

International Seminar on Public Transport Authorities

31 march 2011

Session 1 – Los retos para las cuatro mayores Autoridades de Transporte de Europa

Carlos CRISTÓBAL-PINTO

Director of quality, Process and external relationship, CRTM. Vice-president of EMTA

Sophie MOUGARD

CEO, STIF (Syndicat des Transports d'Île de France Paris)

Steve NEWSOME

Head of International affairs, TfL (Transport for London)

Hans-Werner FRANZ

CEO, VBB (Verkehrsverbund Berlin-Brandenburg GmbH)

José Manuel PRADILLO

Managing Director del Consorcio Regional de Transportes de Madrid (CRTM)

Carlos CRISTÓBAL-PINTO

Thank you for coming to this international seminar for the EMTA association at the same time as the 25 anniversary of the CRTM. There are four speakers, representing the four major metropolitan areas in Europe, but I will explain these four areas and compare them.

I have tried to put together the four metropolitan areas represented here in order to compare some data about population, area and public transport. Regarding areas of responsibility of the transport authorities for the four metropolitan areas in respect of numbers of inhabitants, Paris is the largest, with Greater London, Madrid and Berlin as being similar to each other with 6-8 million inhabitants. Comparing the areas of each of these metropolitan areas, you can see that Berlin-Brandenburg is a huge metropolitan regional authority, with an area of over 30,000 square kilometres; Paris and Madrid are quite similar, with 12,000 and 11,000 square kilometres respectively. However, the case of Greater London is more relevant, because it is a little over 1,500 square kilometres; this is the area covered by the public transport authority. Comparing the data for use of public transport in terms of surface area and inhabitants, it is very high in London and very low in Berlin.

London is not like the other cities; it does not have a city and regional areas, but rather the city and the metropolitan area are covered by the same authority. While the population figures for Berlin and Madrid are more or less the same and those for Paris are lower, Paris is a smaller city when you take surface area into

account, being a little over 100 square kilometres as opposed to Madrid's 600 or Berlin's 900. The city area is the same as the metropolitan area in London, whereas in the case of Berlin and Madrid about 58% consists of the main city; it is less than 20% in the case of Paris.

Regarding population growth in the metropolitan areas over the last ten years, there was an increase of almost 25% in Madrid; there were also significant increases in Greater London and Paris, but a stable or even negative growth rate in Berlin-Brandenburg. The evolution was positive in all four cities, and the rates in the metropolitan areas paralleled those in the cities, with the exception of Berlin.

Perhaps the most significant evolution was in terms of the transport share between public transport, private cars, walking and cycling. Greater London and Madrid are more or less similar in the percentage of private car usage at 36-37%, but the difference is that London covers only 1,500 square kilometres whereas Madrid covers 8,000. Taking Berlin and Paris, you can see the same percentages at 45%. Regarding the percentage of public transport use in the entire metropolitan area, Madrid is at 40% with the others being lower; Madrid and Berlin rank very highly in walking and cycling at almost 40%, with Paris being at 34%. Looking at the main cities, London is the same as the metropolitan area, but with the others, the use of private cars is much lower than that of public transport, walking and cycling, so we can say that the major cities show sustainable mobility in general.

Regarding demand per inhabitant, London is the highest, with Paris, Berlin and Madrid following; perhaps the major factor for Madrid is the lower rate of usage for the suburban network. I have said many times that our suburban network is much smaller than those of the other large metropolitan areas in Europe, and this is one of the reasons, along with the impressive use of buses in London, for example. However, you need to take into account the many commuters in London, because it covers the whole metropolitan area.

Finally, the single ticket is a controversial topic in Madrid; the fare in Paris is much lower than in the others. Regarding the ratio between the single ticket and monthly ticket, the number of trips you need to make per month to add up to a monthly ticket is much higher in Madrid.

Sophie MOUGARD

STIF is the authority responsible for organising transport in the Ile de France area. Carlos Cristobál gave you all the figures concerning our region, and I would just like to emphasise two points, 11.6 million inhabitants in a surface area of 12,000 kilometres, 80% of which is rural, meaning that we have to deal with a very dense population in and around Paris, and a very rural area where there are very few inhabitants.

First of all, we have to see public transport as being part of people's mobility, and to plan it not just from a transport point of view but also in terms of how it impacts urban and transport planning; that is how we meet the challenges we have in our region. All urban public transport authorities in France have to create an urban mobility plan in order to create a sustainable balance between the mobility needs of people and goods, as well as ensuring environmental preservation in terms of preserving health and quality of life. The issues we have to address are reducing motorised traffic, developing public transport but also what we call active modes such as walking and cycling, and also how we organise parking provisions, freight transport and delivery in order to reduce the impact on road traffic and the environment.

When you are dealing with an urban mobility plan, even if you are the urban transport authority, you have to deal with a large number of key players regarding mobility policies, and the key question is how to involve them in the elaboration of the plan so that they will share its goals. We have a lot of people involved in that, because about 1,300 towns will share transport amenities. We face forecasts of increased mobility requirements: today we have 35 million journeys per day, and among them only 8.5 million are public transport, so we have to increase this component. Our plan between now and 2020 is to increase it by 7%.

