobility directives? It is proposition document that was foreseen in the Mobility law explaining some of the goals that the different mobility plans that are considered in this Mobility law have to attain. On the other side, the national mobility directives also explicit what are the minimum contents for the different mobility plans to be developed. From this legal framework, we go on to a technical framework that is really our close and immediate framework for the development of the Mobility Master Plan.

How did we develop the plan? We did not do it in an illustrated despotic way. I must confess that we were tempted to do so but the law is very explicitly saying that we have to count on every single stakeholder that maybe affected by our plans or that the plan maybe be affected by their performance. At the same time that the mobility law was approved, the status of ATM was changed so as to create the ATM Mobility Council. The ATM Mobility Council is a consultation council in which the regional institutions, businesses and institutions, environmental institutions, neighborhood associations, trade unions, universities etc., participated and has been really acting as the heart of the consultation process of PDM. I must say that compared to other plans I was involved in in from my professional life, it has been a really consultative process and a really participative plan as I promised you. We spent a lot of time in getting I must say good ideas from the different stakeholders. As I told you and I will go very fast on that, I mean the law devices a minimum –counsels –on the plan, apart from that which are clear-cut and easy to understand titles. The plan also includes and that is also I would say genuine for the plan which was not necessary to do. The plan also includes guidelines for Urban Mobility Plans to be developed by the municipalities. That means that the original plan is a framework for the bunch of different Urban Mobility Plans that are being developed by the municipalities.

On the other side and that these were some of our specific concerns; we wanted to get quantitative environmental targets to be reached. We did not want to do a sustainable Mobility Plan saying: “our mobility will be sustainable and that is wonderful.” You have to qualify what the sustainable mobility is. What does it mean? In terms of the amount of the

tons of CO² exposed into the atmosphere, of the tons of wastes you are emitting, the amount of NOX and of PM10 you are doing, we specified the quantitative environmental target we will reach and at the end of the plan we did a self-evaluation that will be updated every two years so as you see that we are really in that direction. Also in addition to this environmental quantitative target was that we had some monitoring indicators; I mean to really see if we are on the plan path or we are deviating from that. PDM seeks what a the sustainable Mobility Plan should seek; that is it. Hence an excess in mobility, making it offer less energy consumption, reducing the external costs. PDM includes a full account of external costs of mobility in the Barcelona metropolitan region to inflate into euros apart from the environmental indicators; one of the indicators is the overall cost, the overall calculation of the external cost of mobility for different means and not only passengers but also freight. I mean that this is a small detail I do not want to miss. The mobility plan does not only envisage the passenger mobility, it also gets into tricky and difficult to access world of freight transportation. PDM also seeks to respond to economic challenges; I mean that the gain of competitiveness has to be reinforced by PDM. The good thing is that the drafting of the plan is done by guys like us. We are not purely environmentalists. We were at a tension between the people saying: “we need to have rules and rules because you are not going to put competitiveness into question, will you?”

On the other side, the other people saying: “you are not an environmental savant, you have to be careful about the result.” The PDM tries to keep at the balance between these two controversial or even opposite ranges which are really difficult to conserve. Last but not least and this was a special concern for trade unions; PDM tries to respond to social challenges such as accessibility and the promotion of public transport, the way to avoid social exclusion. This is relevant for region like us in which between 1997 and 2007, we were 6 million people in 1997, but now we are 7. One million of them are people that have immigrated to Catalonia and in principal, I mean they do not have an easy access to the mobility market. In this issue, making to them available performing means of transport at the reasonable price, that means social inclusion. If you ask what is happening from 2008 on and with the economic crisis, we could spend half an hour about these decisions of course. That is an area, we are talking about - where there are 5 million inhabitants -, in 164 municipalities. The dense area and the most performing area from the social point of view is actually the city of Barcelona in which a lot of people walk, a lot of people use public transport. Only one fourth of the total trips are done with private cars, which is quite performing In the rest of the region, the percentages are not so sustainable and that is really where the major challenges for PDM are. Thomas asked during the breakfast that we should highlight why such a plan is needed. This plan emerges as I said from a legal precept and on the other side from the technical point of view,

it emerges from the observation of the trend. The mobility trends in the Barcelona metropolitan region look like that. This is a comparison between figures, number of trips on different means of transport in the region for 2004 and the projected trend for 2012. These trends figures from an analysis we did at the beginning of the plan said that if we did not do anything, the public transport use would continue to increase. We forecasted an increase of 12 % in the eight years but the private transportation would also do the same. What does it mean? It means that although we did well, we only considered I mean the public transport system, if you compare these figures with these figures [refers to slides], it means that the total public transport system would continue losing share in the mobility market. walking and the bicycle --are also increasing but not so much. We have to revert these tendencies and the only way to revert these tendencies is putting on the table --a plan with definite actions - to change this.

On the other side, another important issue is about energy consumption, we see that the energy consumption of fossil fuels especially tends to increase, not for the gasoline which is well-known to be decreasing but indeed for diesel, it tends to increase quite importantly in a trends scenario. This means excess of energy consumption, above the energy consumption established by the energy plan of Catalonia which is a pre-existing plan before the PDM was started to be drafted and CO² emissions in excess of the environmental targets we have established. A plan was needed and that was what we did. The plan has a reasonable and rational structure, I will not get into that right now and you might find it on the CD. I prefer to leave it here, so as not to press the moderator and the President and other speakers, thank you.

Thomas AVANZATA

Just before giving the floor to our next speaker, just one or two very short questions and answers. First, you mentioned the Consultation Council at the beginning of your presentation. You said this Consultation Council has provided a lot of good ideas but did you have to reach a consensus among this Consultation Council and if yes, how did you manage to reach a consensus because it seems that so many interests are represented, it seems a difficult task? That is my first question.

Marc GARCIA

The answer is no, because it was a Consultation Council and the decision about the final plan was taken by the Board not by the council, that is a clever way to do so. Nevertheless, I must say that everybody in the Consultation Council was happy about the final outcome. We

tried to take seriously into account the suggestions made by the members of the Consultation Council.

Thomas AVANZATA

Also it was clear from the beginning of the process that the final decision was only the one of the Board. Ok, thank you for this precision. It is an interesting part of your presentation; you said that you knew from the beginning that you had to specify quantitative environmental objectives. Do you think these targeted objectives are really necessary because you could have said: “we will improve”, but without fixing detailed or specified quantitative objectives. How do you define these objectives? Was it a difficult process?

Marc GARCIA

My answer is twofold. On one side, I have been involved in several planning processes in my professional life. Certainly I hate plans that are not justified for anything. If we want to change these trends, we have to observe, you have to fix precise objectives. You have to know what will you do and for which purpose, which goal you want to attain. I am not so fond of writing saying: “the future will be wonderful”, which will be probably not the case by the way. We have to define specific cases. Second part, we were happy that in our system we had already pre-existing sectorial plans like the energy plan and also a plan that was imposed by EEC for the Barcelona metropolitan region. We reached in excess the air quality levels that are established by the air directives. So, the environmental administration had to put on the table a specific plan to attack well. PDM is at the heart of this quality air plan. It is a means that to attain the goal of this quality air plan. This quality air plan establishes maximal levels I mean, for example NOX, CO2 etc...to be established. We endorsed that; these have to be our goals also.

Thomas AVANZATA

I think that it is a very interesting message but maybe our chairman wants to - say a word:

Thierry DUQUENNE

Was there any consultation after you build your plan to the population or were associations good representatives of the population?

Marc GARCIA

During the development of the plan, we not only made use of the ATM Mobility Council but also set up a full processing with open sessions for cities that were well established. We had

an extensive amount of meetings and even open meetings for any single citizen that came to us and gave us their suggestions. As I mentioned, we took it seriously into account. Once the PDM was approved we did not do any further consultation but it is a good idea that when PDM reaches his mid-life, we could run such a session. That is a good idea.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you for your very interesting answers Mr. Garcia. I already saw that your presentation suggested a certain number of questions in the audience but if you agree, I would give the floor to the questions at the end of the presentations. The audience will come back to some of the points you have just mentioned. Now let us go to our second speaker Mr. Tamas DOMBI from ZTM Warsaw. He is the coordinator for European affairs in ZTM Warsaw. Mr. DOMBI, the floor is yours.

Tamas DOMBI (Warsaw)

[\[Tamas Dombi Presentation\]](#)

Thank you. First of all, welcome. I would like to present you our strategy on sustainable development of the Warsaw public transport system. The main reasons to develop the strategy are just like in Barcelona. Negative effects of the growth of the individual - motorization; we know that especially in the metropolitan area, the modal share of the public transport is much lower than in the city itself. We have to act to change the situation. To change this, we need to plan the development of the transport system in the metropolitan area. We have a pretty huge carrot: there are structural funds. We need to set up a strategy to use these funds in a planned way.

The fundamentals of the strategy are other strategic documents: the first transport policy from 1995 which is at the moment still valid. A -spatial planning document which is called in Polish a pretty long name: Study on grounds and directions of this -spatial management. Every municipality is obligated in Poland to set up such a plan. Warsaw has done it in 2006 and in Warsaw, we have a strategy of the city development to the year 2020. The strategy has 5 parts. It is diagnosis of the current status; actually it is together with analysis of the strengths/weaknesses opportunity/trends. It is a transport policy, it is a continuation of the old one from 1995 and the main part is the sustainable transport development plan. There are specific rules for dissemination and indicators to measure the plan. Of course, there is an ecological impact analysis which is actually not part of this strategy but it was set up together with it. The main goals of the strategy: it is the diagnosis of the actual status of the Warsaw transport situation. It is a transport policy which sets general and specific objectives and it is

a transport development plan. It defines particular tasks to fulfill. In the next few slides, I tried to show you these specific tasks. Our main goal is the set up of a common metropolitan transport authority. The problem is that it is not only our [ZTM] competence because we need new legal framework which is a new transport act. At the moment, it is planned to set up and to be validated until December 2009. We planned to set up a common coordinating and organizing and controlling entity on the ground of the current Warsaw public transport authority. At the moment we are working in the metropolitan area on the ground of bilateral agreements with every municipality at the moment more than 30. A new common authority would replace the system of the bilateral agreements with a common organization of this municipal units.

