Evaluering av alternativ forvaltningsorganisering i norske byområder

Oppsummering av internasjonale erfaringer med alternative finansieringsordninger

Version 14 April 2008

Eduard Röntgen
Didier van deVelde

Sammendrag 3
1.1.1 Frankrike 3
1.1.2 Tyskland 4
1.1.3 Milano i Nord-Italia 5
2 Frankrike 8
2.1 Stakeholders and legislation 9
2.2 Public transport production 9
2.3 Generation of intermunicipal cooperation by fiscal incentives 10
2.3.1 Creation of urban transport areas and introduction of the transport tax 10
2.3.2 Forms of intermunicipal cooperation in the (public) transport field 10
2.3.3 Functioning of the new forms of cooperation 12
2.4 Urban Transport Plans 13
2.4.1 Legal background and aims 13
2.4.2 Some impacts of the PDUs 14
2.5 Conclusions 15
References 15
3 Nederland 16
3.1 Stakeholders and legislation 16
3.2 Finances 17
3.3 Comparison of ingredients 19
4 Tyskland 21
4.1 Organization 21
4.1.1 Administrative structure 21
4.1.2 Spatial- and transport planning 21
4.1.3 Today's issue 23
4.2 Public-transport minded cities 24
4.2.1 Karlsruhe 24
4.2.2 Integration of transport and spatial planning 24
References 26
5 Italia 27
5.1 State organization 27
5.2 Milan 28
5.2.1 Health, environment and sustainable development plan 28
5.2.2 Ecopass 29
5.2.3 Actors responsible for Public Transport 30
References 31
6 Storbritannia 32
6.1 Local government set-up 32
6.2 Actual issues 33
White paper 33
Lyons inquiry 34
6.3 PTA's/PTE's 35
References: 36
6.3 PTA's/PTE's 35
References: 36

Sammendrag

Innenfor evalueringen har vi også sett på noen internasjonale erfaringer som kan være av interesse for de norske forvaltningsforsøkene. Dette er alternative former for organisering og finansiering av transportsektoren fra statlig til lokalt nivå som på ulike måter kan ha overføringsverdi til transportforsøket. Det har ikke vært noe mål å evaluere eller vurdere overførbarheten av disse forsøkene. I første omgang er det kun ment som et innspill til diskusjon rundt alternative grep som kan supplere diskusjonen om en evt videreføring eller justering av forvaltningsorganiseringen i norske byområder. Det er Didier van deVelde og Eduard Røntgen fra Inno-V som har forfattet denne rapporten. Den er ikke skrevet med henblikk på å trekke trådene mot de norske transportforsøkene. Vi har derfor valgt å lage dette som en separat vedleggsrapport på engelsk med et norsk sammendrag. Koplingen mot de norske forsøkene blir skrevet inn i hovedrapporten.

Denne vedleggsrapporten gir en oversikt over fem ulike forvaltningsmodeller for transport i by:

- *Frankrike* som har en spesiell transportskatt og insentiver for å stimulere til interkommunalt samarbeid mellom tilgrensende bykommuner. I Frankrike har de innført en transportskatt
- *Nederland* som har endret de statlige finansieringsordningene fra øremerkede overføringer til større frihet for lokale myndigheter til å omdisponere innenfor budsjettrammene.
- *Tyskland* som har en organisering i transportforbund for å koordinere den lokale transportpolitikken og konkrete erfaringer fra organiseringen i Karlsruhe og Nordrhein-Westfallen.
- *Italia* som har en veldig sterk lokal styringsform med stor grad av uavhengighet mellom regionene. Vi har presentert erfaringene fra Milano hvor det innenfor et interregionalt samarbeid er innført vegprising kombinert med forbedringer i kollektivtilbudet.
- *Storbritannia* som har utviklet en ny styringsmodell for å redusere antall forvaltningsnivåer.

Erfaringene fra Frankrike er av størst interesse for forvaltningsforsøket, både fordi ordningen har eksistert over en lengre periode og fordi det er foretatt en evalueringen av ordningen. I tillegg er erfaringene fra Nordrhein-Westfallen i Tyskland og Milano av spesiell interesse. Vi vil derfor presentere disse mer utfyllende.

Frankrike

Frankrike som har en spesiell transportskatt og insentiver for å stimulere til interkommunalt samarbeid mellom tilgrensende bykommuner. Noe av bakgrunnen for denne organiseringen er de mange små kommunene i Frankrike som i gjennomsnitt er på under 2000 innbyggere. Innenfor en byregion er det derfor behov for et utstrakt samarbeid for å utvikle et enhetlig og samordnet transporttilbud. For å stimulere til interkommunalts samarbeid er det gjennom fransk lov gitt mulighet til å etablere et transportorgan som også kan kreve inn skatter og ha ansvar for parkeringspolitikk med mer.

Transportskatten kan ilegges bedrifter over 9 ansatte og er begrunnet ut fra det kollektiv-tilbudet som må utvikles for å dekke deres arbeidsreiser. Ansatte som bor på arbeidsplassen eller bedrifter som har ordnet egen transport kan slippe å betale en slik skatt. Det er også i den siste tiden blitt åpnet for en viss differensiering av skattesatsen for de bedriftene som har relativt dårlig kollektivtilbud. Skattesatsen avhenger av størrelsen på regionen og om de utvikler et bussbasert eller skinnegående transportsystem.

Det er en nedre grense for hvor ”små” regioner som kan ilegge en slik transportskatt. Og det må være en etablert transportmyndighet som krever inn skatten. I utgangspunktet var det et krav at regionen skulle være på minst 300.000 innbyggere. Etter 1974 ble kravet redusert til 100.000 innbyggere og i dag er det på 30.000 innbyggere. Det er totalt 124 transport-myndigheter av denne typen i Frankrike.