The figures Carlos just presented show that private cars are still the dominant mode of transport. We have to reach the Kyoto targets on greenhouse gases, so we also have to reduce pollution, because about three million inhabitants are subjected to air which does not meet the criteria for good quality. We also need to reduce accidents. Therefore, we need a process designed to increase involvement, and we have an extensive consultation process also involving the inhabitants of the Ile de France via the Internet. We were pleasantly surprised by the response, with over 9,000 contributions. They told us that the first priority was to improve the public transport offer, not to make it cheaper.

We had a large partnership working together in the working groups, consisting of experts, a committee to manage the political aspects, and a technical committee to take note of the actions we needed to take. What are the key elements of the new urban mobility plan? First of all, we decided we would have ambitious objectives in the context of increased mobility, of course, but we did check to see how the actions we intended to take would enable us to meet those objectives. Those actions are based particularly on good practices which should be generalised in the region.

Regarding the mobility targets, we want public transport to increase by 20% in the context of the 7% increase, which is very ambitious; by this time car and motorbike use should decrease by 2%, meaning that the share of car usage should decrease by 4%. We want walking and cycling to increase by 10% by 2020. Our strategy involved 35 actions to meet nine challenges. I do not have time to go through all of these, but I will point out some actions that need to be taken by the public authority. This involves making public transport more attractive, but we also want to be one step ahead and to think about how to build a city which is more suitable to pedestrians, bicycles and public transport, even if we are not involved. We will have to develop a system of governance with all of the towns in order to make sure that the urban mobility plan will be implemented.

We need to increase the provision of public transport by 25% by 2020 if we want the public transport share to increase, and that means creating a new hierarchy of public transport services, building new projects, one of the most important of these being the building a new metro line in the suburbs around Paris so that you can travel from one point to another in the suburbs without going through Paris; this will require 150 km of new metro. We also need to work on rapid transit bus lines; we regard the bus rapid transit lines here in Madrid with envy. Major investments will be planned to restore punctuality in mass transit lines. We have to face a network which is old and is not sufficiently modern to face the increase in traffic. We also have to think about sharing the road space so that main bus and tramway lines have priority; this is a prescription we wrote in the plan.

We also have to enhance the interchange stations, because we can tell how important this is for users of our transport offer. Information has to be easier to understand and has to be harmonised in the entire region by developing a real-time information system. This is not easy, because there are more than 80 different operators in the suburbs, and they all have their own systems which do not communicate, so we as the transport authority have to do something about this. We also have to make public transport more accessible for mobility impaired people.

Regarding how we increase the public transport offer by 25%, we have to develop a regular and reliable public transport service, and to think about the modes and the service levels that will be better adapted to demand from a geographical as well as temporal viewpoint. It has to be an offer that is understandable to travellers and reliable, with a high quality of service; that will require a 35% increase in running costs. We also have to facilitate the use of public transport by all travellers and improve inter-modal conditions.

I told you about modernising the existing rapid transit lines between the suburbs, and we need to build master plans for that, including modernising the rolling stock, investing in the infrastructure, and thinking about how trains can stop in certain areas to respond to demand. We have to improve services on existing lines, for example in terms of frequency during evenings and weekends, and we have to create new infrastructure. The transport mobilisation plan, which includes the new projects we have to develop as well as modernising the existing lines, consists of almost EUR20 billion between now and 2020.

We engaged in an investment plan for renewing rolling stock, and we now have almost EUR4 billion in investments in this area, so that all rapid transit trains will be recently or newly renovated by 2016. We also want to work on the bus network; for example, we have noticed that people want tramways, because they are seen as modern, high quality etc., though we do not have the money to build them everywhere, and they are not useful when you just need a bus line. Therefore, we had to work on a new concept that offered a very high level of service, meaning a contiguous segregated corridor with high service levels, requiring innovative vehicles such as the new service which will operate in the Paris suburbs from next June. This means well equipped stations which can be implemented on new and existing bus lines which have to be transformed.

We need the local authorities to facilitate proper operation of the tramway, bus, express and Mobilier lines, which is a standard of high quality and frequency for buses. We want the towns to adopt the municipal decrees that are necessary for organising all of that.

I gave you all the figures for the finances we require, and regarding how STIF finances public transport every year, the budget is about EUR7.8 billion; this comes from the user fares, which constitutes about 40%, though

8.6% is reimbursed to employees. 38% comes from a transport tax paid for by every company in Ile de France, and 20% from Paris and the Department stakeholders of STIF. We pay 53% of this to RATP, 35% to SNCF and 11% to the other operators in the suburbs around Paris.

We face a gigantic task if we want to implement all the actions around public transport I just presented. Regarding public investments from 1981 to 2006, the average level is EUR1.2 billion per year, whereas the level required to implement all the new projects is much greater, and we have to find new sources of financing. People usually think about an investment budget and find new sources, but we as the transport authorities are really concerned with the operating budget, but if we are to implement all the actions I just presented, our budget will have to increase from EUR7.9 billion this year to EUR10.6 billion by 2020.