Second goal is the modernization and development of the tram system. The photo you see it is the current huge project, the modernization of the east-west axis of the city center, but we have done already one huge project in the last two years and we are planning to other modernization projects in the next few years until 2015. On this map you can see, these are the main tram tracks in the city center, east-west and north-south. It is connected with the Euro 2012 football championships too because one of these axes is going to take the fans to the national stadium which is here. We want to develop the metro system further on. The building of the first line was ended last year in October. And soon, the building of the second line should begin. In the first step, we are building the central part until 2013 but then in the next few years this new second metro line, which is going to strengthen east-west axis under the city center, should be the main public transport line in this direction.

As you see on the map, the blue line is the first line which is ready and working at the moment and the second line with the central part in the first step and then increasing towards west and east. We want to improve the railway transport system bringing together the public railways with the local transport. In order to achieve this, three years ago a new local railway company was set up which trains you see on the photo and we cooperate with the regional railway company which is owned by the regional government. We want to build new railway stations on existing railway lines and set up on them a local railway system. We want to integrate different sub-systems. Actually since few years, we work on the connections between railways and local transport which were the weakest in the last years because in the communist era, these two transport modes were treated totally separately. So, we had the biggest developments in this area. But it was easy because we have started actually from zero. We are planning integrated transport junctions just like at the end station of the first metro line which was ended last year. We integrated time-tables and the organization and integration is concentrated in the railway traction.

We want to develop the bus transport: more priority to the buses in the traffic congestions as you see on the picture and in the next few years, we want to buy low emission buses which fulfill the ecological criteria. As you see here, the statistics [show that] 30 % of the buses and 50 % of the trams unfortunately do not meet any quality standards. There are from the communistic era; these are those buses you might know the Polish produced in the 60s and 70s the BCC based tram cars. But we are going to replace the old buses in the next 3 years but this is a huge project to improve the transport quality and the replacement of the oldest tram cars is planned until 2016. In two huge steps, the bigger step is now beginning; the tram company is procuring 186 new 100 % low -floor cars and this is one of the biggest tram procurements in Europe. Until 2016, there will be another step; it will be smaller, about 30 or 60 cars, but the plan is to replace this 50 % in the next 8 years, as you see in this picture. One of the main projects which is actually already done is the adjusting of the supply to the demand by the differentiation of rolling stocks and the setting up of new routes. Just to be short, [here are] other parts of the transport development plan: The road network development plan consists in that on the main part of it these are restrictions on individual mobility in the city center and the possibility to set up a congestion charge. The policy says that the congestion charge could be set up after the development of the public transport system, the replacing of the old cars to give a good alternative to the individual mobility. So it is in the horizon of the next 5-8 years. Of course road safety is a very important aspect of the mobility plan and the cycling transport development plan is setting up a city cycling system.

The road to implementation was long because the first draft of the strategy was set up in 2007 in the first quarter and then it was consulted in the first step with the main stakeholders for example with us [ZTM] because the setting up of the strategy is the competence of the city hall. In 2008, there were public consultations with non-governmental organizations and citizens, inhabitants and acceptance of the strategy is planned in this year on May-June. So as you see it is not even validated by the City Council yet. The results of the public consultations: 200 written proposals, 700 remarks, one third of them adopted, two thirds declined. The most remarks are on public transport. From this we can see that this is very important to our inhabitants and the local stakeholders. Maybe the main conclusions and the first conclusion because it is still not validated, is that there is a huge need to plan enough time to the process, for the setting up of a mobility plan. It has taken for us at the moment already more than two years and we already see the end of the process but it is not even sure if we managed to do it before the summer holiday.

Thank you for your attention and please ask questions.

Thomas AVANZATA

So thank you very much Mr. DOMBI for your very interesting presentation. The conclusion is very interesting. The process may be much longer than what you expected at the beginning because of a certain number of difficulties and also because you have to set up this metropolitan and large transport authority. Probably this is part of the difficulty of the process. Thank you very much. We will now listen to Mr. Enzo CORRADO BASON who is head of planning and marketing in Torino.

Enzo CORRADO BASON (Turin)

[\[Enzo Corrado Bason presentation\]](#)

Good morning to all of you. I will say a few words about the Torino experience and lesson learnt on this matter. First of all, I have to point out that our authority, it is so-called the AGENZIA PER LA MOBILITA METROPOLITANA-is living its childhood. We started the planning activities in 2004 and previous several levels of planning overlap in the metropolitan area: There is actually the region, the province and the city of Torino. From 2003, the Agency took over the control of the services on a number of railway lines but not the metro which was under construction at that time. Also planning competency was transferred to the Agency by the regional law.

Nevertheless, region, province and city planning offices structures remained more or less the same and the particular skills in public transport planning were in the hands of the main operators, few people moved to the Authority but also the planning offices of the operator with some changes still remain. This is the background.

The State of the art: the Agenzia was born as a mobility one, not only for public transport-mainly for public transport -but one of the fundamental documents that by statute the Agency, has to write, is the mobility plan of the metropolitan area regarding both aspects: private and public transport.

The other fundamental document is the 3 year-plan for public transport. The mobility plan has not been formally written yet, but a 3 year-plan for public transport contains updated long term vision of the PDM [mobility plan] system. In this chart,[refers to the slides] we can see the actors: we have the Agencza, the urban and the extra urban transport operator GTT, previously it was ATM. GTT now is a private company 100 % owned by the city of Torino. The city of Torino itself, the province of Torino- the area includes about 300 municipalities- and there is the region Piemonte which is formed by 8 provinces. We can see a in orange the

planning documents. We can see a sort of drift towards the Agenzia but some planning actions of other actors still remain.

Before the birth of the Agenzia, the city of Torino had a general plan of traffic and then a urban traffic plan; also the region has its regional transport planning. The public transport operator supported the city with the public transport planning and the road development plan strategy in 2003 and also the mobility and planning transport development regarding mostly the first metro line evaluation with the city of Torino. In 2005 was written the mobility transport development plan regarding mostly the second metro line evaluation. In This document the mobility, was forecasted for a period of 10-15 years and the development of both road and public transport network was evaluated. The probable model shift and the environment impacts were also calculated.

This case was one of the first studies in which the Agenzia was involved. Then, other plans, not mobility plans but planning documents were written about the metropolitan railway service, the upgrading of urban transport, with the improvement of tariff integration and in recent time evaluation of the railway mode; it means a simulation of an entire railway mode was done to verify the capacity permitted by the plan. We are starting a so-called “strong network 2012” to improve the network, mostly in urban areas. But a formal metropolitan mobility plan was not written. We aim to do this in the next years.

Only a few words, in green [refers to slides] there are the surveys we are performing now. Previously, it was the operator who was in charge of it. This is a mobility survey every two years. From 2006 we have taken in charge this duty. Another aspect is the 5T project which has started as a project within the public transport company and is a telematic control of transport and traffic. It started as part of the public transport company, then it became a mixed private-public company and now it has become a total public company. This is the scheme. There is a drift towards the Agency but there are also other actors in the area.

Which are the main difficulties we encounter? The main city and the mobility Authority have to get used to work together in planning field because the city maintain the urban planning and keeps involving public transport experts. On the other hand, the Authority's role is to provide the planning of an overall transport system comprehensive including the urban part, this is the difficulty.

It is difficult to monitor the results of the implementation of planning measures as now telematic transport and traffic control companies are not properly linked with mobility

Authority. It needs to be linked better. On the plan of sustainability, the lack of funds makes it difficult to provide money to cover increased operating costs due to increase in public transport services foreseen by the plans. For instance in Torino money has been found to build infrastructure in order to double the railway capacity but it is difficult to find money in order to increase the railway service.

A few lessons learned, the transfer of competence needs also the transfer of skills, of instruments and of expert people. Moving from local to metropolitan integrated visioning is a slow process. But the fact that the main local authorities are member of the same mobility Authority is a big opportunity. In our Agency we formed a sort of technical board where the technical officers of the city, the region and the province sit together with the officers of the Authority and can discuss of planning issues. An important thing we noticed on the other hand is that small towns appreciate the mobility Authority as a place where their voice can be heard. This is for our point of view another big opportunity. Thank you for your attention.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much Mr. Enzo CORRODA BASON. I will now give the floor to Mr. David Brown who is the Director General for South Yorkshire public transport executive.

David BROWN (Sheffield)

[\[David Brown Presentation \]](#)

Good morning. The danger is when you are the fourth out of five presenters; you can just turn round and say that you have heard it all already. There are a number of themes I am sure we will pick up which are common to all the situations here. What I wanted to do was just talk you through what we call our Local Transport Plans, mobility plans; talk you through the key objectives of the ones that we are currently in the middle of, Local Transport Plan2 which covers the period 2006 to 2011. Thirdly, probably the most interesting, the lessons learnt and the difficulties that we faced which I think other colleagues already identified. Then just a very short piece, because some new legislation has just been introduced in England which means that Local Transport plans will be different from 2011 onwards. Just to remind you, *[refers to slides]* this is the map of England, Scotland and Wales. The bit in red is the region I work within which is the Yorkshire and the Humber region. The yellow bit is the Sheffield city region which is based around the city of Sheffield and has about 1.4 million of population. Although it has one large city and 3 large towns, 40 % of its area is designated as roads or countryside. So that gives us a range of challenges like urban congestion as well as rural accessing into town centers and city centers.

The core objectives that underpin what we try to do in transport in South Yorkshire, the Sheffield city region is about rebuilding the economy of South Yorkshire which during the 1970s and 80s, struggled with a reduction of steel and coal mining. And also addressing what we call social inclusion, which is people that currently do not have job and accessing areas of opportunity or health or education facilities. I am actually using what was an outdated structure of transport in South Yorkshire; it will enable people to access those things but to do it in a sustainable way. Just a quick counter-through what the local transport plan is. It is a mechanism which delivers capital funding. It delivers money for schemes within any area. There are different mechanisms that we have to tap in for schemes over 5 million euros which are prioritized regionally but funded nationally. And the revenue funding, that is the ongoing funding that is required, to provide services like bus or train services, is funded by local tax and paid for by the people of South Yorkshire.

