

European Commission

Task 1.9 Urban Transport - Final Report

Report

August 2009

Prepared for:

European Commission
Directorate-General Energy and Transport
DM 28 - 0/110
Avenue du Bourget, 1
B-1049 Brussels (Evere)
Belgium

Prepared by:

Steer Davies Gleave
28-32 Upper Ground
London
SE1 9PD
+44 (0)207 910 5000
www.steerdaviesgleave.com

Contents

1	URBAN TRANSPORT	1
	Executive summary	1
	Introduction	1
	Summary of the policy	2
	Legislative framework	3
	Qualitative analysis	3
	Quantitative analysis	7
	Conclusions	11

TABLES

Table 1.1	Assessment of measures for urban mobility	3
Table 1.2	SWOT analysis – urban transport	6
Table 1.3	Urban transport indicators	8
Table 1.4	Financing of projects in urban transport	10

1 Urban Transport

Executive summary

- 1.1 Urban transport is a recently demarcated area of the Common Transport Policy (CTP), and as such is still in its early development. Furthermore, there is no legislation to have come out of the policy that can be described as distinctly within the field of urban transport. The result is that while the policy has been developed, it is only possible to evaluate its effectiveness over the few years since the publication of the 2001 White Paper when an urban transport policy was first enunciated, and moreover, only through the effectiveness of the so-called soft approaches, supporting collaborative projects and the sharing of best practice.

Introduction

- 1.2 The 2001 White Paper included a section on Urban Transport, with objectives in alternative fuels and promoting good practice. The section on alternative fuels has since been removed from the urban transport theme, and the promotion of good practice has been expanded upon in the Mid-Term Review.
- 1.3 In the 2006 Mid-Term Review the EU recognised that there was potential to act within the principle of subsidiarity in the field of urban transport. Specific objectives stated in this paper were:
- The EU can promote the study and exchange of best practice among Member States in areas such as transport infrastructure, norm-setting, congestion and traffic management, public transport services, infrastructure charging, urban planning, safety, security and cooperation with the surrounding regions.
 - The Commission will build on the experience gained in the CIVITAS Initiative, and on its thematic strategy on urban transport, and continue to promote research on urban mobility.
 - The EU achieved its first objective to publish a Green Paper on urban transport to test opinion on potential European added value to action at local level.
- 1.4 The Green paper set out the following objectives:
- Consultation with social groups like citizens living in towns or cities, users of urban transport (public or not), employers and employees in collective transport organisations; economic groups like businesses at local level, including SMEs, the urban transport industry, the car industry; national, regional and local authorities, stakeholders' representatives and associations in the relevant fields.
 - Adoption of an Action Plan for Urban Transport that had to indicate a time line for implementation and the allocation of responsibilities between the various actors.
 - Identification of specific areas to pursue: free-flowing towns and cities, greener towns and cities, smarter urban transport, accessible urban transport, safe and

secure urban transport, a new urban mobility culture, improving knowledge and data collection, financial resources.

Sources

- 1.5 This analysis has been undertaken primarily by evaluating the progress of the objectives in the area of urban transport contained within the 2006 Mid Term Review of the White Paper and the subsequent Green Paper on Urban Transport.
- 1.6 Interviews were carried out with the following organisations; Council of European Municipalities and Regions, Eurocities, and Polis.
- 1.7 Literature and publications from the following organisations and desktop resources have informed the analysis;
 - The Council of European Municipalities and Regions - <http://www.ccre.org/>
 - Eurocities - <http://www.eurocities.org/main.php>
 - The Civitas Initiative - <http://www.civitas-initiative.eu/main.phtml?lan=en>
 - Polis - <http://www.polis-online.org/>
 - Union International des Transports Publics - <http://www.uitp.org/>
 - European Platform on Mobility Management - <http://www.epommweb.org/>
 - International Road Transport Union - <http://www.iru.org/>
 - European Metropolitan Transport Authorities - <http://www.emta.com/>
 - European Transport Worker's Federation - <http://www.itfglobal.org/>

Structure for the remainder of the analysis

- 1.8 The analysis of the specific policy area is structured according to the following:
 - Summary of the policy;
 - Summary of the legislative framework;
 - Qualitative analysis;
 - Quantitative analysis;
 - Conclusions.