We have to find a balance between the three participants in order to do this, the first one being the user, and we have taken steps to increase ticket prices for the Ile de France transport system. The second is the stakeholders of STIF, the Region, Paris and the Department, meaning all of us, because we are citizens of those areas and pay taxes. The third one is the companies, the business sector, as they will benefit from this improvement of the system. That is why we need the transport tax to be increased, as that will enable us to achieve a balance between the three groups.

I want to finish with some others we need to deal with in this plan. For example, we recommend that the speed limit is reduced to 30 km per hour on main roads in urbanised areas. We also want to develop the bicycle networks by adding 3,500 km of dedicated lanes. We also want the local authorities to prescribe bicycle parking places for new buildings or reserving part of street parking provisions for bicycles; this is important if we want active transport modes, especially cycling, to develop.

I will finish with governance, because we are dealing with this urban mobility plan not just with respect to the transport offer but also actions which are not our responsibility but are the domain of municipalities, who are in charge of elaboration of local mobility plans which will be compatible with the global mobility plan I have presented. We want incentives using subsidies, technical assistance and the creation of good practices, and during the elaboration of the plan we want continuous appraisal of how actions are implemented and their real effects on mobility, just to ensure that the actions we want to implement are the right ones.

Carlos CRISTÓBAL-PINTO

The most inspiring thing for me is the mobility plan that we have heard about. I will give the floor to the next speaker, Steve Newsome, Head of International and European Affairs for Transport for London.

Steve NEWSOME

I am not quite sure whether it is a bigger challenge to devise an urban mobility plan or to limit a talk about it to 10-15 minutes, but I will do my best. You have heard some statistics about the cities represented here, and I will start my talk by giving you some context about transport in London. I will then talk about shaping London, the Mayor's transport strategy, a few words about the impact of the economic crisis, and a few concluding words.

Regarding context about transport in London, one of the things about Transport for London is that it is a completely integrated transport authority and an operator, in the sense that we are responsible for delivering, whether as an in-house operator or under contract, pretty much all of London's transport system, and we are doing that in a reliable and efficient way. For example, the Tube system is at its busiest than at any point in its 148-year history, and this year it will carry 1.1 billion passengers. It will run 70 million train kilometres, up 27% on 15 years ago. London's buses account for nearly half of all the bus journeys in the UK, and they have grown by nearly 40% since 2000. You may have heard that in July last year the Mayor launched a cycle hire scheme called 'Barclays Cycle Hire'; it has been going for nine months and already we have had three million journeys on those bicycles.

Regarding the Mayor's transport strategy, I want to stress that transport strategy should not be thought of in isolation from other strategies. A single document does not solve all problems; they have to be fully integrated,

for example, with land use planning and economic development, and that is exactly what the Mayor has done in his plans to shape London. The transport strategy was launched in May 2010, at almost the same time as the final version of the land use strategy, known as the 'London Plan', and the Mayor's economic strategy, which is called 'Rising to the Challenge.' This policy integration is crucial.

Looking at history, coordination with land use planning, or the lack of it, has an important bearing on the shape of transport. One of the questions for cities like London is how it will grow and where it will grow. Obviously, a higher density of living and working are what public transport needs, and equally, if you have a city with different town centres where people live close to where they work, where their children go to school and where they use their leisure facilities, you can facilitate walking and cycling. Generally, transport tends to follow land use; there are some exceptions to that, one of them being London in the 1930s, where the Metro system actually led to the development of housing in what we call Metroland, but generally speaking it is the other way around, and certainly in the case of London transport will be a consequence of land use planning.

The Mayor's transport strategy has six goals. The first one is to support economic development and population growth, and just to say a little about that point, in the next 20 years, the life of the Mayor's transport strategy, we expect an extra 1.25 million people to be living in London. We expect employment to grow by 750,000, and we expect a huge increase in the demand for public transport, in the order of 30%. Therefore, in addition to supporting that growth, the transport strategy is intended to enhance the quality of life for all Londoners and visitors to the city; to improve safety, security and transport opportunities for everybody; and to reduce climate change and increase the resilience of the city to it.

I should say that the Mayor has the very ambitious aim to reduce London's CO2 emissions by 60% by 2025, and transport will of course have a huge role to play in that delivery. Finally, part of the Mayor's transport strategy is to support the delivery of London's 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and, importantly, to leave a lasting legacy for London in terms of transport. The Mayor has summed up his transport strategy very simply by saying that it is about getting people from A to B as quickly, safely and conveniently as possible. Lots of transport bodies have that slogan, but actually delivering it is quite a difficult thing.

Where are we starting from and where do we want to be in terms of modal share? I just want to emphasise a couple of points. A couple of years ago we had 24 million trips per day, and that is forecast to grow to 27 million. You will see that private motorised transport, i.e. cars, will decrease from 43-37%, with an increase in public transport, walking and cycling. I should say that this is part of a continuing trend, because in London since 2000 we have seen a 7% shift away from private cars towards public and sustainable transport.

Regarding the predicted population for London over the next 20 years, it is a continuous, unbroken rising trend. You can ask economists for statistics and they usually come up with different ones, but a range of economic projections show that employment in London should also steadily increase. Both factors should have a huge impact on transport.

The key issues to consider, issues which the Mayor has considered in his transport strategy, are three main developments. I have mentioned the coordination and integration of all modes of planning including land use planning, but it is also about managing the demand for information, and about providing additional capacity to meet that growing population, and doing so in a sustainable manner so as to allow London to grow.