The final thing is that we do deliver, fortunately we do not have to have bilateral with 30 different municipalities as one of our colleagues, but we do have to deliver the Local Mobility Plans, the Local Transport Plan with 5 partners. The passenger transport authority which is responsible for public transport and 4 authorities responsible for the highway network, the parking policies and the land use policies. Just a little bit on the background about Local Transport Plans. There was an act passed in 2000, the Transport Act of 2000, which required all local areas to have a Local Transport Plan. And the first one of those started in 2000 and covered the period 2001 to 2006. At the time, there was a mix of policy but also delivery. So, you were supposed to identify your policy covering congestion or accessibility as well as the schemes that you would deliver in that 5-year period, to deliver those policies. It was about delegating funding to city regions at local areas. So the national funding will be passed down to the local area and spent according to the Local Transport Plan. But the delivery that you were expected to do in your area in South Yorkshire was actually also linked to the Government national targets that the Department for Transport had signed up to. So therefore, although you might have local priorities within South Yorkshire, you have to demonstrate that what you were doing there contributed towards the national target of the national Government. And increased funding, there was a period of what we called “reward funding or additional funding” which was paid for an assessment on how good your policy was and then as we move through it, how well you deliver that policy. Therefore there was a period of reward funding that was paid to a number of local areas.

It was a 5-year program and one of the key opportunities for us was it gave us a funding profile for 5 years; whereas previously we only had a one year funding allocation, and

therefore how to deliver schemes within a 12-month period. This enabled us to deliver and spend money over a 5-year programme and allowed us therefore to plan schemes and deliver them within that 5-year timeframe. However, there were no direct links to other policy areas; land use planning, economic planning. They were assumed to happen but there was no direct link. I think the combination at the end of the local transport plan period, the first plan period, was that the local transport plan was created after consultation but it was created by transport professionals and only had a sort of 10-year links to land use planning and economic planning.

The second Local Transport Plan which started in 2006 to 2011, there was a much greater emphasis on how you deliver the schemes that you were in, your first plan and second plan? It was less of a policy document and more of a delivery document covering a 5-year program of schemes. The ability to secure reward funding was removed for this period and we got a more, what we call, a formulate approach. In South Yorkshire we get on average around 20-25 million euros a year through the formulate approach for public transport and integrated transport measures. And that will not change over that 5-year period. So on one hand it gives you a guarantee of the funding, but it reduces any opportunity to secure over and above reward funding. Major schemes, again still over 5 million euros, are still now regionally prioritized and there is a stronger set of prioritization rules for you to access that funding. So, you can identify a scheme over 5 million euros which is in theory very high. That has then to be approved with your regional partners and then has to be given permission and funded from national Government. However the opportunities for the second Local Transport Plan has been the fact that the links to economic planning has been greater and there was a greater work with the partners to ensure that happens on an ongoing basis.

All Local Transport Plans have to cover these 4 areas: the first is tackling congestion in your local area but again contributing towards the government national target in reducing congestion; Accessibility is about people having the ability to use transport to access health, leisure, job opportunities. Road safety is about reducing the people killed and seriously injured both young people and other people on our road network. And the final one is air equality or sustainability. So we all have targets against those four key areas and the final one is making sure that the roads, the equipment we put in place is well-maintained so we receive separate funding for that maintenance. So although we have the ability within our local area to identify which of these four key things are important, we have to cover off targets contained within those and they have to contribute towards national targets. You will see prior to Christmas where Manchester had a scheme to tackle congestion in the Manchester area and that was a fundamental part of national Government ability to achieve

its congestion target. But when put to a public vote, it was quite a resounding refusal or to go down that line. So Manchester is now having to look back at their approach to tackling congestion.

We are measured on 3 broad things within the local transport plan and we have to on an annual basis go back to the Department for Transport at the national level to identify how well our mobility plans are doing and how well they are contributing. The first is output which is really: have you delivered the schemes on the ground that you said you would do? So have you put the priority measures in? Have you put in the travel plans that you said you would do? The second one is really an input; so have you spent all the money you said you would spend and can you tell us that you spent it on the right things? This is a sort of ability. There is an input and an output there. Then the final element of the performance measure is the outcomes; so if you have spent all the money you said you would spend and you spent it all on the right things and they have all been delivered, your headline targets on congestion, road safety, accessibility, etc. are those indicators, on a trend basis, being affected in a positive way?.

Finally, I am going to cover what the colleagues were saying. We also have to demonstrate that we have consulted widely with the members of the public, councilors, other interested bodies and it is not just thinking that it is a good idea and spending the money and also we have to demonstrate that we share best practice both on a European national and local level. Lessons that we have learnt, I think the first one is quite wide-ranging really is that local partners, that includes the local authorities but also the suppliers of our services because all public transport services are provided by private sector companies: are their objectives all the same?. And are the local objectives, the things that are important in South Yorkshire, are they consistent with what national Government wishes to see? And the Manchester example on congestion a key area, where there is a national imperative to tackle congestion but the responsibility and the way you are trying to do that is passed down to the local authority to try and secure that. This is particular as probably peculiar for us is that a number of our suppliers work on only a one-year business planning cycle and that does not fit easily with a 3-5 year plan in our Local Transport Plan. Their objectives: trying to reconcile the need to generate profit and to provide a service and accessibility has been one of the big lessons for us. I think the second issue is that of the time to deliver schemes, 5 years is quite a long period of time but actually if you want to develop a large scheme and deliver it, it is actually difficult to do that in a 5-year period and the impact we had on external factors such as land use, such as the economic circumstances affect our ability to deliver the transport schemes, and then, our ability to react and put in place alternative schemes is actually quite restricted.

The delegation of funding has been important to us but not all those powers have been delegated to local authorities and the amounts of funding we are constrained particularly about not having revenue funding to continue to provide the services once the infrastructures are being put in place.

What do we do in post- 2011? Again the structure will slightly change. There will be a greater emphasis on a 15-year transport story or a transport strategy covering all modes. The ability to support the economy over a 15-year period with shorter, probably 3-year delivery plan which will be called Local Transport Plans but the local transport plan will become much more of a delivery document with this policy and the strategy being put into our 15-year transport strategy. The goals although similar to those contained within our local mobility plans at the moment have been slightly amended to those that you can see on this screen. And we also have a particular local aim in South Yorkshire that to deliver those five new goals, we need to have a significant investment in public transport and maybe a change in which way that is delivered. The big change I think we will see from 2011 that we will not have a transport plan for the sake of having a transport mobility plan. But it will much more need to support the things that we are trying to do and therefore transport would be a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The final point is that a Local Transport Act was passed in 2008 in England. And that meant that the passenger transport authorities that I worked for, have become the Integrated Transport Authority. The responsibility for producing a Mobility Plan for South Yorkshire and the Integrated Transport strategy passes now to that Integrated Transport Authority. So, [although]most currently it is the responsibility of five partners, it would be the responsibility of one partner to deliver the document in consultation with the four others. That would mean that the Integrated Transport Authority will now need to broaden out its skills set in the areas that it covers. It would now be responsible for looking at strategic highways for travel planning and for freight. And these are new things that would be brought into to the Passenger Transport Authority's area.

Again trying to talk to local politicians about shifting powers, it would come further down to what's in South Yorkshire is important and a new local transport act does allow us to, if we wish, put in road usage charging locally and franchise bus services currently privately operated. And the final point really, as touched on by of the colleagues, it is quite simple: to call something a Passenger Transport Authority and then change it to an Integrated Transport Authority, the discussion that local councils then have about powers, boundaries and funding can be a very big distraction, from trying to get in on and delivering the schemes on the ground.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much Mr. BROWN. It was really interesting to hear especially about this integrated and the idea that even for freight transport you now receive competencies and powers. But we have to go fast to our next and last presentation. Our last speaker for this first round table will be Mr. Olivier NALIN who is the Director for studies and economics affairs for the STIF Ile-de-France. Mr. NALIN.

Olivier NALIN (Paris - Ile de France)

[\[Olivier Nalin presentation\]](#)

I can also say that many things have been said and I could see that there is a kind of convergence of the rule about planning, about urban transportation in Europe, in particular most of what was said of Barcelona could be said, of Ile de France which is the region around Paris. So, I will try to pass on those similar things and to stress the particularities of our region.

In France many things are defined by laws, in particular public transport. Urban transport planning was made compulsory by a law which was about air quality, in 1996. Here, the objectives that are written in the law about what should be put in those plans are very similar to those that have been said for other metropolitan areas and in particular the case of Barcelona is extremely similar to ours. In France, the region around Paris, Ile de France is often special and the rules applying to this region are particular. So, the devolution of power to the Regional authority was only done in 2005. The first Urban Plan was made in 2000 and the national Government was responsible for this plan. Now STIF, the Public Transport Authority is in charge of the plan and we have done an evaluation of the first plan in 2007 and then we decided to revise and make a new plan for the future. The process of writing and approving the plan is very complicated. First, STIF has to make a proposal and then this proposal is transferred to the regional government and has to go through fairly elaborated approval process which means that the regional government first approve the project; then the consultation is formal with all other local governments, there is a public inquiry and the State the national government -also has to give its opinion about the plan. Eventually the plan is formally adopted. Which means that we decided the revision in 2007 and according to our forecast, the plan will not be formally approved before 2012. The law has made it fairly difficult for us to do the planning; we tend to spend a lot of time just checking if we are right according to these regulations.

What are the main conclusions of the evaluation of the first plan? We see that many of the measures that were written were not actually enacted or only very partially realized. So, we tried to make a new plan that will not have these defects. Why is it like that? First, in this Region we have many local governments. So, we have the national government, the regional government, we have also eight *départements* like counties and then we have the very local towns and these towns are many times grouped in other institutions that also have some prerogatives and responsibilities.

The problem is to see who is responsible for what and to think about whether the people will have some reasons to do what the plan say they should do. So, here [refers to slides] we have a graphic explaining at least a few of those levels of governance and for example, roads are split between the State, the municipalities or the grouping of municipalities, and the *départements*. According to which road, you have to talk to different person; only the Region, that approves the plan is not responsible for any road. Then, the PDU *Plan de Déplacement Urbain*, which is what we are talking about, has to be compatible with a regional plan about land use; then it has to be compatible with a regional plan about the air quality and there is another plan about air quality which is the responsibility of the State and the difference is that these [regional plan] are just suggestions made by the Region whereas the measures in the plan by the State are compulsory measures.

Then you have some more local land use planning. Here for the groups of municipalities and here the municipal land use plan. Each has different obligations. These have to be compatible with the mobility plan. We have to deal with all those connections between different planning processes. Now, I want to talk a little about the organization of the process of writing this plan. I could say that it is very similar with the Barcelona example. We have a political entity which is in fact the board of STIF which is responsible for the political orientation of the planning. Then we have a technical group which is made of the technicians from all the members of STIF and some other partners which are the States, the Departments and the Region. Then we have something like the Consultation Council which is divided in 4 thematic groups which are very classical: public transport, individual motorized mode, these are the non-motorized modes [refers to slides] and then the goods delivery and transportation.