Ansvarsområdet var opprinnelig den lokale kollektivtransporten innenfor regionen, men det er også noen myndigheter som har ansvar for flere områder. Den viktigste endringen og utvidelsen skjedde i 1999 hvor ansvarsområdet ble utvidet og hvor det ble lagt til ytterligere statlige insentiver for å få til et samarbeid:

- For det første ble det skilt mellom tre ulike nivåer på disse transportmyndighetene etter størrelse på byregionen.
- Ansvarsområdet for disse byregionene avhenger av hvilken gruppe (størrelse) de er innenfor og det kan utvides til også å gjelde vei og parkeringspolitikk hvis de lokale myndigheter ønsker dette.
- Det ble lagt til et ytterligere statlig insentiv utover bedriftsskatten på 30 til 80 $/innbygger for de som etablerer slike transportorgan.

Denne lovendringen 10-doblet antall interkommunale transportorganer fra 1999 til 2006 slik at 85 prosent av befolkningen i Frankrike nå bor innenfor en region med slik transportmyndighet. Det førte også til at transportregionene økte i utstrekning fordi det ble veldig økonomisk gunstig for de lokale myndigheter. Evalueringen i etterkant fra CERTU antyder at det har vært en ”overkompensasjon” for å stimulere til denne utvidelsen og at sammenslåingene i større grad har vært finansielt betinget enn ut fra hva som er en hensikts-messig byregion.

Ved utvidelsen av disse transportorganene var det også behov for mange overgangsordninger pga eksisterende kontrakter. Det var også behov for å reorganisere kollektivtilbudet for å få et mer integrert tilbud for de nye regionene, både når det gjelder takster og rutetilbud. Dette har også stilt transportmyndighetene overfor nye utfordringer når det gjelder kontrakter og konkurranseutsetting av tilbudet.

Kollektivtilbudet er i all hovedsak konkurranseutsatt etter en spesiell fransk modell. Dette innebærer at transportmyndigheten eier transportmidlene mv og har ansvar for de ansatte mens det er administrasjonen som konkurranseutsettes. I de fleste tilfellene er dette konkurranseutsatt til en operatør, men utvidelsen av antall transportmyndigheter har også ført til noen eksempler med flere operatører innenfor et område. Dette er imidlertid mer uvanlig.

Tyskland

Tyskland består av 16 delstater (Bundesländer) med stort ansvar. I tillegg er Tyskland delt opp i 3 byregioner (Hamburg, Berlin og Bremen), ca 400 distrikter og 12.000 kommuner. På transportområdet er det etablert 50 ulike transportforbund som har ansvar for planlegging,

koordinering og konkurranseutsetting av kollektivtransporten, inklusiv regional jernbane. I tillegg er det etablert Takstforbund for å sikre et mer integrert takstsamarbeid innenfor et større område.

En av utfordringene på transportområdet er at mange naturlige byregioner overlapper de lokale administrative ansvarsområdene. F. eks vil bosatte i Frankfurt-regionen omfatte flere delstater og flere av delstatene er enten for små eller for store til å dekke en funksjonell enhet. Og i de tre byregionene dekker ansvarsområdet for transportforbundene utover byregionenes grenser. For å møte denne utfordringen ble det i 1995 etablert 6 større byregioner som i større grad dekker den funksjonelle byregionen, med et frivillig samarbeid mellom de ulike myndighetsnivåene i regionen.

Nordrhein-Westfallen er i folketall den største delstaten med 18 mill innbyggere. De har etablert en interessant insentiv-ordning for å stimulere til boligbygging rundt kollektiv-knutepunkter. Ordningen ble etablert i 1998 og ga støtte til sosial boligbygging for utleieboliger hvis de lå innenfor en radius av 1000 meter fra nærmeste jernbanestasjon. I tillegg ble det gitt støtte til byer som satset på fortetting, med minst 150 boliger nær jernbanestasjoner (1000 m) eller 500 m fra trikk eller forstadsbane. 130 byer/tettsteder har byggeplaner innenfor denne støtteordningen.

Milano i Nord-Italia

Italia har også svært sterke lokale myndigheter. Landet er delt inn i 20 regioner hvorav 5 har utvidet lokalt ansvar. Innenfor dette prosjektet vil vi fokusere på erfaringene fra Milano. Byen har 1,4 millioner innbyggere og regionen har ca 7 mill innbyggere. I denne byen ble det i 2007 vedtatt en plan for transport og miljø i byregionen som inkluderer:

1. Forbedre kollektivtilbudet i form av to nye forstadsbaner, innfartsparkering, økt frekvens og flere kollektivfelt,
2. Stimulere til grønn energi for boligoppvarming og planting av 500.000 trær i byen
3. Restriksjoner på biltrafikken, i form av en miljøavgift hvor avgiften varierer avhengig av hvor store utslipp bilene har. I tillegg satses det på bildeling, økte parkeringsavgifter og færre parkeringsplasser i sentrum.
4. Utvikle sykkelveinettet med bygging av 50 km nye sykkelveger og oppgradering av 67 km med eksisterende sykkelveger.

Den store utfordringen var å få de ulike myndighetene i byregionen til å samarbeide om en så stor plan og det er første gang i Italia at dette har vært vellykket i en så stor skala. Den økonomiske rammen for denne planen er på ca 1300 kr/innbygger over en 3-årsperiode. Miljøpasset er den andre viktige lærdommen fra dette forsøket. Det er en av de første eksemplene med vegprising i Europa, etter London og Stockholm, og de betaler mellom 2 og 10 Euro for å kjøre inn i byen. Ordningen startet 2 januar 2008 og avgiften gjelder mellom kl 7 og 19 på hverdager. Avgiften øker avhengig av utslippsnivå og biler med høyeste utslipp (euro-0) slipper ikke inn i byen i denne perioden.

Målsetting med miljøavgiften var å redusere utslipp fra vegtrafikken med 30 prosent i bysentrum, øke framkommeligheten i sentrum ved å redusere biltrafikken med 10 prosent og å stimulere til økt kollektivtransport. Det er grunn til å understreke at selv den laveste avgiften er høyere enn snittet for norske bompengeordninger, og den høyeste avgiften er høyere enn det som må betales i Stockholm.

Abstract

This document presents a brief overview of the some of the main features of the countries and cases reviewed for the purpose of this research.
We cover here experiences from:

- France
- Germany
- The Netherlands
- Italy
- Great-Britain

France

France counts four layers of organisation, that are not strictly speaking hierarchically organised. A particularity of the French internal organisation is that municipalities have a very small size. This, in its turn, generates a strong need for intermunicipal cooperation.