Summary of the policy

- 1.9 The CTP recognises that urban transport is the key battleground in a number of cross cutting policy areas; environmental, social cohesion, safety and security, and economic growth.
- 1.10 The Commission first proposed an urban mobility policy, the "Citizens' Network", in 1995. These proposals led to a "best practice" approach. Following this, the 2001 White Paper included further references to urban transport and the important role it plays in the life of the citizen. It was the Mid-term Review of the White Paper that really brought the concept of an urban mobility policy to the fore, the Commission's commitment to this area was underlined with the publication of the

Review of the Common Transport Policy

Green Paper "Towards a new culture for urban mobility" on 25 September 2007. This consultation document asked the question of what could be the potential role of the EU in a number of specific sub-policy areas: free-flowing and greener towns and cities, smarter urban mobility and urban transport which is accessible, safe and secure for all European citizens. Following this, the Commission is working towards the adoption of a future Action Plan on urban mobility, however concerns about subsidiarity have stalled this process. As a result the European Parliament has taken the momentum and published its own action plan on urban mobility, spearheaded by a few interested Members of the European Parliament.

Legislative framework

- 1.11 Transport is governed by Title V (Articles 70 to 80) of the Treaty establishing the European Community. Many of the directives and regulations affecting the field of urban transport however are not introduced with the primary aim of supporting a policy objective under the urban transport field. Whether in the fields of environment, employment, security, or competition - fields that are well established and accepted areas of competence for the European Union to legislate - there are a wealth of legislation that supports and furthers the CTP in the field of urban mobility.
- 1.12 Furthermore, the Treaty of Amsterdam, inscribing the commitment of the EU to sustainable development, provides a theoretical framework for policy and action in urban transport; however the concept primarily recognises the need for the EU to support local action.

Qualitative analysis

- 1.13 Owing to the lack of a legislative framework overtly intended to support action in the field of urban mobility, we focus here on the soft measures taken by the EU in pursuit of the objectives contained in the relevant sections of the 2006 Mid-Term white paper Review and the subsequent Green Paper on Urban Mobility.
- 1.14 Other aspects related to the environmental sustainability of urban transport such as the actions taken to improve local air quality or to promote the usage of clean vehicles have been dealt with in Task 1.8.

TABLE 1.1 ASSESSMENT OF MEASURES FOR URBAN MOBILITY

Measures contained within the Mid-Term review of the White Paper and in the Green Paper on Urban Mobility

Study and exchange of best practice	Some progress. Through the CIVITAS I and II initiatives, the Commission has funded a programme of transport improvements in a number of European cities since its inception in 2000. The actions have been clear and target-led, resulting in the achievement of objectives in the following areas; clean vehicles and fuels, integrated pricing strategies, a less car intensive lifestyle, soft measures, access restrictions, collective passenger transport, urban goods transport, and transport management.
-------------------------------------	---

Measures contained within the Mid-Term review of the White Paper and in the Green Paper on Urban Mobility

<p>Promotion of research and furthering experience</p>	<p>Some progress. The EU prioritised research in transport based on the work of "Technology Platforms" (TPs), ERTRAC for Road, being the most pertinent for urban mobility. Also, an FP6 project, the European Research Forum for Urban Mobility (EURFORUM) - delivered a "Strategic Research Agenda" (SRA) for urban mobility that established the priorities for urban mobility research.</p> <p>Within this field there are several broad areas for research, including; smart transport concepts, innovative demand management schemes, high-quality public transport and innovative strategies for clean urban transport.</p> <p>In total, €610 million was set aside for research of sustainable surface transport systems in the 6th Framework programme. Nevertheless it is not clear how much of this will be spent directly on urban transport projects.</p>
<p>Publication of Green Paper</p>	<p>Done. The Green Paper was introduced to induce debate about a common transport policy, specifically to bring in stakeholder perspectives to the debate about the key issues; free-flowing and greener towns and cities, smarter urban mobility and urban transport which is accessible, safe and secure for all European citizens.</p>
<p>Consultation</p>	<p>Done. Further to two conferences and four workshops held before the publication of the Green Paper, the Commission has consulted with stakeholders and civil society on each of the issues described below, and in each case has asked the question: 'What could be the potential role of the EU?' Over 400 responses were received and most favoured a more active involvement in urban transport policy by the Commission. The areas of involvement considered most appropriate generally refer to information gathering and sharing.</p>
<p>Publication of Action Plan</p>	<p>Not done. Following a delay to the publication of an Action Plan that was promised by the Commission in the wake of the Urban Transport Green Paper, the European Parliament will publish its own Action Plan.</p>