Now we have worked a lot on the consultation process because we think that if people have been very much associated with the designing of the plan, they will be more willing to support and apply it, especially for the local governments who have the responsibility for a lot of other things that have to be done to improve mobility. This was the written by consultants. It would

be too long to comment each of these but it means that we have lots of different groups and the way we let them talk about the subject is not straightforward: some specialized consultants helped us, for if you just put people in a room and ask: “what do you think?”, you do not get a lot out of it. Here are all the different subjects that were studied by expert-groups. If someone wants to take the presentation, it will be available here [*uploaded on www.emta.com*].

Then here we tried to summarize what the plan is about and it has to find a sustainable balance between mobility issues, environmental health, quality of life issues and economic and financing issues. I do not go into the details but that is very similar to other presentations I would say. Then, we are in the process of writing this new plan, we tried to summarize the main themes that will be included and to say that we have on one part to act on the mobility conditions and on the other part, to change our behaviors and this means the behavior of the people who make decisions, who are responsible for some aspects of mobility and also to change the behavior of the general public. I will end here.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much Mr. NALIN. We have seen that you have to deal with various and numerous levels of local governments, it is probably with different competencies. We have seen before with the Sheffield presentation that in Sheffield they managed to make this movement towards a more integrated authority. Do you think it is possible in the Paris area, in the Ile-de-France area? Because it seems to be quite complicated to reach a consensus. Is it a movement that you are looking for?

Olivier NALIN

Well we might be able to change a few of the prerogatives of these levels of government, to put it at higher level; but this is not the solution. I think the solution is more to convince people that what is in the plan is something worth doing at their level. For example the urban planning in France, a lot is done at the very local level and I do not think we can expect that this will change and for example in our region this means more than 1200 different municipalities.

Thomas AVANZATA

Ok. I prefer my job. We are a little bit late but with the agreement of Mr. the Chairman, I think we can have less coffee and more debate so, I will now ask for your questions, your demands to our speakers.

Hans Werner FRANZ (VBB)

I have a question to Tamas. You explained your plan to create the integrated system. I think it is right. First you need a plan, but second you need money. My question is: is regional government willing to spend money so that you can integrate the regional train system in the public transport system especially in the fare system of the Warsaw metropolitan area?

Carlos CRISTOBAL (CRTM)

I have a question for Marc; it is also the same for other speakers but Marc in the presentation has said that one of the objectives is guidelines for urban mobility plans to be developed by the municipalities. I want to know in your PDM plan, what is the budget dedicated to implement the municipality's plan? And also for the other speakers, what is the percentage of the budget dedicated in the regional plan for the municipalities?

Maria MACHANCOSES (CENTRO)

A question to all of you to consider. Everybody starts on consultation. I just wonder how influential becomes a plan afterwards, after it gets approved by the other stakeholders. For instance, your housing partners, your employment skills partners, and your health authorities, how much they take into consideration your mobility plans for their future, to develop their own plans? When they are thinking about our future hospitals for the region, future schools, universities, future employment areas, how do they use your plan to influence or to support them? That's something that the consultation might help initially but afterwards, after the plan is approved, how do they use it? How useful it becomes, how influential?

Tamas DOMBI

Thank you Mr. Franz for your question. It is a bit complicated because we have like two governments in the regional transport we as [agency] of Warsaw City Hall in cooperation with the municipalities around Warsaw organizing local public transport; but the regional railway is a competence of the regional government. Last year in November, the Marshall which is head of the regional government and the mayor of Warsaw, signed the letter of initiation of cooperation, to cooperate in the integration of the regional railway with the local railway and the rest of the local public transport modes. This is only a paper, but the regional government spends a lot of money to develop the regional railways and it is a question of a cooperation : to cooperate this money with the money spent by the Warsaw City Hall on its public transport. We have a hope that the new Public Transport Act is going to regulate this field and set up more legal fundamentals to do this cooperation together. It is a good hope, in a few months we will see if it succeeds.

Thomas AVANZATA

I think the second question was for you.*[turns to M.Garcia]*

Marc GARCIA

As for Carlos's question I think it is worth clarifying what is the mobility master plan and what it is not. The mobility master plan is not an investment plan; that is important to underline. If somebody would ask: "which is the investment of the plan as a regional government deed -I mean for the approval processes?_", the answer is 197 million euros in 6 years. It is a very low amount of money. What does it mean? It means this is the amount of new actions that are not covered by our plans. For example if you take into account the public transport programme within the master mobility plan, the cost of this programme for the public administration, is 600 million euros a year. So these 197million in 6 years is ridiculous.

And it is obvious on the other side that these 600 million euros a year are ingested into the whole system that is managed by the master mobility plan. I wanted to clarify this because sometimes, I mean in some of the administrations, somebody could be thinking about the sort of mega extra whatsoever plan, whereas it is in fact a rationalization and assembly of different other actions that do not have a proper integration. I think of something that Enzo said –he said that the Torino mobility plan is not explicitly written yet but this is obvious that if they launch already a public transport plan, they are doing the bulk of this planning to some extent. That is point I wanted to mention.

About the Urban mobility plans, of this amount that I mentioned, there is zero euro for the Urban mobility plans. Why? Because the [Catalan Law] very explicitly divides the competencies and responsibilities. The metropolitan plan is not expected to provide any funding for municipalities to implement the Urban mobility plans. It has to be on their own budget, that these measures are implemented. Nevertheless it is obvious that as I mentioned in the field for example of public transport, the big part of these 600 million euros a year that are spent by the public administrations in the region, it is mostly devoted to Urban transport. It is clear and it can be anticipated that the funding of the key measures of these Urban mobility plans is already insured by already existing subventions for public transport.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you. Who wants, among our speakers, to answer to the third question related to more or less the efficiency of the mobility plan once adopted, once implemented?

Tamas DOMBI

A few words to your question [refers to M.Machancoses]. I would split the answer in three parts: with the public institutions, it is the best situation because we are in actual cooperation, we do plan the transport system as they do plan the public institutions; we cooperate and it is not a problem. A bit worse is with the public but I just brought in and I wanted to show it to you, at the beginning of the public consultations, the city hall just disseminated in the newspapers the biggest polish newspapers information about the plan, about this strategy in the rolling-stock and everywhere, on the streets were disseminated brochures like that. So it raised the awareness about the strategy and the consultation process. The third part of the answer I think is the worst one: it is with the private institutions, where we have actually no legal framework to obligate for example real estate development companies to consider the mobility plans and the mobility needs, for example for new apartment districts. This one of the biggest problems in our land use and special development at the moment. We try to push the government to work a deal with it but it is again a problem of ideas. It is important to have very liberal system in this field, and we had a huge investment boom in the last few years. It is really a problem.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you. Anyone else among our speakers want to say a word about this? Then, we will take one last question if there is and a few words by our chairman and then we go to coffee.

Marc GARCIA

About Maria's [Machancoses] question, I wanted to give her a partial answer. Apart from the plan itself, what is crucial is your legal framework as Tamas Dombi said. In Catalonia, apart from this mobility law, we have had a number of decrees that have developed the law. And one crucial decree is one decree approved in 2004 establishing that for each single real estate development or similar Urban developments that are planned; there has to be a compulsory assessment report written by ATM in this case, in the regional mobility area. That means that for every single real estate development, we check that if the associated planning fulfills the goals of the metropolitan mobility plan. And in case not, we make a non-approval assessment report and this plan stops; it has to be revised. Decrees are very precise, they also ask the planners and the promoters to put a funding for promoting a sustainable mobility and for public transport but that another story The key for being taken into account seriously is the law, essentially the law.

Thomas AVANZATA

Ok, thank you. I think you had quite comprehensive answers to your questions. I do not know if there is one very small remaining question; otherwise we have time during the second round table, we will dedicate more time to questions. So maybe we can directly end with a few words of our Chairman, Mr. DUQUENNE and then we will have a coffee break.

Thierry DUQUENNE

Thank you very much. I will draw some conclusions about what we had in this session.

The first one, we did not need European regulations to make our local plans, *Plan Développement Urbain* or some other features or names. Till today there were no directives for doing it and we could do it. We need to have some freedom at local level because our problems in Brussels are not the same as in Warsaw, Barcelona, Sheffield, Ile de France or other towns as Torino. We are afraid of rigidity. If you read the directives or regulations you must do this, this and this and it is not always what we have to do because some problems are already solved for long time and others are not taken into account by Europe but are existing at local level.

For example for Warsaw, they have old rolling stock; Brussels has too, but some other towns have totally new rolling stock. It is not the same case. We use different ways to make our development plans. There is no one way to reach transport or mobility plan but you see the titles are about the same. What is taken into account is about the same but it depends on local level. We have identical means and identical goals. The main goal is to reduce pollution and traffic; we see it at all levels. We have health problems, we must solve them. The transport or mobility plan is the best way to solve pollution made by transport means and the main one is goods transport and the cars. The means are the same because the solutions are not very various. We have some differences; some are now attacking the aspect of behavior. In the past it was more a demand management or offer management in the very long-term past. Now it is the behavior we have to change, because we see that the usual model for changing modal splits does not work without changing behavior and thus educational aspect is very important.

We have a necessity to have integrated approach. There is no one solution, there is not a menu; we have many axes to develop and not only one. And then I understood that there was the necessity to extend the compulsory aspects not only to public authorities which normally have to act in the same way but also to private stakeholders as housing and so on because not only public sector can act on this field.

These are the main conclusions I can draw. Thank you very much.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank once again all our speakers from this first round table. Thank you very much for your contribution, thank you very much for your time. Thanks to the audience for the questions and now we go really quickly to have coffee and whatever we need to. We planned a 30 minutes coffee break, it is impossible to have the 30 minutes; we will have a 15 minutes coffee break. I will ask you to be back five to twelve, thank you very much.

Coffee break

Round table 2**Thomas AVANZATA**

Thank you very much. So we enjoyed the coffee but finally we did it. Just an information, we will try to stop our second round table for half past one, maybe with five minutes delay but not later because after the coffee break, comes the lunch time, not that I am only thinking about food or something like that, but it is important, especially that we are enjoying Valencia. So let us think about very positive things. We have to be at lunch around one thirty because we will have to move for the technical visit precisely at 3 o'clock. The appointment for the technical visit, the coach will probably take us to the technical visit at 3 o'clock precisely. So, we need some time for the lunch.