There are many ways to manage the demand for transport, but one important one is giving people the right information about transport options in a simple, clear and relevant way, and in a way they will understand, so one of the things Transport for London has done is to make available its real time traffic information to people so that they can develop applications for iPhones. We now have a huge range of apps for London's transport system delivered very quickly by private developers, some of whom work from their kitchen table, in a way that we could never do; however, this is all part of providing information in the way people want it today.

Regarding increasing capacity, the biggest single increase from one project in London's transport capacity will come from a new east-west railway line called Crossrail, 118 km long. We tend to think of it as being similar to the RER in Paris. It will go from Heathrow Airport in the west to Canary Wharf, what one might call the new business district, in the east. It is a huge and expensive project at GBP16 billion or EUR18 billion, and it will open in 2018.

Alongside Crossrail, we are upgrading and modernising the Metro system. I should stress that we are not in the position of extending our network as you are in Madrid; we are not increasing the length of the network, but

what we are doing is to put in new trains, new signalling and new track to allow us to run more trains per hour and therefore carry more people per hour. Looking at the Hammersmith and City line and the Circle line, the capacity increase after the upgrade will be 65%, which is amazing; that is partly because some of the signalling on those lines dates from the 1920s.

We have a joke in Britain that they do not make things like they used to, and they certainly do not in the case of signalling systems, but they have come to the end of their useful life, or will have, and the trains on the Hammersmith and City line will be nearly 50 years old by the time they come out of service. Therefore, by upgrading the system we can get a huge increase in its capacity. It is all very well to carry more people on your network, but they have to get in and out, so a modernising of interchanges and extra capacity are also important components of the Metro upgrade.

I said that Transport for London is responsible for pretty much all of London's transport modes, but that is not quite true for suburban rail. Transport for London has an increasingly important influence over the shape of suburban rail in London, and we are responsible for part of it ourselves, London Overground, although we do use private companies to operate it for us. It is an orbital system, or will be, and that is an important part of transport planning, for two reasons. It is about enabling people to get where they want to go, which may not be in the centre of the city, so rather than force them in, you actually provide an orbital link so that they can get to where they want to go. Secondly, they should not always have to go to a busy rail terminus; you can provide other links which enable them to get to a central part of the city and avoid a busy congested rail terminus, and that is what we are trying to do with our orbital rail strategy. That is where London Overground will go when fully complete, an inner London orbital network with links to other parts of the suburbs, and it is supported by the bus network.

The orbital express routes fulfil the same purpose, or the same logic, as London Overground, facilitating suburb to suburb trips directly without forcing people into the centre of the city and then back out again. We do not want them in the centre of the city, because it is already very congested; they do not want to have to come into the centre of the city, but just want to go to their final destination.

We are also increasing and improving the tram system and the Docklands light railway. I have mentioned bus services, but we are trying to clean up our bus fleet through increasing use of hybrid buses and river services. Sophie mentioned walking in her presentation; it is one of those modes of transport which people do not always think about, and here we have much to learn from other cities, for example, what we call way-signing in cities, such as 'You Are Here' maps, something we are increasingly doing in London, along with increasing the streetscape for pedestrians.

Our Mayor, Boris Johnson, is a very keen cyclist and is very keen that we promote that. I have mentioned Barclays Cycle Hire, and we are also introducing radial cycle routes into the centre of the city during the current life of our business plan. We have also integrated cycle provision completely into the Mayor's transport strategy and, importantly, into the land use strategy as well.

Finally, regarding the strategy itself, one of the things we hope it will achieve by 2031 is to improve accessibility for people to jobs. The number of people who have access to a job within 45 minutes will massively increase towards the end of the Mayor's transport strategy, improving that accessibility to jobs which is crucial for economic growth in the city.

Regarding the impact of the economic crisis, you may know that the UK has one of the largest budget deficits in the EU; I am told it is actually bigger than that of Greece. That of course has an impact on public expenditure, which has been reduced, and transport is no exception, with a 21% reduction in its grant from central government, while protecting London's transport priorities. This 21%, I should say, will be an 8% reduction by the end of the business plan, because one thing we have seen despite the end of the economic crisis is a huge growth in passenger numbers, which has meant that passenger revenue is rising very quickly. Despite the reduction in grant, Crossrail will be built, albeit a year later than planned, the Tube upgrades will be progressed as quickly as possible, bus services have been protected in terms of quality and volume, i.e. kilometres run, and the Mayor has managed to maintain fair concessions, for example a 24-hour pass, called a 'Freedom Pass', for older people.

However, Transport for London is required to make huge savings in the operation of its business, so by 2014-2015 we will be expected to have cut nearly EUR9 billion from our operating expenditure, principally by reducing back office costs by 25% and a total reorganisation of the transport authority.

What are we trying to do, and what is the Mayor's transport strategy trying to do for London? It is about putting customers at the centre of everything TfL, Transport for London, does. It is about managing an increase in the demand for transport as a result of a growing city. It is about major improvements in the transport system, including rebuilding a 148-year-old metro system at the same time as it is carrying more people than ever. Finally, with the economic crisis in mind, we have to demonstrate value for money with a consistently good operational performance.