1.15 Hereafter, an assessment of the objectives contained in the Green Paper on Urban Mobility is provided:

- I Free-flowing towns and cities.** 100 billion Euros or 1% of the EU's GDP is said to be lost through congestion. There are no comprehensive surveys of congestion across the EU, however there is clear evidence that the market-based instruments of congestion charging in cities reduces the problem: within the London charging zone, peak traffic congestion, measured in terms of additional journey time relative to the time taken for a journey in uncongested conditions, was reduced by 21%; in Stockholm peak traffic entering the charging zone was reduced by 25%, which came along with a substantial reduction in congestion.
- I Greener towns and cities.** There are clear objectives from the Commission to look at the improvement of emission standards, and to a certain extent this has been done through the Euro emission standards. The Commission has also

Review of the Common Transport Policy

published a Communication on green procurement. The initiative is targeted at public bodies and provides details of best practice in green procurement, including within the area of transport. This is dealt with in more detail in Task 1.4. Traffic restrictions, green zones, and a European directive on noise mapping 2002/49/EC are further areas that the Green Paper suggests offer potential for development.

- **Smarter urban transport.** The Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS) Action Plan was published by the Commission on 16 December 2008, and takes into account the ITS aspects of the urban mobility policy. Key areas where the urban mobility policy crosses into ITS within this document are: Real Time Traffic and Travel Information Systems (under Improving transport efficiency), Improving road safety and security, and Continuity of traffic and freight management ITS services.
- **Accessible urban transport.** A cross-cutting and emerging area, accessibility plays to the strengths of a common transport policy in that the concept of accessible transport is universal and offers the CTP a field of action that will more clearly fall within the competences of the European Union. Passenger rights and the development of measures that ensure consistency of service quality in public transport are key areas of this section of the policy. These have been achieved so far in air passenger transport but are yet to be achieved in urban transport.
- **Safe and secure urban transport.** The key areas of coordination in the policy are also cross-cutting issues with other transport policies: notably safety and security is itself a policy area within the CTP. Within the policy area of safety and security, the Commission has been undertaking an investigation of the feasibility to extend security rules to urban transport. Other initiatives have taken place within the context of CIVITAS, for example the development of safe corridors for cycling in cities.
- **A new urban mobility culture.** The concept of a new urban mobility culture was established and developed by cities in their European associations. Improving knowledge and data collection are the two principle areas of concern mentioned in the Green Paper on Urban transport. However, promotion of a new urban mobility culture is also concerned with smarter choice and the travel decisions of the travelling public, and this is not clearly represented.
- **Financial resources.** From an overview of the budget, there appears to be a substantial growth in the ERDF funding of transport projects specifically for urban areas in the period 2007-13, when compared with the period from 2000-6 even when accounting for inflation, from €2 to 8 billion. This is under the DG Regio budget, however this excludes the allocation for the CIVITAS, programmes at €180 million, as well as money allocated for transport within the budget for urban regeneration. Furthermore, it is unclear to what extent the research funding will be allocated to urban transport.