As we have seen during round table 1, transport authorities which were present just at this table, they know how to lay down sound mobility plans, and barriers or difficulties in as much as they are technical, are taken care of; transport authorities know how to take care of these technical difficulties. However, implementing important measures needs funding. So the funding issue is one of the questions we will deal specifically with during this round table 2.

During this round table 2, we will have the pleasure to listen to Mrs. Sabine AVRIL, she is the Secretary General of EMTA; to Mr. Carlos CRISTOBAL who is the Head of department for studies and planning in Madrid. I will call as well Mr. Steve NEWSOME, the Head of

International and European affair for Transport for London and we will have Mr. Marc GARCIA representing Barcelona on the table and of course the second session will be shared by Mr. Thierry DUQUENNE representing the Brussels' capital administration but as you know Mr. DUQUENNE is also the treasurer of EMTA. So talking about funding, having the treasurer at the table is always interesting. It is not the solution of course but it is part of it. I will first give the floor to Mrs. Sabine AVRIL, she will present a synthesis of the result on the questionnaire on governance and mobility plans. This questionnaire was issued at the initiative of STIF Ile-de-France and received around 15 answers from transport authority's members of EMTA. Sabine please.

Sabine AVRIL

First of all, I would like to make two very short reminders I would say. First of all, all the presentations that have been done and will be done for the whole meeting will be uploaded on the website of course and as soon as possible; maybe some would be already uploaded at the end of the day. Then also the debates are registered. So the minutes and the proceedings will be transcript into a written version that will be sent to you, uploaded on the website and maybe on disc like this one, on a CD. Also I would like to apologize for the changes in this round table programme.

I have to say that we went through many disappointments when setting up the workshop and several of our mains speakers declined, I would say honestly at the very latest moment We had to adjust but fortunately and I knew that I could count on our dear members and all their experience and their willingness to share it with us. In spite of this, I would congratulate you for the real interesting round table and shared experience that we have enjoyed so far and we will do it for the second round table certainly.

Let me start with something that is a little older; it goes back to our previous general meeting in Paris when in October in fact, a STIF issued a questionnaire. STIF were in the middle of the revision process about the PDU [local mobility plan] as Olivier NALIN told you this morning. One of our colleagues, Audrey SAUNION sent out a questionnaire on governance and mobility plans. This questionnaire contained four main questions: Have you already designed and implemented a urban or regional mobility plan? Can you describe it in a few lines and who is responsible for the following up of the projects? Then, in your point of view, what are the positives and negatives of this and have you worked on ways to improve governance? So it was very geared to governance. The answers came in, we had like 12 to 14 answers, we have the list in fact of the nice authorities who responded and I would like to thank you for the dedication and the time. In fact, they arrived in two waves I would say.

Audrey had the time to go through the first one but not all of them. So she made a synthesis very focused on governance through the ones that she had at hand at the moment. And then I personally went through the additional ones and I found that very interesting points were raised, so I took the liberty to add some comments, not exactly on her point of view but some additional writing.

About the first group of answers, the first question was: have you implemented such mobility plan? We have seen this morning that it is really a usual activity mostly among EMTA members. We have quite an experience and as Thierry Duquenne pointed out, we did not wait for European Commission to give us the kick-off for these mobility plans, we went ahead of time. As regarding organization of the process, Audrey finds that the consultation phase at all level is always very valuable as the process even if it translates into delays and that was stressed by Helsinki saying that sometimes really the delays are long but it gives all the weight and the legitimacy of the whole document, so it is worth the time. Amsterdam insisted on the planning and the organization of the priorities inside this mobility plan as an important point. On the part of Manchester, there was a concern and some experience in the follow-up of the mobility plan, throughout a performance committee which I thought was interesting as a title (almost a programme) for such a committee. About the implementation of agreed measures or projects and who is in charge of what, apparently the efficiency calls for the evaluation of progress made whether it is through adjusted indicators, that was the raised by Sevilla -who was satisfied with in coming-up with new indicators to eventually reorient the process or report on performances. Both are necessary and can lead to another way of heading the whole document.

On the question of how to improve these documents or improve rather the whole process, there is a real question on the part of some authorities for extending the scope of competencies I would say and David BROWN told us this morning about the Integrated Transport Authorities, ITA on your document, and this is probably something that is important and I know that in France for example, there was a claim on the part of the transport authorities largely in all the cities in France I mean beyond Ile-de-France itself, for having the competencies, not only of transport but of mobility as a whole.

Also facilitating the implementation by the training of expertise and the care to funding at the sub-local level has been raised and we saw that this morning and also Amsterdam stressed it in the answer as a really important point and I think that this is almost something that we could possibly keep in mind and see how we could maybe make some progress on the

training of expertise which certainly is very important when it comes to the sub-local levels; for municipalities do not have always the means to achieve such training.

Basically STIF drew some conclusions. Of course all of this is more detailed in the documents that you have received with your file this morning. I am just making a very brief “synthesis of the synthesis” but you have more on your documents and everything is on the website as well and you are welcomed to put any question to STIF to Audrey SAUNION and very possibly to Olivier NALIN, I am sure he would accept all your questions on this why we are together, so you can have more information. Basically STIF drew the conclusions from its own experience, from its own point of view and in front of this benchmarking of other cities, that it was important to reorient the mobility plan within the over-arching original planning, make sure both are not only compatible but more than that, more integrated, that they interact almost one with another. It was important also to elicit the political support that has been an important point for STIF and also to better define the role of actors. While reflecting more precisely on the benchmarking input from all your nice contributions, STIF thought that it could be convenient to have let’s say a community or a group of municipalities coming up together, joining efforts to stir up the process and again have a political champion, someone who really acts as the locomotive of the process.

Then another point that STIF made important and a priority, is to arrange for high level of communication and for a permanent platform of coordination and again for the training of all actors. Again we are crossing the topic of training and then plan for a regular follow-up and process of reorientation.

As I said, there was also a second group of answers that came in a little later and among these answers, I picked up some ideas or topics that I thought were of particular interest. In Berlin for example, the mobility plan though not mandatory, is seen as a “very efficient tool that holds the whole transport strategy together”. I thought it was a nice definition of what is a mobility plan. Madrid sees also the mobility plan as something very beneficial to higher level of integration in terms of planning and of fare policy except for the scope of the RENFE [national railway] and Cercanias [suburban trains] which are apart. The transport authority of Budapest the municipality thought that it was nice to have the municipalities more responsible for implementing the measures and sharing the project. However, it is still pending on in sufficient State funding, so even with good will, it might not be implemented easily. Vilnius on its part insisted on the very big difficulty in coordinating actions which are spread over either different municipalities or different departments even inside the same municipality. So people much separated from one and other in different departments; each of them has its own culture and it’s hard to make them work together, they have their own

rationale and it is hard to bridge all of this. Again, I think it is across the topic of training and sharing objectives and how to implement shared objectives and follow-up the shared objectives. CENTRO pointed out something a little different and very interesting among a very extensive answer, very detailed and very elaborated which we appreciated a lot. Mainly what I picked out is this problem of the difference in the time scale between the central meaning the national level concerns and the local concerns. Long-term planning is difficult when it is pending on central funds; it is difficult to make it flow in an easy way. On the other hand, small projects that are locally funded, that can find grants locally, do not necessarily add up with a bunch of measures that really serve the long-term vision planning. There is some kind of articulation that does not go always easily there and I thought it was an important point.

Finally I have two more experiences. I have London experience but, I am sorry, STIF made me notice that you have only part of the answer. So you might be very frustrated and I apologize for that, there is a complementary answer that is not in your file and I picked up among other themes that it was a very comprehensive plan but it might be in the context of the economic downturn that we are facing that priorities might have to be reconsidered or reorganized in another way. Finally we will end with a contribution from Brussels. Brussels gave us an interesting view I would say on an alternative to the congestion charging schemes that we already know; we have the example of London which is different from the one from Stockholm and Brussels is reflecting upon a third way I would say which is called “pay as you ride” and I will let you discover more about this scheme in your papers or we might have Thierry himself commenting on this. So I thank you very much for your attention and most of all, I would like to thank you for your time and dedication in answering these questionnaires which are very valuable to build upon and implement our common knowledge. Thank you.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much Mrs. AVRIL. We will now listen to Mr. Carlos CRISTOBAL. He is the Head of department for studies and planning in Madrid Transport Authority. He will make a presentation about the Spanish frame concerning the implementation of mobility plans. So you correct me if I am wrong, it is not exactly a presentation concerning your local experience but more concerning the Spanish frame that is in force. The floor is yours Mr. CRISTOBAL.

Carlos CRISTOBAL

Well it is related to the Spanish frame and to my personal experience. We have today in Spain three ministries that are responsible in a same kind of way to public transport. In the past, it was only the Ministry of Public Work and Transport but in the last 5, 6, 7 years, we had another two ministries that entered in subjects related to public transport. One is the Ministry of environment and the other is the Ministry of energy. The Ministry of energy had an agency with the name IDAE the Institute for Diversification and Saving of Energy and this institution has a specific programme and budget transferred to the regions in order to improve sustainability.

The name is the “Effort+ Strategy”. The aim of this strategy is to arrive to the compromises of Kyoto with the CO2 emission, in Spain from the 90s to 2012, there has been a +50 % [?] of increase of CO2 emission but in the last year it was a higher level of about 48 % over the base year of 1990. The strategy is to try to decrease the emission of CO2, the strategy has defined seven sectors or actions: industries, transport, buildings, public services and so on, and this Institution gives money to the regions in order to reduce this CO2 emissions and transport is one of the sectors. Here is all the budget; for example in the Madrid Region, the budget transfer was in the last year 52 millions euros for all the sectors, 70 % is transferred by this national Institution and 30 % is put by the regional and local governments. It is a kind of compromise, the national government put 70 % and the region and the municipalities put in total 30 %. In the transport sector, the programme has 8 actions. One is urban mobility plans, all that is mobility plans to work [concerning trips to work places], the third is greater participation of public transport by road; management of road transport fleets, efficient driving of cars, efficient driving of industrial vehicles, renovation of car fleets and renovation of road transport fleets.