The French transport tax ("Versement Transport" or VT) is certainly a main point in any presentation of the French public transport landscape. What is particularly interesting is that the possibility to levy this tax was used, more or less consciously, as an instrument to generate intermunicipal cooperation. This was achieved by a gradual lowering of the threshold of the authority size required to be allowed to levy this tax benefiting public transport systems. Whereas only large cities could benefit from it originally, the threshold has gradually been lowered to 20.000 inhabitants.

Intermunicipal cooperation in France covers many issues. We concentrate on transport matters here and observer a strong tendency to stick to public transport. Other policy issues should or could have been integrated as well, but we must observe that that is not always realised for several reasons.

The cooperation forms themselves are quite numerous and have been transformed in the course of the last thirty years, trying to generate more policy integration. This has not always been successful and depends very much on local (political) circumstances.

Another main feature of transport policy in France is the obligation for larger urban areas to establish urban transport plans, integrating various policy topics related to transport. Whereas this was a rather loose idea twenty years ago, it gradually became a more and more compulsory requirement for authorities, due to successive legislative measures. The more recent changes also require more involvement by the other layers of regional authorities, and it adds new financial incentives for further cooperation. One of points being stimulated in the transfer of parking policy from the municipalities to the cooperation concerned.

Even though these plans are now well-established, further analysis in France showed that politicians remain reluctant to set clear targets, especially on car traffic. Yet other measures in transport policy (other modes) seem to be more successful.

Germany

The internal structure of Germany is based upon a federal model and authority areas that are in general rather large. Nevertheless, the necessity for cooperation can be observed. The most interesting examples are probably the cooperation form observed in the provision of public transport. This is organised in almost the whole country through a regime commonly known as “Verkehrsverbund”. Although these organizations have a wide diversity of organizational forms, they can broadly speaking be distinguished into the two- and three-level organizations. The intermediate level being the transport planner, taking care for a cooperation of authorities of various levels of public transport coordination and planning, with an integrated tariff and timetable.

On wider issues, various experiences, such a that of Nordrhein-Westfalen are interesting. In this Land, a better coordination of some land-use planning (housing) and public transport was realized through new forms of (informal) cooperation, involving the creation of a “Forum” between involved actors.

Netherlands

The Netherlands are organised according to a three-tier government system. Yet the provincial level is not always considered adequate to solve all urban problems related to transport.

Long-standing discussion exist pertaining to the establishment of new forms of Urban Government. These never succeeded until the rather recent creation of the ´Stadsregio’s”, being cooperations between province and municipalities. This was first organised in the form of an experimental model, before being fully officialised in legislation. These new authorities have taken over the competences for public transport and other transport matters.

Related to this is the interesting experience of the bundling of all transport-related transfer from the State to the provinces and Stadsregio’s. It is important to note that the Netherlands have only few local forms of taxation. Consequently, most money comes from transfers from central government to regional authorities.

The bundling of transfers meant that these authorities are now allowed to re-allocate the budgets they receive according to their own preferences, forasmuch as it is still spent on the topics for which some of the transfers were given.

Unfortunately, it is still to early to evaluate the results. An official evaluation is planned for 2010.

Italy

The Italian state organisation is not federal, although some developments and features tend to move in the direction. We have been looking at the case of Milano, as a recent interesting case of how more integration in transport policy can be realised. An important feature in the understanding of that case is the particular position and image of the mayor of the city, who has put a lot of effort in this endeavour.

The resulting Milan master-plan aims at integrated measures ‘to improve quality of life’ with concrete measures related to mobility. It also includes environmental measures (the ‘ecopass’ system presented hereafter but also measures pertaining to individual heating and even more trees), besides more traditional transport themes such as: parking policy, more bicycle tracks, stimulation of shared car systems, more public transport.

This was made possible by an informal, new way of cooperation between central and local governments, under the initiative of the mayor. With this “Tavolo Milano”, it is said that it allowed the creation of common budget (various authority levels) at a scale unprecendented.

The “Ecopass” is one of the very interesting measures resulting from this. It consists of large-scale automatic toll-system, functioning only for the city core and inspired by London and Stockholm. Only polluting vehicles are charged between 7:30 and 19:30, Monday to Friday. Effects on traffic could be observed, with a shift in freight traffic towards less polluting vehicles and more usage of PT.

UK

The set-up of local government in Britain is confusing compared to other European countries. For many years, attempts and concrete measures were developed to simplify some of the regime with the creation of ‘single-tier’ local governments (unitary councils) in the 1990s.

This is currently being brought forward with a call for more “Unitary Councils” in order to realize more efficiency and savings in administrative costs. Five new ones will have been created by the election of 2009.

Further inquiries and new legislation has also recently been developed to foster more flexible forms of cooperation, including a possible taxation reform and reforming the incentives given by central grants from government to local authorities.

In the public transport sector, this is now accompanied by a legal reform aiming at reforming the PTA’s (passenger transport authorities), integrating them into Integrated Transport Authorities, including extended powers and reducing the involvement of various authorities.

1 Frankrike

One main particularity of the French territorial administration is the huge number of municipalities that exist in the country (about 36.000 for a total population of less than 62 million inhabitants). As a result, the average size of a municipality is very small (about 1700 inhabitants). Consequently, most policy issues tend to be cross-border issues where several municipalities are involved.

This necessitates the creation of intermunicipal structures to tackle those problems. One of the main issues at stake is passenger transport. The past decades have seen in France the creation of various 'waves' of intermunicipal cooperation, on the basis of particular financial incentives related to a specific local transport tax.

This will be the main focus of this case study. The following text will present the main actors and the elements that generated a growing cooperation between the parties involved.