You may remember, if you were in London before 2003, that the north side of the square in front of the National Gallery was a road. You could drive around the Square, and it was very difficult for pedestrians to access the centre. The north side was pedestrianised in 2003, and it has brought that public space to life. We as a transport organisation get excited about new buses, new trains and new trams, but our job is actually more than that, and the transport strategy demonstrates that. It is about making the city a better place to life, to work, and hopefully for people like you to come and visit.

Hans-Werner FRANZ

Ladies and gentlemen, Albert Einstein said, 'Out of all times I am most interested in the future, since that is the time I will live in.' Generally speaking, we live in times of transformation, getting rid of state-owned monopolies even though it is hard to do in terms of implementing fair terms of competition and setting quality standards. Finally, we live in the time of the IT revolution; we are in the midst of it, and most business today and for the future is about IT; we in public transport have to make use of it.

Regarding the challenges, metropolitan areas have problems raising finance, and as Steve said, national debts are very high throughout Europe, the financial crisis is not over, and we have to manage a lot of challenges. We have to look at what things are important and how we can manage them.

VBB's network is a very large one; we have a train system, then a bus system in the rural area, where the population is lower than in Africa; some specialists say that nobody lives in this part of Brandenburg, but there are always people there. Looking at Berlin, we have a railway, an S-Bahn, and a subway; we have a very good tram system in the east of Berlin, whereas the tram system in the west of Berlin was closed in the 1960s and 1970s. We are now investing in a new tram system for the western area, but it costs a lot of money.

Looking at the important facts and figures, you can see that young people are increasingly getting their driving licences later, meaning that more and more people are not so interested in using private cars. The difference from 20 years before is interesting to us. The modal split in Germany indicates a very low share for public transport in the whole of Germany, the dominant means being private cars, with bicycles becoming more and more important. This is also the case with Berlin, where bicycles are playing a more important role.

45% of the financial resources were provided by the states of Berlin and Brandenburg in 2009, with fare income being 55%, and our special problem is increasingly to finance the infrastructure. Deutsche Bahn has a monopoly on the rail network in Germany, and the fees charged for using the stations and the tracks have not been reinvested in the run-down networks and stations for years, all profits being retained by the parent company, Deutsche Bahn, which uses the money for its worldwide expansion. We heard yesterday that it intends to buy Areva.

The fees increase faster than funding from central government, and they do so because the return on equity is set by Deutsche Bahn Networks at higher than 10%, but the transport authorities have to pay kilometre prices, and the public transport company rate of increase is 2% on a daily basis, whereas the rate of increase for the funding is 1.5%.

Short-distance versus long-distance traffic is a very important area; in the early 1990s, the German parliament decided to transform the monopoly rail market into one of free market competition, but unfortunately it stopped half-way. The German states now get the funding from the Government to pay for the desired traffic, whereas the long-distance network and stations were left with Deutsche Bahn, who wanted to be listed on the stock exchange. This has had negative effects, because the network and the stations have to make profits which are not reinvested. Long-distance traffic is reduced where there are not enough profits, meaning at least 10% return on investment, meaning that there are lots of cities without long-distance rail connections, and regional rail subsidises the long-distance trains. We think this is a case of general mismanagement by central government.

The rail infrastructure is an area of tension in Germany. The responsibility for it is written into the German Constitution as lying with the German Government, and it cannot be sold, but the Government has a conflict of interest between regulating the monopolies and preparing Deutsche Bahn for the capital markets, and they want this to be done with the infrastructure. This is an economic contradiction in terms of regulatory policy, with the result that regulations are weak and prices and fees are excessive. Expectations of equity return are too high and impose excessive expenses on the whole system, infrastructure cost increases are above average, regional traffic offers must be reduced, and PTAs have no influence on infrastructure.

Our solution is that long-distance rail also needs a transport authority, with strict separation between network and station operation. It is also very important for us in VBB to create a lot of cross-border connections using short-distance tracks. VBB will be preparing a lot of invitations to tender together with our partners in Poland, along with ticket cooperation and marketing activities. Our goal is to create more long-distance traffic to Poland, with stopovers in Berlin, Brandenburg helping us to improve our offers. That is why we promote cross-border infrastructure as much as we can.

What is our strategy on this? Looking at Steteen, the problem is that the track is not continuously electrified, with a gap of about 20 km. First of all, we launched a single price of EUR10 for the entire distance from Steteen to Berlin. EUR10 is the price you pay for a minibus from Steteen to Berlin, whereas in the past the train cost almost EUR30, so people took the bus instead of the train, so we have had a lot of success with this EUR10 ticket.

Almost all of the cross-border connections are in poor condition, and looking at the estimated rail freight service in millions – it is very important to look at both freight and passenger services in terms of long-distance rail – it is significantly increasing, and it is clear that it will increase considerably, so more invested in this infrastructure is required. We are creating a special book about cross-border rail connections between Poland and Berlin; we call it the ‘White Book,’ and plan to launch it in the summer of this year, and we hope that the politicians will invest more in these connections between Poland and Berlin.