The CRTM [Consortio Regional de Transportes de Madrid, the transport authority] is responsible to implement the first three measures: the mobility plan, the mobility plans to work, and the greater participation of public transport by road. Our experience is with this three measures because, the first measure is oriented more to municipalities and the others, we try to manage [them] in our organization. This national Institution IDEA has produced two guides: one methodological guide, one about urban sustainable mobility plans and the other about mobility plans to work. In Spain it is not compulsory to produce urban mobility plans and also it is not compulsory to produce mobility plans to work except in Catalonia according to the Law of Catalonia in this subject, as Marc [Garcia] explained before. The rest of the regions are not obliged to produce, it is only a recommendation; so this is a kind of “play”. In the urban mobility plans, we have also five measures: the urban sustainable mobility plan,

the first one, the promotion of urban transport by bike it is the first time that bike was introduced in the cities-, the feasibility study related to urban sustainable mobility plan the monitoring of the studies of the measures of the urban sustainable mobility plan- and also training programs for mobility managers. For example, 2007- it was the first year that our organization managed this programme- we dedicated 2.8 million euros to this plan and in 2008 we dedicated 6.2 million euros to this plan.

The big change was in 2007. In 2007 the money arrived directly from our own organization to the municipalities. In 2008, with the new conditions we entered, we recommended IDEA to give the opportunity to the public transport authorities to implement measures; not only municipalities but also the public transport authorities. These conditions are for all the regions, not only for our region; it is also for the rest of the regions. The conditions today are to give money to develop the study of the mobility plan to the municipalities according to their size: more than 3 000 habitants or more than 5 000 or 100 000 or 300 000 habitants. The money is only for the study not for the implementation of measures. The municipality receives 60 % of the cost according to this figures and the municipality put 40 % of the cost. In 2007, we gave to 12 municipalities the help, the subsidy to produce the mobility plan and in 2008 we have four municipalities that have asked us to support the mobility plan according to this programme. Also we have the promotion of the bikes in the municipal context. According to one formula [*refers to slides*] that is here, related to the number of bikes, the number of the basis [spots where they are parked] and also the number of electric bikes, if the municipalities want to implement 200 public bikes -not private bikes- the municipality ask the help, (the support) and we give according to the formula 100 % of the cost of the implementation of the bikes in the municipality, with a condition that the national government through this programme pay 100 % of the cost of the implementation but not the supply of the bikes, nor the operation during 3 years . The operation is a cost of the municipality, it is one of the problems that we have with all the plans that I will show you in one moment.

At the beginning, in 2007 we gave money to different municipalities after the problems to manage the municipalities, we introduced a new condition of a first feasibility study. The municipality needs to present us a feasibility study first and after we decide to transfer the money to buy the bikes and in the last year we gave only this subsidy to one municipality because we think that the feasibility study is a very important previous condition in order to give the money.

The maintenance depends on the municipality because the condition is: I give you the money to buy the bikes and to put the bikes in the streets but you have three years almost of

operation of the system. It is the condition with the municipalities. Madrid has to study the system of the bikes but I think, first Madrid is a very big city, Barcelona is 100 square kilometers and Madrid is 600 square kilometers. So the condition is certainly not the same. Second, the topographical conditions are certainly not the same. Also, Barcelona has no good conditions referring to topographical conditions. Barcelona is a success, but also I think has some problems. Not all is a success in this system. Also the carbon footprint is not clear with this kind of bikes system because you transfer people from public transport and walking to the bike but not people using a car, I think you need to implement before a very strong policy against the car and implement at the same time the bike system. If you implement bike system without a very strong policy against the car and taking the bike lane not from the pedestrian area, but from the car lane (many other cities put bike lanes from the pedestrians and not from the cars). The policy about that is not clear. We need to study it but I think in the metropolitan context, in other cities around Madrid, it is very important because there are cities about 200 000 habitants where the length of trips is less than 5 kilometers or 6 or 7 kilometers. You do not need the car to produce these trips; walking or bikes is enough in the majority of those municipalities.

You have here some ideas about this kind of study that we carried in Madrid in its metropolitan area or region, depending on the demands of the different municipalities. Also we have mobility plans to work [see above], it is a very strong policy. Today in our region, we have a mobility [round] table with different stakeholders in our organization and in order to do that, we have prepared a plan to improve the feasibility to industrial areas and economic activity areas in our region. For example in Madrid City, we have a plan and also we have changed and defined a name for this kind of lines, we call them T-lines. The T means work (in Spanish: trabajo). We have changed the color of the lines in order to give the idea that they are different lines than the other lines, normal lines; different in terms of supply according to peak hours or off-peak hour. On holidays, on week-ends and so on, we do not give this kind of supply in this kind of lines. Also in the metropolitan context, we are introducing now this kind of lines connected with metro stations and with regular stations and these two lines in one industrial area in the south of Madrid City in Getafe city.

In conclusion, these kinds of measures in our region are well accepted by the municipalities. You can imagine that today we have different call for tenders for this kind of studies. We have a lack of professional teams in the municipalities and also in the consultants because in many parts of Spain, there are call of tenders about that at this moment. But I think that more important, –I raise my question before to Marc [Garcia]– is the problem of the implementation of the measures. Today in Spain, the municipality has no big budget, with the economic crisis

the budgettoday. We have a very nice study but the municipality does not have too much budget to implement the measures. We try to convince the Ministry of Environment in order to have some budget to transfer to the municipality but I am not sure that we will be successful. Maybe in the future the European Union can give some subsidies which can help to implement this kind of measures at the municipal level. For me, it is the most important for success; not only the big city of Madrid or Barcelona, but also the medium-size or small cities in the metropolitan area. Thank you.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much Mr. CRISTOBAL. Please stay for the rest of the round table; if you want. I feel a bit lonely for the moment. I know the subject of funding for the implementation of the measures will be at the heart of the rest of this second round table. Your presentation was very really interesting on that point. Also concerning the bicycle policy, if I understood you correctly, it is not using the carrot or stick, we have to use both at the same time. The carrot and the stick, otherwise you are not completely sure of the carbon footprint, of the efficiency of the policy. That is very interesting conclusion but will come on that point during this second round table. The funding issue – where will the money come from because you said we have very nice studies, we have a variety of measures that we could implement or that we will implement but the question is the money especially in the context of the economic downturn and you mentioned maybe European money. This morning Mr. DUQUENNE said that transport authorities did not need an obligation to have mobility plans but then what do you expect from the European Union? The message would be more, we do not need obligations but maybe we need funding, correct? OK, So we will discuss this funding issue and I will like to have Mr. Steve NEWSOME, Mr. Marc GARCIA and Mr. Thierry DUQUENNE joining for the remaining of this second round table.

The second round table will be mainly a debate between the audience and our speakers. Maybe I will start with the first question maybe just to launch the debate but it is a bit naïve question. Before talking about the funding of the measures, I never draw a mobility plan, I am just wondering what does it cost to draw a mobility plan? How is the process of the drawing not of the measures funded? Do we have an idea what does a study cost? Do we need household surveys? How expensive are they and how long does it take to draw such mobility plan before talking about the measures? Everybody is allowed or welcomed to give an answer.

Marc GARCIA (ATM Barcelona)

Short answer: 2.5 years, 500 000 euros; only external work.

Thomas AVANZATA

We reach very high numbers if we include the salaries etc.

Thierry DUQUENNE

In Brussels the first step was the household study; it was made by the Federal Government. It costs about one million euros for the Federal Government but we only had the results after ending our study. We had to add some local household study to make the result affordable. The second one, we made use very much of modeling . Modeling was at the cost of about one million euros and the plan itself is about 500 000 euros. The total cost is more than 2 million but it is not an important amount in comparison with what we need to apply in the plans. So I feel that it is a very low figure.

Steve NEWSOME

I think on mobility plans and on studies and surveys, they can take as long as you want them to take and make them cost as much as you want them to cost. There is not a set answer for that and if I think of mobility planning, I think of the transport strategy, how long does that take and we have heard a lot of different examples this morning, how long they may take. In the case of London, we had a directly elected Mayor first time in May 2000 and within just a year, he produced his first comprehensive transport strategy. That has had a number of revisions since then and we are now working on a new transport strategy which we will published in about two weeks time following the election of new mayor about a year ago. For comprehensive mobility strategy if you like, that has taken us from starting from a very limited base set of policies to about a year and revisions have taken different amounts of time in between. How much does all of this cost? How much does a strategy cost, how much a household survey costs? They are very different things. Transport for London does a range of studies and surveys; in fact lots of studies and surveys every year. For example, we do 36 000 customer surveys on our buses every year; I mean 36 000 responses to a survey on customer satisfaction on our buses; the range of other studies as well to gauge public's perception of how our services are doing. It is very hard actually to give a cost of a strategy or a survey as such.

Thomas AVANZATA

Maybe we can now talk a little bit about the main problem because probably drawing the mobility plan is not really the problem, as Mr. CRISTOBAL said, the real problem is how to fund the measures and sometimes very ambitious measures. Can you tell us how in your local experience the cost shared between the national, the regional and maybe the sub-

regional levels? For example in case you achieve one of your goals, let's say you achieve a really good modal shift and it appears that there is a need for expanding sooner than anticipated the network, then what happens? Who is going to pay? What is the process? Who can take the decision? Maybe Mr. DUQUENNE can give a part of the answer?

Thierry DUQUENNE

The normal way of financing in Brussels is very simple; it is the Region that has to pay. No municipalities pay and the State does not intervene but we have an agreement with the State for now about 17 years for investment. They invest in Brussels for some infrastructure and other features yearly because we are the capital city. All the three regions are on the same level for the distribution of money from the State. It is the revenues that determine the amount the Regions receive for their finances. Revenues are attached to the people, that means that somebody living in Brussels is paying taxes on the revenues for the Brussels Region. But we have about 50 % people living and working in Brussels and 50 % working but not living in Brussels. They pay their taxes to the other Regions and we do not get any cent from the other region although we have to organize public transport into Brussels; metro, street car and buses are 100 % paid by the local government. The way to solve our situation if we are looking to the goals for diminishing traffic, is to have more money from the State through these agreements on investments and we need investment. Why? because we have a goal to diminish by 20 % traffic in Brussels, all over the year, not only during the peak hours. It means that all capacity must double; the double of capacities, not the double of street cars, buses and metro cars but it is about the same proportion. We need billions and the only way to fulfill Kyoto goals is to have more money from the State. We cannot ask poor people to pay more taxes. Rich are outside Brussels.