SWOT analysis

1.16 Table 1.2 sets out a SWOT analysis relating to urban transport.

TABLE 1.2 SWOT ANALYSIS – URBAN TRANSPORT

<p>Strengths</p>	<p>The urban transport policy has the strength of being directed largely by inputs from stakeholders</p> <p>Most of the areas of intervention of the urban transport policy are linked to environmental protection, a field where the EU has a strong policy record.</p>
<p>Weaknesses</p>	<p>The urban transport policy has the strength of being directed largely by inputs from stakeholders, and as such is participative and less likely to encounter opposition at the level of implementation.</p> <p>By the same token, the areas of policy action that are generally accepted as part of urban transport policy, such as the drive towards a new mobility culture, are more difficult to measure as the results are based on norms of policy implementation at a local level.</p> <p>While neither of the above are strictly weaknesses of the policy, they do imply that the urban transport policy arena struggles to act as a normative overarching policy framework or ‘title’ under which action occurs.</p>
<p>Opportunities</p>	<p>There are further opportunities to encourage the sharing and dissemination of best practice. Support for the stakeholder associations, such as CEMR, Eurocities, and Polis has led to take-up and spreading of best practice among the larger cities, however the smaller cities that lack the budget and possibly, English speaking staff, struggle to assimilate and benefit from the experience. Targeted funding for developing the knowledge and skills of local transport officials with the support of elected city officials is likely to lead to a more widespread take-up of new initiatives in urban mobility.</p>
<p>Threats</p>	<p>There is a threat from the MS level of governance to the achievement of the policy objectives, as the common urban transport policy must account for the varying MS priorities for urban transport. While there is often agreement among cities on the benefits of market based instruments for reducing demand and other high impact policy tools such as these, the agreement among MS is not necessarily so strong.</p> <p>The Commission must also understand that every city is different so specifying too rigidly can prevent real sustainable mobility sometimes as the city will not have bought into the idea. It is critical that the spirit of each city is at the heart of each drive to improve urban mobility, and it would be useful to undertake some research on the differences between cities and how they might best respond individually to different stimuli.</p>

Results

- 1.17 The urban transport policy has led to results in distinct areas of work:
- Creation of links between cities and among stakeholders, and normalisation of the attitude to betterment of urban transport. The creation of the shared stage and open development of sustainable transport goals has allowed the policy makers at local level to gain support from European colleagues to break from the car culture that has predominated to date. Without the forums created through the urban transport policy, responsible persons at cities across Europe would not have the moral support from their European peers for implementing initiatives and sharing best practice.
 - The CIVITAS, initiative, especially, has led to the quicker take up of successful policy ideas, giving the development of urban transport policy the feel of a more liberal market in ideas, where local officials are not limited by the knowledge and norms of their own transport planning institutions.
 - The research programmes are more difficult to assess in the context of results as many of the programmes are long term and research into technology can take many years before the results are visible in practice. In addition, there are achievements worth mentioning such as those shown by CUTE, which allowed the introduction of hydrogen-powered public transportation in 9 EU cities.
 - The urban transport aspect of the common policy is limited in the instruments at its disposal since much of the work falls to the local authorities in the context of hard (especially legislative) policy options. The harmonisation of legislation across Europe at city level could be encouraged further, however there are significant barriers to do so, especially in the context of policy actions such as the introduction of infrastructure pricing.

Quantitative analysis

- 1.18 The quantitative analysis of the urban section of the common transport policy is difficult to measure at the macro level, however there are some good quantitative results displayed in the projecting reporting of the CIVITAS, initiative. These, though are solely for individual projects and therefore do not allow an overview of the effectiveness of the common transport policy as a whole. So while there is no benefit to citing the results from individual cities, it is worth noting that the focus on targets or objectives within the CIVITAS, framework has led to measurable achievement. Increase in journey speeds along SMILE routes, increase in the use of biodiesel, developments in road pricing, are all measurable achievements that can be cited and fall within the context of urban transport policy, however have not yet been collated into a useable database of results that would allow quantitative analysis at the macro European level.

Analysis

- 1.19 Using the Urban Audit¹ data compiled by DG Regio, it has been possible to look at some indicators of the success of the common transport policy on urban transport;

however these data currently only run every four years, the last for which data is currently available was 2004. Also these data do not give us an indication of the entirety of the European cities, and as such, are likely to include only those cities that are particularly interested in obtaining the statistics. This may be due to the city measuring the results of a specific policy, and in which case, the results may not be representative of the rest of the European cities.

TABLE 1.3 URBAN TRANSPORT INDICATORS

	2001	2004	Up or down
% of journeys to work by private car	53.54	52.84	↓
% of journeys to work by public transport	26.59	26.18	↓

Source: Eurostat

- 1.20 When the data is disaggregated, there are some clear differences between countries. Germany, has on the whole, reduced private car use substantially, whereas the countries that joined the EU more recently have tended to see an increase in private car use of this period. However Germany has also generally started from a higher percentage of car use. There is also virtually no data for major countries like France and the UK provided to the Urban Audit.
- 1.21 While it is difficult to make assumptions about this data in evaluating the common transport policy, we can clearly see that there is a huge gap between the implementation of common urban transport policy objectives of leading countries like Germany and Sweden, against other countries.
- 1.22 Much academic research² has been undertaken on the implementation gap between policy and practice across different countries, and such data bears out their analysis that common transport policy objectives are being achieved in states that also lead the development of the objectives. Both Sweden and Germany are key proponents of environmental policy in the European Union, including urban transport policy, this may not though be an appropriate model for countries and urban areas whose economies are undergoing different cycles of development.