It is important to have not just more regional trains but also more long-distance trains, and it is a real problem that long-distance trains are not profitable in a developing market; they need time. The special situation with DB is that they want to go public in a short time, although they are cutting all the long-distance services. This is a bad decision from our viewpoint, and we hope to bring new ideas to convince the governments in Warsaw and Berlin to invest in this important system for the future.

Regarding IT, we have to take more and more advantage of its development, because there is a revolution in public transport which we do not talk enough about. Departure times are exact because they are in real time, and changes can be seen in a few clicks. Lots of smart phones have Internet flat rates, so people feel that the service is free. We launched our own iPhone app called Fahrinfo, and using this you can view your connection from each point within the network to your destination, which is very convenient for passengers. We created a special arrival button for tourist areas, companies and institutions so that the customer can always find out the connection to the point he wants to reach with one click. This innovation is proving very popular, because companies can use it free of charge.

I think we have to do our homework, which means that we have to bring our focus to bear on quality, safety, and cleanliness. We have to do more in terms of real time information; we have to save money through tendering, setting quality standards through contracts, putting in place sanction mechanisms in place in the case of poor performance, and getting rid of monopoly structures. The future has just begun.

Thanks for your attention.

Carlos CRISTÓBAL-PINTO

Thank you very much Hans Werner. Now, I give the floor to Mr. José Manuel PRADILLO, General Manager of Consorcio de Transportes de Madrid.

Jose Manuel PRADILLO

Very good, good morning to all of you. Obviously, I cannot compete with Einstein, but here in Spain, we have the following saying: “the water that already passed cannot move the waterwheel”. In the end, the meaning both sentence aim to convey is very similar.

What is going to happen during next years? Because this challenge is the real subject of this reunion and also a little...changing the impressions.

To see the future, it is necessary to look a bit at the past. What happened to us in the region of Madrid? In ten of fifteen years depending on what we want to analyze, we have undergone, as you can see here, an important population growth, of one million persons, nevertheless remaining stable.

Indeed, during the last years, the population has kept increasing of one hundred thousand inhabitants per year, and it seems that we are condemned to suffer it at least for some more time. If we consider that not only the population has grown but also the mobility increased, that is to say a number of motorized trips per inhabitants and per day increased, it led us to face an increase of 51% more motorized trips. I dare to assure you that in spite of the economical crisis, as we can see here not only the global mobility was reduced but also the individual mobility, the figures keep rising and maybe in twenty or twenty five years, we will have to face another increase, which maybe will not reach 50% but at least 40%. In some of the presentations, we already mentioned a possible 30% increase in ten of fifteen years. That is to say that whether we want it or not, we are condemned to answer the need of an important number of motorized trips. Moreover, and I go back to something I already mentioned: where is mainly going the new population? Well, the increases of population are not localized in the city centres of capital cities, where as you can see, the traffic is quite stable, but in the metropolitan areas. In the metropolitan areas, the problem is getting worse for two reasons: first, the trips are longer, and secondly, in these areas, the offer is poorer. Nevertheless, these, are the areas where we need to concentrate our efforts to bring new solutions in terms of public transport if we want to preserve the modal distribution, which, as the **director** said this morning is distributed as follows: in the city center the most important zone the public transport represent 74%, in the capital two third of the trips are made in public transport and one third in private transport, but as we move away from the center, the figures are changing and in the outter suburbs-let's say- that the figures are reversed and 74% 75% of the trips are car trips whereas 25% are made in public transport. Moreover, we have 43% of what we call “not compulsory mobility” which represents the journeys whose object is different from studies or work. This kind of need for mobility is much more difficult to answer, since it is much more instable than the other kind of mobility.

We are also surprised to observe that people travel more. Not because of the income levels or because of the distance where they are located, but as you can see there, although these figures represent the complete trips, including the trips made walking and with any other transport mode, really people travel more regardless of where they live, including in the populations located far from the center. And as I said previously, it cannot be linked to the income level.

What measures do we need to take in the future? Well, I hope that it is clearer here than on the computer. Outside the capital city, the metro is not efficient, the commercial speeds are low and the distances are long. It does not make sense to extend the metro much farther. So, we have here, in blue, a line we want, in due course, to operate. This is the extension of line 11, for those who know the Madrid Metro, with some little modifications. But the most important, is to improve the suburban train network, and here are some actions we are carrying out on the Torrejon and Majadahonda to be concrete.

We are going to undergo a serie of important developments, each of which should represent between 12 and 20 thousand homes. That is to say, that it is an important development including inside the capital, and while the population is growing, we will have to answer the need for public transport, fundamentally with

metros, or LRT, or, why not to say it, **metrobus**. Here, someone said, I think it was Sophie, that the tramway or light metro convey an impression of modernity, etc. but they are really expensive. I think that the transport modes are justified by the demand and not by the modernity. A mayor told me one day, and he did not repeat it many times: “Jose Manuel, yes, you are right, but the problem is that the bus is not attractive enough.”. Well it is a challenge, as I will try to explain now, to make the bus attractive because what is not economically sustainable will not be possible to realize in the end.

Because of that, as I said previously, since the population is spreading toward the metropolitan areas, in the case of Madrid, I think we have to improve the suburban train network, which is under the competence of the State who set up a important plan for infrastructures, as you can see here, and in which the Madrid community added some other actions. It was done in a spirit of consensus, and I think this is fundamental for Madrid region.