Steve NEWSOME

I think there are two issues here actually for transport authorities; one is no matter how good your organizational structure is, you need money to do anything. That is very important. Secondly you need stability in that funding as well to enable you to plan in a fairly medium to long-term way. In the case of London, we have transport for London a completely integrated Transport Authority which is responsible for all of London's transport modes. Not just metro, not just bus, not just tram, but we license taxis, we are responsible for the principle highways, all of the traffic signals and perhaps we will catch onto it later on promoting walking and cycling. So a huge range of responsibilities and a lot of power that goes with it. We need the financing to put those things into practice. I think one of the things we have been very successful with actually since the Transport for London was created in 2000, is having that stability in funding. I think there is a real responsibility actually for the Transport Authorities. If

you want stable and adequate amount of funding, you have to demonstrate financial responsibility. David BROWN said earlier on in his intervention you have to show that you are delivering value for money for what you are getting. Transport for London has been let me say quite good at doing that. We have had relatively long periods of funding settlement or funding award from central Government.

We are now actually in a 10-year funding agreement with central government which allows us to plan effectively for the future. When I say central government that is quite important, because approximately half of our revenue comes from tickets and approximately half comes from central government. That second bit of that statement might sound a bit odd when you think for isn't transport for London responsible to the Mayor of London,? is it not responsible for implementing the Mayor's transport strategy.? Yes we are, to both of those questions but the way the funding system works in the UK, here in England, London, most of it comes from central government. In the case of London, a very small amount comes from the Mayor of London. The large amount of funding from the State if you like is all from central government.

Quick word on modes, modal shift. That is a very important part clearly of any transport strategy or mobility plan but I think actually there is no simple answer to how you do that. I will just refer to something that Thierry said this morning talking about mobility plans in general. There is no one-size-that-fits-all. There is no one-solution. The same actually with modal shift getting people to move from private to public and sustainable transport. It is a range of different measures. I do not really like the term carrot and the stick but persuasion and dissuasion of measures to get people to move in the direction they want them to do.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you. Steve just one word; with Sheffield this morning we have seen examples of very integrated Transport Authorities with lots of responsibilities, lots of competencies. Would you say the more integrated, the more financially efficient?

Steve NEWSOME

I do not want to say that the London model is certainly suitable for everybody. The London model is very integrated and if I look at the way transport is delivered in London, it is done efficiently and you can measure its success by the fact that since 2000, it has seen a 5 % and growing shift from private, to public and sustainable transport. That is a very important measure of success. I would say that if you have an integrated transport authority, you can give an integrated service to passengers. Passengers are not interested in who provides the buses, who provides the metros, they simply want a join-up reliable journey from home to

work or home to a leisure destination. They do not have to think about time tabling or ticketing, they want a simple seamless, a joined-up response. I think that integration of transport authorities is one way to do that but it is not the only way.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you very much. Anybody wants to react on that point? Maybe I would have a more contextual question concerning the situation today right now. We all know that we are facing an impressive economic downturn. Concerning your own experience, have you seen already any impact? I mean, did you have to delay some projects to give up some projects already? Are you planning to delay or to forget about a few ambitions? For example, in London I have seen that you had stressed a lot and put a lot of money for soft modes; walking and cycling. What about this new economical situation? Is it going to change the approach and maybe also in Barcelona, in Madrid or in Brussels, we can have a few words on that point?

Marc GARCIA

Yes. I answer to your contextual question. Let me produce the context for this answer. In terms of mobility plans, the big issue, the big expense is related to public transport; to public transport operation and to public transport infrastructure. That is really what is the financial headache. I mention some of them already. The total public subsidies per year from the different administrations allocated into the public transport in Barcelona metropolitan area is around 600 million euros. The State funds that only up to 25 %, the regional government, 46% and the municipalities, 29 %. If you compare the different transport authorities there is a completely different situation: Thierry [Duquenne] example is an authority managed by the ministry; so the regional ministry is shooting for 100 % of the total subsidies needed. In our situation and in Paris as well, I see that is also the case of other authorities for sure, we see that the involvement of the State is declining in a steep way.

The master plan for infrastructure 2001-2010 comprises works for a total amount of 13 billion euros in 10 years. The plan is roughly half way through. The investment in the metro and in the regional railways networks, also in tram networks, for these three in Barcelona it is of the order of 1 billion euros per year. The State funds only 4 %, the regional government funds the rest of it.

What is the situation now? The situation now is that as for the first part, let us go to the economic downturn. The number of customers in public transport authorities are declining. So our income is being reduced compared to previous projection. As for the infrastructure funding, the consumption of citizens is declining; the VAT income by the different

administrations is also being reduced. What is the challenge? The challenge is not to bankrupt and I would say that curiously, at least in the Barcelona case, as we replied in the survey that you are circulating, we do not see any serious indications by our top responsible people that we should reduce our public transport offer. That is strange so to speak. But we believe that they really understand that the public transport system is the way, in this situation, to ensure social inclusion. The situation is getting so complicated; Spain is getting really complicated. In addition, if we would deteriorate the quality of public transport that could be explosive!. This is certainly not the way that the authorities are going to go. I mean in my perception, I do not know on other system, perhaps there is some slight differences but this is not that we are reducing strongly and adapting the public transport offer to our financial capabilities. On the contrary, what the administrations are doing in Barcelona is getting loans to cope with the additional funds needed that they are not able to fund via the ordinary budget. That is the perspective for 2009 and 2010.

Steve NEWSOME

Just a quick update on the London experience. As I said we have a 10-year funding settlement for central government which takes us to 2017-2018 and has been no change in that funding agreement with central government in the light of the current crisis. Half of our revenue in theory at least is still secured and there has been no change to central government support. The other half of our revenue of course is from fare revenue. In an earlier budget of course we predicted increases in that. We have seen strong increases in ridership like most public transport operators. What we have seen in the last few months is a change in that pattern of growth to a slowdown and even a position where we are not growing passenger revenue at all and where in some instances, actually passenger revenue is falling.

That has posed a big problem for our budget. When we announced our budget for the current year last month, we had to postpone a number of projects because of this shortfall in income. You can call them relatively small projects; those smallish bus rapid transit system that has been postponed and there was an upgrade to a Central London station partly to introduce step-free access. That has been postponed. Within that context, transport for London budget this year is actually much bigger than in was last year. The context is that we are very big integrated transport authority with lots of power. Last year our budget was 8 billion pounds; that is probably about 8, 5 to 9 billion euros. This year it has done up an extra 1 billion pounds; so we are now in a current financial year, going to be spending 9 billion pounds and that supports an incredible investment program in the underground. The metro modernization project and also a new east/west rail link Crossrail which is a bit like the RER

in Paris and of course the transport preparations for the Olympic Games. In the context of the current crisis there is a huge investment program going on which you can make the case to central government. This is vital to support the economy.

Carlos CRISTOBAL

In Madrid the situation is, as has explained Marc [Garcia] more or less the same, with some differences. I think tomorrow, it will be the subject of the meeting, So only two remarks, after more than 10 years of very big investment plans, we have done many things. We have also today a plan of investment, important, but less than in the past 8 or 12 years. The crisis arrived in a moment when we had built so much infrastructures, and remain with a plan of investment more related to buses and also some suburban rail . At this moment the new investment plan is more or less stopped. But the problem is with the subsidies because with so big investment, the level of subsidies also increases year after year. In Barcelona it was about 600 million euros something like that. For us it is more than 1 billion euros. Tomorrow it is the topic: the political decision to decrease the supply of public transport in Madrid in order to meet the budget. Because if you do not have money, it is clear that you need to decrease the supply. This is the topic for tomorrow. For me, it is not only the big investments in public transport that are taken but the public transport authority or the regional government. For me it is a very important point in the municipalities.

When you see the figures in the case of Madrid on mobility- urban mobility in the municipalities is more or less the 25 % of all mobility in our region. Half of the population is located there. Normally this mobility is by foot in Spain. 50 % of the urban mobility in medium-sized municipalities out Madrid City, is by foot. But there the majority is by car. The majority is 80 % by car and 20 % by public transport in urban context. So trips of 5 kilometers, 7 kilometers: the majority is by car. I think we need to stress the importance of the urban mobility plans in these metropolitan cities. Not only Madrid City but also medium-size cities in our metropolitan area. We need to find funds to implement these mobility plans in these cities.

Thierry DUQUENNE

We have a problem in Brussels. There are elections over five weeks. Officially, there is no problem. I expect on 8th or 9th of June, there will a problem, because we have revenues coming from taxes and taxes will decrease; that is sure. Revenue is decreasing, more people jobless and so on. The second problem is that the municipalities have lost very much money because they were shareholders of a big bank DEXIA. The lack of dividend is about 20 million euros for the 19 municipalities. The value of capital, it is also important, diminished by

98 %. You see what a decrease it is. It is about 1 euro per share instead of 25. There is another problem arising. 20 % of our budget is for public transport. It means about 400 million a year on a budget of 2 billion. I expect that we will have many problems. There is no regional plan to boost the economy. We do not invest; we do not do anything, we spend on social plans and so on but nothing for boosting the economy and one of the sectors that is hit by the economic crisis is the construction sector. We need some boosting in the construction sector. For public transport officially last year there were 3 % more people, but as the 6 first months it was already a 6 % year-trend so it means that the second part of the year was 0 %. At the same time, we changed the network. So maybe because it [the change] was made very bad, maybe also because of the crisis? We do not know.[what generated the decline in passengers] That is another problem we have.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you Thierry for this very optimistic point of view. Nobody jumps from the window.? Maybe one last question, then we will listen to your questions to our speakers. We see that mobility plans involve a large variety of measures. Some of these measures may attract the private sector. This could be part of the answer of maybe the lack of money. Some measures could attract the private sector in case for example of car sharing or bike rental schemes. For those of you who have this experience, what is the lesson you have learned? Do you foresee to setup new partnerships with a private sector? I think there is the example of car sharing, the Cambio experiment in Brussels, you have bikes. I do not know that the bike rental scheme involves the private sector in Madrid; probably. Maybe in London you have also different PPP experiment. Mr. NALIN could maybe tell us a few words about the Vélib experiment? Then, please be ready to ask a few more questions.

Thierry DUQUENNE

The first PPP we have is for car sharing. The risk is divided between the operator and the region for the first years and for next year and 2011, it must be self-supporting. It is a small scale; it is not billions of euros. The other is bike renting. We made a general tendering process to find an operator for bike renting and it is financed by publicity. The problem is that we have already thousands of square meters of publicity in Brussels and this will add to it. I am not sure that the market is ready to add money for publicity because we have already very much. Some municipalities refused the system because they find it not beautiful enough. The true reason is that they have today the publicity for the shelters for public transport. They feel they will lose some money in favor of bike renting. That is the truth.