The Green Paper on Urban Transport³

- 1.23 The Green paper on Urban Transport was supported by a preparatory report that included quantitative data to illustrate the state of urban transport. This is discussed in more detail below, however since there has not been an update to this data, it should be recognised that its inclusion here is predominantly to highlight the potential measures that could be used to evaluate the efficacy of the common transport policy in the field of urban transport.

² For example, see Tanya A. Börzel, *Environmental Leaders and Laggards in Europe: Why There is (not) a Southern Problem: Why There Is (Not) a Southern Problem*, Ashgate, 2003

³ Report on Urban Transport in Europe, report prepared for DG TREN, 2007

Review of the Common Transport Policy

- Transport Growth and GDP growth has been cited as a key indicator, and indeed a principal target often cited is the ‘decoupling of transport growth from economic growth’. This is not a particularly useful indicator for urban transport as it is very difficult to disaggregate the data to surface transport within urban areas. Aviation growth is included, and as a result, it is difficult to measure the rise in strictly urban transport growth against economic growth.
 - It has been shown in the report that tram and metro growth has been as high as passenger car growth over the ten years from 1995-2004, however the modal split has actually gone down slightly, indicating that the rise is more a symptom of increasing urbanisation and density of population.
 - The biofuel target which was set by the EU of 2% of fuel usage to be attained by 2010, is well advanced and looks set to be met. However, the recent debates about the impact of biofuel subsidies on the price of staple foodstuffs and the appropriation of land have brought the methods into question. In the UK, for example, a report was published in 2008 that recommended a more cautious approach⁴.
 - CO2 emissions from urban transport have decreased in the period 1990-2004 in a study of several major European cities; including London, Berlin, and Brussels. This is a dramatic achievement but has been largely achieved through the performance of cleaner vehicles.
 - In 2006, in a selection of Member States (19 countries) 37.3% of road fatalities occurred in urban area, 54.2% on national or local roads outside urban areas, 6.2% on motorways⁵.
 - There are further indicators including disaggregated modal share by a number of cities, levels of urban sprawl, level of investment in infrastructure and services, cost of transport to public, and employment in urban transport.
- 1.24 All of these indicators will provide a useful benchmark for a future sample and so should be considered as the first stage in the quantitative monitoring of the success of urban transport within the common transport policy.

Finance of urban transport as a measure

- 1.25 The following table shows that the headline ERDF / Cohesion Policy funding specifically for urban transport has been substantially increased and gives some evidence of the commitment to the development of this area, wherein the common transport policy in urban transport can be most effective.

⁴ The Gallagher Review on Biofuels, Department for Transport, 2008

⁵ SafetyNet, Building the European Road Safety Observatory, Annual Statistical Report 2008.

TABLE 1.4 FINANCING OF PROJECTS IN URBAN TRANSPORT

Project	Value	Field of funding	Project Description	Period
ERDF / Cohesion fund	€ 8 billion	Urban transport	Urban transport infrastructure and major projects	2007-13
ERDF / Cohesion fund	€ 2 billion	Urban transport	Urban transport infrastructure and major projects	2000-6
CIVITAS	€180m	Urban transport	The key urban transport funding vehicle for city cooperation across Europe	Originally 200-2008, however spin-offs still ongoing
ELTIS	Unknown	Urban transport	Urban transport information portal for local transport officials	1998-Ongoing
'Urban' programmes	€400m+	Urban regeneration	Can include transport regeneration as part of wider strategy of urban regeneration	Ongoing
Call for proposals DG TREN/SUB/01-2008	€5.4m	road safety	Can be focused on urban transport, and specifically on the relevant Commission objectives	Current
Call for proposals TREN/SUB 02-2008	€5m	urban transport	Focussed on the objectives of the Green paper on urban transport	Current