1.1 Stakeholders and legislation

These are the main stakeholders and their responsibilities on public transport:

Stakeholder	Responsibility
Etat (state) Ministry of Transport	• Responsible for national rail services
Régions	• Responsible for regional rail services.
Départements	• Responsible for public transport services (buses) in the Département, except where a PTU has been defined.
Urban transport authorities	• Responsible for urban public transport services (bus, tram, metro) in the area of the organizing authority (AO) for uran transport. This is defined by a Périmètre de transports urbains (PTU), or urban transport area, which is a contiguous urbanised area. • This authority (AO) is a municipality, or an intermunicipal cooperation competent for public transport or for several policy matters. It can also be a mixed authority, being a cooperation between e.g. municipalities and a Département.

1.2 Public transport production

Public transport in France is in general operated under contract after competitive tendering. However, the general legal situation regulates that a transport authority produces the services itself, unless a specific decision has been taken to delegate this public prerogative to a third party. In such case, a competitive tendering procedure including a specific negotiated procedure has to be followed.

In general urban passenger transport services (more than 100 networks across France) are tendered to one operator, who is also partly responsible for service development within a rather strict contractual framework. In effect, the authority remains in charge of defining services and agreeing on modifications as suggested by the operator.
Most contracts tend to incentivise operators to reduce costs and increase demand. A wide variety of contracts are used.

In general the urban transport authority remain the owner of the rolling stock and all public transport installations. In effect, only the management of the network is tendered to operators. They take over all personnel and a going concern.

The Paris region is still organised according to a different legislation. Competitive tendering is not used here and the market is dominated by the RATP (Paris public transport company) and SNCF (French national railways).

Non-urban public transport is usually also submitted to competition. Contrary to the urban case, this usually takes the form of route or sub-network contracts. Here operators are more often the owner of the vehicles.

1.3 Generation of intermunicipal cooperation by fiscal incentives

Due the small size of French municipalities, urban public transport almost always covers the territory of several authorities. As a consequence of this, the actual urban agglomeration does not always correspond to the territory of the urban transport authority and to the actual extent of the public transport network.

1.3.1 Creation of urban transport areas and introduction of the transport tax

The French law defined in 1974 the concept of "Périmètre de transports urbains" (Urban Transport Perimetre), defining the territory of competence of the transport authority at the urban level (either a municipality or an intermunicipal cooperation). However, until the 1970s only few intermunicipal cooperations existed in France as far as urban public transport is concerned.

In 1971 a specific transport tax "Versement transport – VT" is created:

- This was initially only valid in the Paris region.
- This taxation is levied on the businesses located in the area of the transport authority, for as much as they count more than 9 employees.
- The companies can escape from paying this taxation if they can prove that their employees either live at the company site or that they have organised their transport from home to work by specific means.

The LOTI (Loi d'Orientation des Transports Intérieurs), which is the French transport law of 1982, continues on this principle. Under this law, without the creation of a PTU, it is the Département who is responsible for all public transport, also in the urban areas. However, a municipal or an intermunicipal cooperation can create a PTU and ask the Département to delegate the public transport competence within that area to themselves. The incentive to do so is that this entitles the municipality or its cooperation to levy the transport tax (VT).

A very interesting feature of the implementation of the French transport tax is its incentative character in creating intermunicipal cooperation:

- Originally the VT could only be levied in the territory of transport authorities counting more that 300.000 inhabitants (since 1973 also outside Paris).
- In 1974 this was lowered to 100.000 inhabitant, generating a movement towards intermunicipal cooperation and the creating of transport authorities in the areas that could fulfil this criterium. 44 authorities are created according to this mechanism until 1982. The extension of the cities and the public transport networks are direct drivers of this.
- Since 1982, the threshold level for the VT is lowered to 30.000 inhabitants. This led to the creation of 80 new transport authorities.

1.3.2 Forms of intermunicipal cooperation in the (public) transport field

Intermunicipal cooperation in France can have many different setups, having only one field of competence (Syndicat intercommunal à vocation unique – SIVU), e.g. public transport, or combining several of them (Syndicat Intercommunal à vocation multiple – SIVOM). Most of

cooperations have the character of a SIVU, as an authority with public transport organisation as sole competence.

It is only after 1992 that a movement towards the integration of various transport policies (i.e. not only public transport) started to develop when a law created new possibilities for cooperations (Loi Joxe, 1992), with “communities of municipalies” and “communities of cities” as new possibilities besides the pre-existing Syndicats, Districts and Communauté Urbaine. At the same time, the threshold level to levy the transport tax was lowered to 20.000 inhabitants. This new law also indicated which policy topics had to be transferred to the cooperation and which could remain at the level of the participating municipalities. Interestingly, public transport is not a compulsory competence. Actually, the SIVUs appear to remain rather attractive.

The transport law of 1982 (LOTI) had already created the concept of Urban Transport Plan (Plan de Déplacements Urbains – PDU; more on this later in this text), but with little practical impact. In 1996 the LAURE law promoted the idea once more. The main aim was to encourage the inclusion of public transport policy in a wider range of transport policy issues, in order to generate a more integrated policy approach, including transport and land-use issues. However, as concludes by Certu (2007), all of this did not succeed in generating more integrated organisational conditions for public transport. Public transport continued to be organised as a separate institutional arrangement.

A law enacted in 1999 (Law on the reinforcement and simplification of intermunicipal cooperation - Chevènement Act) aims at reinforcing and simplifying intermunicipal cooperation in France:

- The principle remained to be a cooperation at the initiative of municipalities. Three forms are (re)created: “community of municipalities”, “community of agglomeration” (more than 50.000 inhabitants with a central municipality of at least 15.000 inhabitants) and “urban community” (more than 500.000 inhabitants; this level already existed and was only amended), all depending on the population size.
- Contrary to former forms of cooperation, some topics are now part of the field of competencies of these authorities on a compulsory basis, such as public transport. This can be extended to road management, but also to parking management when the participaring municipalities decide to do so.
- Financial incentives are added to generate this cooperation. Various budget bonuses (transfers from the state to the authority) are given (30 to 80 $/inhabitant in addition to the general transfers). Also new taxation sources are granted to those who cooperate (taxe professionnelle unique). The larger ones have to use the Taxe Professionnelle Unique (unitary professional tax), while the other may only do so. This generated a huge increase of this form of cooperation.