Steve NEWSOME

I think clearly there is a role for private financing in public transport schemes from car clubs to large infrastructure projects. Most people are probably familiar with the private finance involvement in the modernization of London metro system. Let us say that has not been that successful. It is probably a polite way to put it but private finance where we have used it for other parts of our infrastructure, for example, extension or Dockland railway as we heard in our meeting in Paris in November. They have been much more successful and there are particular reasons for that which we discussed in November. London is going to follow other cities' examples. I think it has one of the beauties of this kind of associations where we learn from each other. In May next year we will have a cycle-hire scheme in London similar to other cities. We will do that in a slightly different way actually to other cities. It will be a contractor that will be providing the service. So it would not be wholly based on advertising like other systems. We are going to announce that very shortly actually. So I do not want to preempt what is going to be in that. There is a role clearly for private finance but I do not think it is necessarily in itself and I do not think everyone probably would argue that it is the only solution.

Marc GARCIA

In Barcelona the biggest example of PPP projects is the tramway network. The regional government delegated onto us. That was funny also. In 2000, the full responsibility for the development and implementation of the tramway system; that is a 30-kilometer network divided into two different sub-networks. A total investment of about 560 millions euros over 7 years. The trams are running till 2004. The network was completed in 2007. I must say that this is a very successful story according to what people tell us in the surveys. Couple of figures about the perceived quality by customers; they give it in their total 7.8 over 10. That is good mark.

Another funny answer we have read from the surveys because these quality surveys are not only in this case for tramway customers but also to other citizens. We discovered that 61 % of the citizens living in the city of Barcelona declared to have used the tramway, even if the system does not serve them. So why should they? Because they really like it and they really think that there is a high quality of public transport system. One lesson we learned is that of these three PPP, the third P is partnership. The type of management we are doing of these concessions is a very close one. We [ATM] are a legal body, so we are able to make a very close interaction with the operator, which is not a huge one; a middle-size operator. We are able to push them to remove and to change things, even with the concession contract. For two of the networks that's what we dared to propose in 2007 and we have completed that a

couple of months ago, there were a number of draconian clauses in the original contract but the present direction team of ATM did not like it at all and we did not agree with them. We entered into a new session. We managed to change a substantial paragraph in the concession contract. That is the third P. The third P does not mean only that the administration says: “how are the surveys being delivered and how nice are the transport?”, but getting really into the heart of the business. That is absolutely crucial for the success.

Another example of the PPP is the bikes example. This is a concession by the Barcelona municipality. The other municipalities in Barcelona area would also copy. This has been kept at the municipal level because that is the sufficient level. In my conception it does not make sense that a metropolitan agency runs the bike scheme. That is too big in my perception. Same as probably the regional government about the Barcelona tramway. is a too big level of administration. How is it paid? It is paid by their revenues obtained from the parkings. That is also a way to divert money that is being obtained from the private sector to the sustainable system.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you. Mr. CRISTOBAL, just a few words. We have to keep 10 minutes for the questions of the audience, otherwise we will be a little bit late.

Carlos CRISTOBAL

You know in Madrid we have many kind of PPP: PPP in metro lines, PPP in railways, PPP in interchanges, many other things. In relation with the two aspects of bikes and cars sharing, we do not have so much experience. When you speak about PPP as bus shelter or bikes, it is not so difficult to get PPP and private participation in the big city but out of the big city, in the other municipalities, it is not clear. For example bus shelters in Madrid City is no problem. The problem is bus shelters out of Madrid City. 20 kilometers away in a small municipality, this is the problem. Bikes in Madrid City maybe it will be a problem or maybe not in the future, but the problem might be bikes out of Madrid city, the public/ private participation in the medium-size cities. Our metropolitan area has many medium-size cities.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you. Who has the first question?

Ingemar ZIEGLER

I am from Stockholm. I do not think we have mobility plans in Stockholm as far as I know. At least we do not have them in the shape you have been describing here. Of course they can

look very different in different places; that is one of the conclusions today. In Stockholm we used to do the traffic planning in combination with the overall planning for the region. It has been a part of that organization. Now we are changing the organization, SL my company is taking over the traffic planning and I suppose that we will find some kind of mobility plan methodology. Of course we have to work very close together with the region planning office because the traffic is part of the region planning and it is a very important part. My question is, do you think there is a risk when you work with these mobility plans separately from all the other planning for society? There is a risk that you do not really go hand in hand with the overall planning. That is the thing I am facing right now in Stockholm.

Marc GARCIA

That is a very good question. I think that the solution for that is a hierarchy within a legal set-up of the different plans. In our case, the mobility plan is at the fore-front of that which is what is called the *Plan territorial metropolitain*: the metropolitan territorial plan. That is the overall planning that is devising how the population and the economic locations are etc... whatsoever....and the main transport infrastructure in the region will be developed for the next 20 years. This plan is now getting out from the oven, right now; in this precise month. Although the plan was not there, we were aware of that.

What we did is somehow supervising part of the guidelines of the actions axis of the mobility plan to the determinations of that plan. It has to be established as I mentioned several times that it has to be established by law. That is very important because if that is established by law, then everything else is clear. Then this sort of mismatch you may have between different plans and different situations is not possible. In our system it is clear cut, well-established and we know who answer for the different levels that have changed our planning.

Thierry DUQUENNE

I totally agree with you because it is very important. We included in the team people specialized in land use planning as well as in the environment. Normally it must match with the other policies but there is pressure from promoters to have another settlement policy for housing and for economy. It is more a bargain to obtain a normal way of land use planning and not the freedom of establishing that some people are asking.

Room

My question is for the former speaker. Do you synchronize the different kinds of planning? There must be some top level that makes the judgment. What interest shall have the advantage in the final plans?

Thierry DUQUENNE

We have a general plan but it is already 8 years old and it does not fulfill all the conditions to have 20 % less traffic in Brussels. We have to change this plan too. It is a rolling and running adaptation of each plan because I know environment will ask more for CO² reduction because we need 50 % less traffic for CO². It is a big bargain, a big challenge for the future.

Steve NEWSOME

Mobility plans on their own are useful but not as useful as they could be if you tie them in as you quite rightly say with land use planning and economic development strategies, health strategies, environment strategies. Yes they must be synchronized and at least if they are produced at different times, there must be some kind of coherence between them all. In a way with the election of a new Mayor in London, we are slightly lucky because we starting these processors with a fresh look if you like. Next week we will publish in draft the Mayor's new transport strategy. This week we are publishing the new land use strategy and the week after next, we will publish the draft economic development strategy. They should all fit together and as you quite rightly say they should be synchronized if you want to get the most out of them.

Thomas AVANZATA

Any other question? Yes.

Maria MACHANCOSES (Centro)

It is probably more a comment than a question but speaking in up on that particular land use planning issue, I was talking to Marc about this in the break, that it would be useful to have a session on long-term planning and how it links with land use planning. We were talking about how public transport can influence land use planning in the long-term. We keep following people: where is the housing? Yes we can do something here. It is really about capacity and things like that. The difference between long-term aspirations on public transport are actually deliverable projects. Things that actually got funding and therefore going to happen. We still like a network with 6 lines and encourage growth in this area of the region rather than here because the capacity in this area is big. That will be useful.

Thomas AVANZATA

Thank you. It is a very interesting comment. I have a question now. I discovered that mobility plans, I thought before preparing this round table, existed for decades. That is not the case.

How did you do it before? We are talking about 2005, 2002, 1992 and I think you are one of the first. Everybody was shooting in different directions?

Thierry DUQUENNE

At the beginning of the world so to speak, we moved from State to regional organization - the first step.

At the general level it was one minister responsible for public works and another one for transport, all public transport in Belgium. Now we have four and for public works we have three. By the regionalization, it was at the same time an economic crisis. It is not the first. We had less means and more problems to solve and so we merge the problem from offer management to demand management. The first step was the first plan that we began in 1991 and we ended in 1998. The second step is more mobility management but it was already included in the first plan. We need also to intervene on financing more investment, more capacity and more costs.

Marc GARCIA

A very short comment Essentially At the beginning it was everyone's will. Everyone did where they wanted and what they wanted. Suddenly you discovered that you had to go from Barcelona to Madrid several times a year for business or to get stamps at the ministry and that you do not have roads (So you put a plan for the development of roads -in the 18th century-). Then you wished to get quicker. So you built the infrastructures and suddenly this process of accommodating infrastructure and the transport services to the citizens will get in collision with the citizens quality of life. That is the original mobility planning. That is normal. That is my point of view. That is the origin of that. How is it possible that we leaved without mobility plans for many years? We were very few and there were no real conflicts with the exacerbated consumption that man can do of nature. It was like that. At a certain level, this cannot go any longer like this.

Intervener

Yes. The mobility plans practice obviously is the result of this conflict. I am just a little bit surprise because mobility plans appeared around the year 2000 and I have a feeling that this conflict of the knowledge of the consciousness of this conflict arrived a little bit earlier.

Marc GARCIA

The answer to that by 1990, let's say to be fair, was on a sub-sectorial basis. There was traffic management, there was public transport management, there were pedestrian zones, there was even some lucid people thinking about bikes. They were not integrated. There were tiny pieces of planning and things like that. What really mobility planning means is coordinating, assembling to coherent objectives to produce coherent actions.

Thomas AVANZATA

Allow me a stupid question: Stockholm, do you plan to have a mobility plan?

If there are no more questions, I will ask Thierry DUQUENNE the Chairman of this session, to very briefly tell us a few words of conclusions and to close this session. Thank you.

Thierry DUQUENNE

The first thing I think the economic crisis impacts very badly our economy or can impact also public transport. The second, the financial responsibility is needed in the future. For public transport we need stability, secured financing on the long-term. Not only on yearly basis depending from economic growth or declining but consents and forecastable. We need not only decision measures but also persuasion. There is place for development of pedestrians and cycling in all our cities. It does not cost too much. It is going in the sense of sustainable development. There is also a little or bigger place, it depends, for private financing. It depends on what you are intending to do. There is a need for synchronization of land use planning, environmental policy, transport policy and economic development strategies. And last but not least, we need to forecast the long-term and to find solutions not only technical solutions to meet the goals but also financing solutions to built the solutions if they need money. That is all. I wish you a good appetite.

Thomas AVANZATA

Ladies and gentlemen thank you very much for your attention. It was a real pleasure to moderate these two sessions. Have a very nice lunch. The coach will be here at three o'clock for the technical visit. Thank you very much.