But also, as I said, when this suburban train plan is carried out, we have to take the opportunity to make parking deterrence. The transfer parking should be part of the train stations. But the problem is the same: who is going to pay for it, since it is not economically profitable. And I do think that the parkings must be systematically a complement to the new train stations. But it is also necessary to improve the bus network. Let's say that if we have BRTs, but since when do we have this kind of bus lines? Well everybody forgot but if I remember well, it we have it since around the year 1995 and we have done nothing more since then. So it is fundamental to end up building infrastructures for, let's call them “bus-vao”, dedicated lanes, trolley buses, where buses can travel 20 or 30 km from these towns on dedicated lanes, without interference with traffic. In the end, the “trick” of the light metro is that it has dedicated lanes, which is fundamental. Moreover the type of vehicle also matters, and this is a subject on which we didn't work enough. We have considered these lines so that they link the tunnels that are already prepared on the interchange stations we built, and this way, the bus will come from 20 or 30 km without interferences with the traffic.

But once these infrastructures are done, I think we still need to do something. Well, here are the two new interchange stations that are missing to make it possible that each arterial or motorway, or dual carriageway entering in Madrid end up in an interchange station, but as I said we will also have to work on the vehicles. It seems to me that I have already seen some vehicles similar to the one I put here. As a joke, I say that we should create galactic buses, referring to this sentence that was all the rage in soccer terms. We have to make sure that the buses taking this platform are very similar to the light rail tram, because in the end, it is what really matters. What does it changes that it rolls on rail or on tyres? It is necessary to change the design, not only the outside design but also the inside design, the... well, it is only a serie of pictures; to choose other kind of colors, to install sunroofs even if in Spain because of the heat, the subject of sunroofs can be debatable. But as I said, it has to be as similar as possible to a LRT for the passenger to understand that this transport mode is different from a normal bus. The subject of optical guidance, not optical guidance, well, in all the network, only on the arrival on the stations, those are also very special buses, very big, very long for meet the need for high capacity dedicated platforms.

Well, all these, are pictures of existing buses. This one is not, I put it here more or less as a joke because the other day, I found this bus, I cannot remember if it was Chinese or Japanese, which dimensions are designed so that it could pass above the road and the cars would be under it. It seems that this is a quite strange thing, that we might never see for real, but I wanted to show that we need to think about innovations to attract the passengers and that the demand could be oriented toward solutions different from LRT.

The subject of technological innovation is as important as the subject of the means of payment. We already forgot that during the last 25 years of the consortium, the single tickets and 10 trips paper tickets became magnetic tickets and the payment means which used to include only coins have been extending to credit cards and now we are even trying the payments with mobile phones. But anyway, there is no other solution but to keep betting on these technologies, since, as you can see with the magnetic tickets, their capacity is so limited that it is impossible to add more fares. We already introduced the contactless card for all the annual travel cards, and before the end of this year, we will extend it to the young public, and then, step by step, hopefully in 2012 the contactless card might be distributed on the whole network. This process will make

technological developments necessary, to get all the data, the guarantees and a good level of security which is not easy. All these systems are very complex, but in the end, what functionalities do they make possible? Well, thanks to all these data and moreover with the bus modernization plan, with the supervision and automatic vehicle location systems, etc., it will allow us, I think, to improve one of the weakest point, at least of Madrid network, which is the passenger information, and which is vital for the future, as it was said here previously. In the end, all these operational control centre systems – I would prefer to call them centre of management and information- and all these data we got thanks to the new technologies introduced in all modes of transports, are to be used to improve the services to the citizens which is fundamental. The passenger appreciate to get information about what is going to happen and information that will make it possible for him to choose to take another mode of transport, etc. This information being given at bus stops or stations, through mobile phone or through a website. If one has the information, today, it is possible to spread it through so many channels that the only thing necessary is to get it, or it can hardly be transmitted.

Finally, I would like to make some brief comments about economic sustainability. We spent these years when we were rich, or at least when we thought we were rich, talking almost exclusively about environmental sustainability, which is fundamental. On the subject of the buses, our choice is going to the hybrid and gas buses. The hybrid bus has the great advantage to consume approximately 30% less combustible, and give out at least 30% less. We are currently testing hybrid gas buses on which I cannot say emissions are null, but reduce them a lot. We will see if this is to be the orientation chosen concerning this subject in the future, it seems that it is, and important companies are all going for hybrid vehicles. But in the end, to get environmental and social sustainability, it has to be economically sustainable. Indeed, this is the entry frame, receipts and expenses of the consortium, which are difficult to show now, but I summarize it on a very simple way.