This law led by 2006 to ten times (!) as many intermunicipal cooperations using the TPU (professional tax) as in 1999. This means that in effect about 85% of the French population is now located within such a cooperation.
Consequently, with this law, the many cooperations are equipped with all necessary instruments for the realization of an integrated policy:

- Public transport, infrastructure management and parking,
- And also all planning competencies related to those matters.

Further legal texts regulate the possibilities given to French authorities. It is not possible to give the total overview of these texts here. Most tend to generate further cooperation, while

reducing progressively the threshold linked to the award of new financial and taxation advantages. This always created a powerful incentive for the further development of cooperation. Also, looking at the texts adopted, one can observe a movement towards a stronger basis for policy integration between the various parts of transport policy.

1.3.3 Functioning of the new forms of cooperation

The development of these new forms of cooperation also led to the enlargement of many urban public transport networks, as the corresponding territory of the urban public transport authority was enlarged.

The enlargement of the PTUs and the creation of new forms of cooperation between authorities, especially the "Communautés d'agglomération", also created a severe increase in the duties of many authorities, who were often ill-equipped to these new tasks, or who at least had to undergo a thorough reorganization to cope with their new competencies. This led to several alternative forms of organization, as transitional measures, but also to various solutions and experiences.

Interesting points are:

- The integration of all pre-existing forms of cooperations into the new cooperation needed to be realized. It meant that the pre-existing contracts with transport operators and their length did not necessarily correspond to the creation period of the new authority. Transitional periods were therefore necessary during which some competencies were sometimes delegated to appropriate levels of authorities.
- The enlargement of the public transport area necessitated the re-thinking of fares policies, transport networks, etc. Authorities reacted quite differently to this, from doing nothing and waiting to a fundamental reorganization of the whole network. With the enlargement of the PTUs, public transport services were often redesigned. But several practices appeared, such as optimization of the existing services (integration of the former services of the Département in the urban network, development of regular services in the basis of the pre-existing school services, etc.) and the development of demand-responsive services.
- As a consequence of the enlargement of the public transport area, transport authorities have started thinking about a division of their transport areas into several public transport contracts, implying the possibility to have several public transport operators. This practice which is very common in many other countries was, however, unknown in France. The French tradition considered that a unique operator was the only possibility.
- Interestingly, with the enlargement of the territories, public transport has become relatively less prominent in the considerations. Even, some of the companies located in outer suburban areas have refused to pay the transport tax as the public transport network actually does not adequately cover their areas. This has been made possible by a law which allowed negotiating the transport tax rates in a transitional period.
- This last point is also interesting in that the former dichotomy between urban transport inside the PTU and departmental/suburban transport outside the PTU has now been replaced by a more vague situation. The new structure, as presented in the former point, shows that variations and intermediary solutions are now present within a PTU. In conclusion, Certu (2007) states that the simplification intended by the Chevènement-act actually also introduce new complexities in the cooperation

between municipalities or their cooperations with other layers of authorities such as the Département.

- The influence of varying political majorities and political priorities and preferences (e.g. between city centre and suburban areas) also often led to not-as-coherent territories for the cooperations and the public transport networks. Politicians of suburban and regional areas sometimes have quite different views on transport policy when compared with the priorities of the politicians in the city centre. As stated in the analysis of this by Certu (2007), this is more of a "club" logic than a logic based on rational transport areas.

In conclusion, the French Act relative to improving and simplifying cooperation between municipalities (Chevènement Act) has led to radical changes in the framework within which public transport is administered (outside the Paris region). It has resulted in the extension of many PTU (official urban transport areas) and this raised many new issues in terms of the place of public transport, the role of the actors involved, the relations between the existing institutions and the extent to which the services provided correspond to the actual needs. This has to be seen in the wider context of the compulsory development of urban transport plans, required by other pieces of French legislation. This is addressed in the next chapter.

1.4 Urban Transport Plans

The preceding chapter focused on the institutional aspects of intermunicipal cooperation, and its evolution, when looking at public transport competencies. This chapter will look at the other main aspect of such cooperation, especially in the wider transport context, which is the establishment of policy in the form of urban transport plans.
As introduced in the presentation above, "urban transport plans" have become a major feature of the French transport scene. Their development started during the 1990s and led to various policy measures which aims at a better integration of the various branches of transport policy. It also led to a greater coherence in those policies.

1.4.1 Legal background and aims

Two main laws are responsible for the development of urban transport plans in France.

LAURE Act on air and rational energy usage

The Loi LAURE (Loi sur l'air et l'utilisation rationnelle de l'énergie) made compulsory the development of Urban Transport Plans (Plans de Déplacement Urbains, or PDUs) in all agglomerations of more than 100.000 inhabitants. According to this law, the State needed to be involved in the establishment of the PDUs, besides the urban authority concerned. A number of cities (above 100.000 inhabitants) have the duty to establish a PDU according to this law. Other cities have the freedom to establish one. More than 50 cities had to do so.

SRU Act on solidarity and urban renewal

The Loi SRU (Loi relative à la solidarité et au renouvellement urbain) imposed all PDUs (developed by the LAURE act) to be approved by 13 June 2001, and it also extended requirements to traffic safety, parking and freight transport. This had to be realised by 13 December 2003, although a postponement to 2006 was also possible. This law requires both the Région and the Département to be associated more closely in the establishment of the PDU and it also reinforces the compulsory character of the issues decided within the PDU. To this effect it also introduced the obligation to establish a calendar of realisation of the

measures defined. Furthermore, local urban development plans (PLU, Plans Locaux d'Urbanisme) have now to be made compatible with the PDUs. Furthermore, transport authorities are now also required to develop social public transport fares (solidarity issue).