Source: Europa

Conclusions

The overall impact of the policy

- 1.26 Since the concept of an urban transport policy has not been concretely established as a legitimate area of policy competence for the European Union, it is very difficult to assess its impact. Any assessment of the policy must take account of the work that was previously done but not under an 'urban transport policy' umbrella. The main achievement of the policy has been greater coordination among cities across Europe, and this has led to a quicker dispersion of urban mobility best practice across the Union.
- 1.27 The policy has also led to a greater level of acceptability of new concepts in transport planning and policy, which in turn has sped up the achievement of specific goals and targets in improving mobility for the citizenry.

Contemporary developments

- The Action plan on urban mobility and current initiatives of the Parliament (a draft action plan presented on 21 January) have moved the agenda forward substantially from the impasse in the latter half of 2008. Actions suggested include; improvement of the data collection, the development of CIVITAS III, and other further community funded incentives for development of urban mobility, and finally a recognition of the economic importance of urban transport in the context of the Lisbon strategy and economic recovery plan.
- The EU's Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7) for 2007-2013, includes, under the theme "transport", an activity area on "ensuring sustainable urban mobility" with an allocation of €4,160 million. FP7 is planned to heavily support ITS application research. Also, the Intelligent Energy Europe (IEE) Programme, financed through the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP), includes the ALTENER and STEER sub-programmes provide a platform for research on energy efficient and renewable energy use in transport.
- The Covenant of Mayors brings together over 100 cities across Europe, in a commitment to reduce CO₂ emissions in their urban areas by 20% by 2020. This target will need to be addressed through a mixture of energy and transport related CO₂ reduction targets. The work is still in an early phase, with most support coming from other cities and regions that have signed up to the covenant. These actions are supported by grants and loans from the European Investment Bank.

Lessons learnt and going forward

- 1.28 There needs to be a clarification of the positions held by the various levels of governance with respect to the principle of subsidiarity and the work of the Commission in developing a common policy on urban transport. The specific urban transport objectives and areas of work need to be discussed in this context, and agreement reached about whether they fall within the competence of the European Union. In this way, it will be possible to develop a common urban transport policy that has the support of all levels of governance rather than the stalemate over the action plan at the moment. It is telling that even the European representations of city level governance do not go into detail with respect to the principle in terms of

Review of the Common Transport Policy

the areas of Commission competence. This may be due to the levels of support that is received by these bodies for their work in urban transport projects such as CIVITAS.

- 1.29 It may be useful to hold a colloquium bringing together representatives of the different levels of governance, city and national to discuss and decide on an action plan with the Commission in an open forum. The Parliament action Plan should, however, be taken forward and delivered by all partners.
- 1.30 The Parliament Action Plan recognises the need to go beyond modal change policies to include a package of measures targeted at the way people consider their travel habits, the so-called smarter choices. A UK Government review of international experience of these measures demonstrated that they can in combination can deliver reductions in peak period urban traffic of about 21% and nationwide reductions in all traffic of about 11%.
- 1.31 There is a need to better coordinate transport policy with other areas like spatial planning (as part of broader EU environmental policy). While the design of city transport infrastructure should be unique to the personality of the city, there is much to be learned from best practice (and mistakes) from previous projects across Europe. This is especially relevant within the context of major investments of the Cohesion Policy and ERDF.
- 1.32 The recognition of the importance that successful urban policies play in the success of the economy at large should be taken forward beyond what is mentioned in the Parliament Action Plan.
- 1.33 As mentioned above, further research should be conducted on the nature of individual cities. At present, there is an indication from quantitative data that some cities are more successful at improving urban mobility than others, e.g Scandinavian and German cities. Perhaps this is because the norm of projects is outside the true spirit of the other cities that are not performing as well. It must be recognised that a variety of measures and modes are necessary to build a stable platform for sustainable mobility.

CONTROL SHEET

Project/Proposal Name	Evaluation of the Common Transport Policy (CTP) of the EU from 2000 to 2008 and analysis of the evolution and structure of the European transport sector in the context of the long-term of the CTP
Document Title	Task 1.9 Urban Transport - Final Report
Client Contract/Project No.	TREN/A2/143-2007/S07