The transport system of Madrid community needs as you can see here, 2.200 million Euros a year. Among this amount, the national government provide about 200 million, Madrid city council provides another 200 million, the other city councils provide 12 million, and the Madrid community provide more than 900 millions. And we only collect 855 million through the fares. That is to say that the fare cover more or less 40% of the expenses. Consequently, we will have to wonder if this is sustainable or if we need to find new financing sources, how could we apply the French “versement transport”, how to manage the investments. I think that we have to try to make urban added values pay for the investments, because I think that for next years, and these figures are always more unbalanced, the fare coverage in Madrid is decreasing of two points every year, so that in 20 year we would reach zero. So, some measure we will have to take, I think that in this moment, all the...e! (1:56:57) consortium and authorities in Spain, yesterday we had a meeting and we are going to demand an analysis of the possibility to create a special law to finance public transport, which make possible to get financing from other sources different from administrations and public transport users. And fundamentally, on the subject of investments, that I think should be separated from our accounts, here was mentioned the subject of rents or tax, let's call them as we want, for the use of the road, of the stations, etc. This, I think should be considered apart from what is pure operation.

And to finish with a wordplay, I don't know if in English the wordplay is the same, well, what do we want to say with that? That, there is not only one solution that solves the entire problem. We have to apply a lot of things and a lot of solutions, and as was said at the beginning, and I will finish with this, if 25 years ago, when the consortium was created, it was an impressive step forward for these times, today it must be said that it is not sufficient, and it has been said several times during the time we have been in this room. We should keep thinking about it, and I don't think we should wait 25 year more to build unique mobility authorities in the whole region because if we can see that policies are in favour of public transport, their effects could be annulled or diminished by other kind of policies more favourable to private vehicles. It is not easy to create unique mobility authorities, but let's say it not an utopy either. I don't know if the Olympic Comitee demanded it or not, but at least both time Madrid was examined by the Olympic comitee, it

demanded that for the Olympics a unique mobility authority would exist during the Olympics preparation period. Finally, it doesn't seem a crazy idea although, one more time-I would say- great political generosity will be needed to allow the concentration of all these competences in one authority, in one region, in one big metropolitana area, in a big city.

And nothing more, thanks a lot (applause)

Questions and Answers

Assistant

Good morning. I am Charo Baradina of the Spanish office for the climatic change. First, I would like to congratulate al the speakers, and give an idea to José Manuel, who insisted on the need to promote the bus. I think that one of the weakness in Madrid may be the lack of flexibility that does exists in the case of the metro which is the possibility to use the **metrobus** instead of buses transfers, which is made possible in the metro and in my case, to get here, I chose the metro and not the bus which was more convenient because of the necessity **to ticar??** twice and not juste once. Well it is just an idea.

And also, I would like to highlight the subject of economical sustainability. I was surprised that only 40% of the incomes come from the fare collection and well, I suppose it will be related with the non-use of this measure.

Thanks a lot to all of you.

José Manuel PRADILLO

Well, it is a measure which is possible to apply and actually, I do not want to announce such a measure, but maybe it won't be long happening, but today already two thirds of the journeys are made with a mensual travelcard. It doesn't penalize the transfers, and make them possible. Nevertheless, it is not such an important subject. And obviously, if a new fare is created, which is today impossible as I said because of the magnetic band subject, since nothing more fits, and this is something anybody can understand. When the contactless cards will be introduced, and it obviously will be introduced, a lot of much more flexible fare will appear. But logically, if a new fare allowing transfers is created, its price is obviously not to be the same as the fare that doesn't allow transfers. We analyzed this demand. And there is obviously a part of the population that wants this kind of fare, and I am convinced that within a year or more, this fare and other kind of fares will be a certain fact.

Hans-Werner FRANZ

I think what we need for the future is a fully-integrated in the system, not only in the cities but also in the other areas, and we need it for the whole of Europe. You can go from one point to another in the entire region of Berlin-Brandenburg using just one ticket, and you can use all forms of public transport. We are trying to integrate all the Polish cities on the border into this system at the moment so that the passengers can travel on one ticket. What we are doing at the moment is developing a ticket for the route from Berlin from Russia; it is a common ticket enabling you to use all forms of public transport in Russia, to travel by train to Berlin and use all public transport there as well. We also have to develop our IT systems so that we can go from any point in Europe to any other point with just one ticket.

Bernard SIMON, General Manager, Transport Authority of Lyon, France

I have a question about financing, and an important point which was addressed by Sophie and to a greater extent by Steve. Operational costs are very important. We are going to increase all these networks and transport facilities, and so increase operational costs, so one of the topics I think is very important is how to decrease these costs, how to make savings. Steve, apparently one of your goals is to reduce costs. Can you give us some idea how you are going to do that?

Steve NEWSOME

I will give you two examples very briefly, one concerning the corporate level and one the Metro itself. I said that our Metro system is very old, 148 years old, and some of our signalling system dates from the 1920s. That of course is very expensive to maintain and repair when it goes wrong, so through the programme of line upgrades that we have, we estimate that by 2014-2015 the Metro system will actually break even on an operational level. Therefore, we have actually reduced costs by modernising the system and using up-to-date equipment which does not break down as much and when it does is less expensive to repair.

Secondly, on a corporate level, we have a huge programme of reducing cost in Transport for London. I said it was an integrated authority; it came together from 14 different organisations, and although we have been one family, if I can put it like that, for over ten years now, there is still a bit of legacy, a bit of duplication around the business, with different bits of marketing all over. What we want to do, and what Peter Hendy, the head of Transport for London, wants to do is strip out all of that duplication so it becomes a much more efficient organisation, and so we really focus on delivering what we call front line services, the things that passengers want.