The main aims of this legal step were to reinforce social and urban cohesion, to have a clearer timetable for realisation of measures, to integrate safety into the plans, to develop parking policy and integrate freight transport into the plans, to stimulate the development of company transport plans and to develop integrated fare policies.
A few interesting points are that:

- This law induces the transfer of parking policy from the involved municipalities to the public transport authority of the urban area, allowing a better integration of measures in the whole area. This, however, requires a modification of the status of the authority, creating a slight administrative hurdle.
- With this SRU-law, the experimental transfer of the competence on regional railway traffic to the Régions has now been made official.
- The establishment of the PDUs had already led to the enlargement of many PTUs (urban transport areas), but the SRU act now also stimulates the creation of mixed authorities (such as municipalities and Départements) to achieve more intermodality. The incentive and advantage for the involved authorities to create such a 'mixed' transport authority is that it entitles them to use the 'Versement Transport' tax in all participating municipalities (although at a lower level of maximum 0,5%).

1.4.2 Some impacts of the PDUs

The law requires to evaluate the results of the PDU, but there is no requirement to establish a proper monitoring scheme, although many cities have do so with the help of Certu (a research centre from the French Ministry of Transport).

Certu analysed in 2002 the actions taken in the development of PDU's since the enactment of the LAURE law. Making the overview of the 1996-2001 period, Certu concluded that their development led to a strong participation of local actors, sometimes even leading to the establishment of forums on transport issues, where the public and various actors involved in transport, parking and urban development and management issues, could participate. However, the resulting programming of the actions to realise seemed to be much less precise.

Concerning the transport modes:

- The PDU often focus very well on public transport, with a lot of attention for new tramways, dedicated bus lanes, better service frequency, better service period, more suburban rail services, etc. They also favour intermodality with more more P+R and more integrated ticketing between the various operators at the level of the urban region. However, the analysis concluded that the focus tended to be more on supply than on real quality of service.
- Most PDUs do not dare to set a car traffic reduction target, except the Paris region. They do, however, set a reduction of market share target for the car system. Many PDUs contained plans for new urban roads, although some plans decide to reduce the total amount of public space available for roads.
- A new dynamic in favour of cycling appeared. All PDUs want to increase its share (although it is never above 5%). Specific measures are the development of good cycle-paths networks, public cycle-parking, etc.

- Walking gets more attention too, with the intention to increase the share of walking trips, though mostly only in the city centres.
- Most PDUs address the issue of freight transport, which was to a large extent a new development which led to a better understanding of the problem by allowing urban transport authorities to meet freight transport professionals and discuss urban distribution issues.

In terms of other general policy issues:

- Although the PDUs are supposed to address urban land-use planning, most aims remain ill-specified although most plans recommend denser developments alongside the main public transport axes, control on suburban development, proper public transport services to new urban areas, a policy favouring short-distance travelling, etc.
- Little developments took place in terms of mobility management.
- Parking issues are well included, and very much seen as main factor to influence car usage, yet enforcement is much discussed in the plans. Some large cities define a maximum parking space norms for offices located in areas well-served by public transport.
- Safety objectives appeared to be less well formulated and integrated into policy.
- The PDUs integrate policies to act against pollution but few have developed measures to evaluate the real effect of the actions taken.

1.5 Conclusions

The particular circumstances of France (especially the small size of municipalities) required specific action in view of the growing urban transport problems. The evolution presented here, that took place of the last thirty-odd years showed how – more or less consciously – various pieces of legislation generated waves of intermunicipal cooperation by means of financial-fiscal incentives for the authorities involved.

This rather ‘easy money’ for the authorities is sometimes a cause for debate, about its democratic legitimacy. Sometimes observers also point at the fact that the level of coverage of the cost of production of public transport in France is very low: 20% passenger revenues, 40% transport tax, 40% other local financing. Whether this is partly due to the relative ease for the authorities to generate these tax incomes remains a point for discussion and contention.

During the latter part of this period, considerable effort was put, both at the legislative level and at the local level, to develop effectively integrated urban transport plan that are more than dead letters. Waves of legislation contributed to a stricter approach and more enforcement. However, no studies seems to have, as of yet, adequately covered the analysis of the true impacts of these transport plans.

References

Certu (2007), ‘Les intercommunalités et le départements face aux enjeux des transports publics’, CERTU, Lyon.
Certu (2003), ‘PDU et loi SRU’, CERTU, Lyon
Certu and Ademe (2002), ‘Bilan des PDU de 1996 à 2001’, CERTU, Lyon.

2 Nederland

2.1 Stakeholders and legislation

Transport flows do not take boundaries into account, but most transportation takes place at the level of cities and provinces. This is one of the main reasons why the Ministry of Transport has given provinces and so called city regions (Stadsregio's) responsibilities for transportation issues. These lower public authorities can coordinate the demands from the Ministry of Transport, all the municipalities that 'belong' to the City Region or province, the City Region's and provinces themselves and, off course, road and Public Transport users. These are the main stakeholders and their responsibilities on transport:

Stakeholder	Responsibility
Ministry of Transport	• to build and maintain the network of highways; • to build, maintain the network of railroads, including stations and their parking facilities for cyclists and motorists; • to tender the exploitation of the network of railroads, except some regional branches of the network; • to determine the fares for city and regional transport (until the Chipcard is implemented) and trains • to write a National Traffic and Transport Plan (NTTP) which is to be adopted for a period of ten years
Provinces	• to build and maintain the network of secondary roads; • to tender the exploitation of city and regional transport (busses, trams, underground, ferry) and regional branches of the rail network. • to tender transport for disabled persons (taxi) • to write a Provincial Traffic and Transport Plan, taking account of the PTTP, which is to be adopted for a period of ten years
City Region's	• to tender the exploitation of city and regional transport (busses, trams, underground, ferry) and regional branches of the rail network • to tender transport for disabled persons (taxi) • to write a Regional Traffic and Transport Plan, taking account of the NTTP and the PTTP, which is to be adopted for a period of ten years
Municipalities	• to build and maintain the network of local roads, including infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists; • to write a Municipal Traffic and Transport Plan, taking account of the PTTP or RTTP (depends on the location of the municipality), which is to be adopted of r a period of ten years

What is a City Region?

A City Region (Stadsregio) is always part of a province, it is composed of a city and the municipalities in their agglomeration.

The current institutional form of the City Region is a result of an attempt to create new boundaries for provinces by introducing city-provinces during the nineties. This attempt reflected on large political discussions (on national and regional level), resulting in a new institutional form instead of new provinces.
Since January 2006 the Stadsregio[1] has found its principles in the "Wet Gemeenschappelijke Regelingen plus (WGR+)" (Act of Communal Settlements plus). This regulation makes it possible for municipalities to arrange a partnership. The 'plus-part' of the WGR+ contains some extra regulations for the seven Stadsregio's. The Stadsregio has no direct elected general management (Dagelijks Bestuur) like a province has. The management is formed by aldermen from the municipalities of the cooperation.

Key to success

Provinces and City Regions are coordinating authorities for the region, between regions and between region and the nation. By giving them these responsibilities, these authorities are capable to realize more sustainable solutions, better than a Ministry could do. The authorities know their area and their relevant parties.

Challenges: the system starts to grow up

- Cooperation between municipalities and coordinating authorities: by seizing chances by using their coordinating role. For instance, as municipalities compete with each other's economical centres, the interests of the region can be optimized by coordinating the interests of municipalities as well as of companies searching for location or space for expansion.
- Cooperation between regions: geographical borders of provinces are rarely the same borders as those of regions, whether they are from City Region's or historically/natural regions like a valley. City Regions and provinces experience difficulties working together, because of their different objectives: a City Region focuses more on economical goals, while a province has various goals in nature and social policy. This happens for instance in Utrecht ("Bestuur Regio Utrecht" vs. province of Utrecht) and in Gelderland ("Stadsregio Arnhem-Nijmegen" vs. province of Gelderland).
- Some regional subjects are still on the political agenda of the Ministry of Transport. This is not fully consistent, seen from the perspective of regional authorities. For example: a substantial part of the traffic on motorways uses these for only few kilometres, making them effectively part of the regional road network. Despite this, the Ministry of Transport remains the only authority for motorways, while City Regions have no authority on them. As negotiation is an important part of the Dutch culture, in the case of motorways with a regional purpose negotiation between a city region and the Ministry do take place. Here the Ministry starts to learn to find a new role.

2.2 Finances

Since 2005 traffic and transport policy aims at the regional level have been mostly financed by the Brede DoelUitkering, BDU (Broad Aim Fund). Main aim of the BDU[2]: A faster and

[1] http://www.minbzk.nl/contents/pages/8177/WGRplus.pdf

[2] http://www.kpvv.nl/files_content/kennisbank/samenwerken%20met%20de%20bdu%20Kennisrapport.pdf

better realization of traffic and transport policy at the regional level, related to the national policy aims.

These are some examples of national policy aims[3]:

- "For those who travel by public transport, the Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management aims to ensure that they get from door to door as quickly, comfortably and safely as possible for a reasonable price."
- "Stronger economy by improving accessibility."
- "Travel times will be more reliable by 2020. In 95% of cases, travellers will arrive at their destinations on time. On the motorways, journeys during rush hour will last no more than 50% longer than in non-peak periods, and on urban ring roads and roads not managed by central government, they will take no more than twice as long."
- "Passengers must be able to transfer smoothly and easily from one mode to another, and from public transport to a private vehicle or bicycle. In the urban networks, public transport can also contribute significantly to quality of life."
- "Acoustic quality in the main ecological network will be no worse in 2010 than today, and will have improved in 2020. The main ecological network will be completed by 2018."

The BDU makes integration of policy topics possible, though, it does not stimulate to do so. Formerly, regional authorities got, for example, separate amount of money public transport by bus, by taxi for disabled persons, cyclists' facilities, regional and local roads, bus, tram and underground infrastructure. Now these are combined, opening the possibility for smarter combinations.

The BDU means that all funds of the Ministry of Transport to the regional and municipal authorities are combined into only one fund. Regional authorities are free to define to which purpose this money will be used. This is how the BDU-money is distributed:

- Policy integration is more or less guaranteed by the obligation for Regional authorities (provinces and city regions) to translate national policy aims to their Mobility Plans. Municipalities have to translate those plans to their Mobility Plans. The status of a City Region's Mobility Plan is only indicative: it has to be in line with the Province's Plan in which the City Region is located.
- The government decides on the total amount of money of the BDU and, for each of the Region Authorities in particular, which share of the BDU is allocated to them. These shares are determined by characteristics of regional area, amongst others: number of inhabitants, houses, companies, stores, physical barriers, the importance of cities and villages for the region.
- Regions are free to decide to which measures they spend their BDU-money as long as it is spent to realize policy aims. Moreover, municipalities have to have a prominent role in this decision. Though, a Regional Authority can decide to not fulfill wishes of municipalities if it is motivated by a report of consultation with a motivation for this decision.
- For example: in the Province of Utrecht, the Province decides which share of the BDU is needed for her measures, like Public Transport, transport safety and road works. For the remaining amount of money, municipalities can offer plans which have to meet the Province's criteria. However, this year the Region (in this case this means the province as well as the City Region and all municipalities) reserved this

[3] http://www.notamobiliteit.nl/pdf/nm3/PKB3UK.pdf

amount of money for the outcomes (projects) of integrated Traffic and Transport studies in the region. Thus they can finance their share of the costs for infrastructural measures to improve accessibility of the region.

The Ministry focuses on the expenses of the regions and only to a very limited degree on the realization of policy aims. Section 11 of the BDU describes the justification the Regional Authority has to provide to the Ministry of Transport. The Minister of Transport is responsible for a rightfully and effectively spending of the money on the assets ("Comptabiliteitswet" 2001). An Authority has to describe which part of its BDU-share is spent and which part is reserved for following years (motivated). Moreover, the Region has to make clear that their BDU-money is spent on traffic and transport projects. However, it is not needed to motivate the effect of BDU-spending on national policy aims.

Because the BDU is effective since 2005 it is to early to draw some hard conclusions about its effects. In 2010 the BDU will be evaluated on the following question: is it possible to realize the same goals with less money?

2.3 Comparison of ingredients

Subject	Reality
A higher priority for Public Transport in comparison with other forms of transport?	Especially in city regions, urban planning / real estate projects are on pause, because of the environmental effects of car use in the agglomeration. This effect asks for a restrictive car policy. Because a city region is able to arrange public transport and cycling measures it is also able to lead a more restrictive car policy. In short: the organizational form makes it possible to do so.
Does it lead to a more restrictive car policy?	
Improved relation between infrastructure and operation of public transport?	Not at the moment, but it is just a matter of time. Both expenses have to be paid through BDU-money. If policy aims were better monitored, a better consideration of expenditures could be made.
Increase of cyclists?	This is likely because regional authorities finance roads, public transport as well as cyclists' facilities, though there is no information.
Improved relation between mobility and environment policies?	Yes, because of the decentralization of competences. Example: because the organization of bus transport is on the level of the province or city region and as these authorities know their local conditions they can arrange suitable environmental solutions (environmental friendly buses in towns and cheaper less environmental friendly buses in the region, because the effect in the region is nil).
Integration of urban planning and mobility?	Not by decentralization or financing, but by the Spatial Planning Act (Wet op de Ruimtelijke Ordening[4]). This act coordinates spatial issues between the levels of the stakeholders. This means that when a for example a road is needed for the region, a municipal decision can be overruled. This act works best in infrastructure projects.
Improved cooperation between real estate parties and public authorities?	Not likely, because urban planning and mobility are not integrated by decentralization of financing. Moreover real estate parties mostly have a businesslike relation with municipalities, which do not (directly) receive the BDU-money from the Ministry of Transport.

[4] http://www.vrom.nl/pagina.html?id=23941

3 Tyskland

First, this case study will focus on the organizational and hierarchical structure of the Federal Republic of Germany and the spatial planning. Subsequently, a number of topics will be addressed that are of interest to the research. To start with, an actual discussion that is going on at the national level about spatial planning that will have implications for transport policy in the future. And secondly, on the local level, two cities will be discussed where public transport has had, and still has, an important and interesting role.

3.1 Organization

3.1.1 Administrative structure

The German Federation is divided into 16 'Bundesländer' (states). There are the three 'city states', Berlin, Hamburg and Bremen. Legislative power is divided between the federation and the Bundesländer. All legislative powers are placed on the state level unless designated by the 'Grundgesetz' (constitution). The Bundesländer also have their own constitutions. In some areas both the federation as the state have the legislative power. The federal law overrides the state law.

Most of the Länder are governed by a cabinet led by a Ministerpräsident (Minister President), together with an own legislative body/parliament known as the Landtag. A Regierungsbezirk (a total of 22) is a subdivision of certain Bundesländer. Only 5 Bundesländer have such a division.

At the local scale we have circa 400 'Kreise' (districts) and over 12.000 'Gemeinde' (municipalities).

A general characteristic of Germany is the polycentric regional structure. For example, there is not a one single metropolitan area that dominates the country, unlike in France. Germany has a distribution of economically and internationally important centre's throughout the country.

3.1.2 Spatial- and transport planning

For a long time, the central objective of German spatial planning has been to ensure equal living-standards in all the states. This was done by transferring financial resources to and improving the infrastructure in regions that were running behind. Spatial and infrastructural plans aimed at achieving that scope. It seems logical that, after reunification of East and West Germany, this became even more important. East Germany had to be integrated in the rest of the country, both economically and socially. Following this idea, the federal government creates the procedural framework to insure consistency between the states. The states are relatively autonomously and therefore there are still differences.

- The federal government forms a Bundesverkehrwegeplan (BVWP, federal transport investment plan), with indicates investments in water, rail and motorway for the coming 10-15 years. These agreements are converted to state and local levels. The most recent one has been established in 2003.

- In ‘Ministerkonferenzen’ (conference and discussion between the states and federal government) the general German approach to urban planning and related issues such as transport is being decided in the ‘Leitbilder’ (visions).
- The Bundesland creates a Landesentwicklungsplan (Urban development plan). This integral spatial plan is further developed by the Bezirke or other lower leveled bodies.
- The Gemeinde create a Flächenutzungsplan (a strategic plan) and a Bebauungsplan (approved by the states).

For historical reasons, Germany consists of administrative units that do not match the modern relations that exist within large urban agglomerations. For example, the enormous metropolitan areas around Frankfurt (Rhine-Main) extend across state boundaries, or some of the states are simply too big or too small to cover efficiently a functional urban area. The German law makes it in theory possible to change boundaries of states, but there is little chance of public approval for that option.

There are more than 50 Verkehrsverbünde (transport associations) in Germany. The Verkehrsverbünde can be seen as a unified transit agency, a ‘joining forces’ in order to create an integrated, more attractive, public transport in a certain area. Operators (private and public) and/or responsible administrations work together to be able to offer this. They can have a diverse range of responsibilities, often including the planning, coordination and/or integration of modes, fares, schedules and routes and the possible tendering of rail services. A simpler form of cooperation is the ‘Tarifverbund’, an agreement on a uniform and integrated pricing system.

The standard model of German local public transport organization is a 3-level model, with the Verkehrsverbund operating on level 2;

- Level 1: Regional administrative body as political supervisory body (intercommunal cooperations).
- Level 2: Management level – non-commercial limited company with often functions as planning and marketing and a procurement function for local public passenger transport services.
- Level 3: Transport operator offering transport services to customers

The subsidized local rail-transport is, since the reform of the railway law in 1996, in the beginning the responsibility of the states. Besides the regional branch of national railways Deutsche Bahn, DB Regio, a growing number of new private operators operate now regional railway services. Certain states decided to stay responsible for the train services, others transferred this (including possible tendering, to the Verkehrsverbünde. Around half of the Verkehrsverbünde have also integrated the regional railway services (mostly the organizations around regional centres). The railway services operate under the brand of the Verkehrs-verbund, in this way an optimal coordination between rail and bus or tram can be achieved.

The national long-distance railway-network is operated, maintained and built by the Deutsche Bahn and its infrastructure division, DB Netz. On a very small scale, other operators operate long-distance railway service in Germany.

The ministerial conference on spatial planning, held in June 2006, developed and approved a new strategy for spatial development in Germany. This marked a break with the previous

focus on equivalence between regions. The following paragraph illustrates this new approach to spatial planning, which has been subject to much debate.

3.1.3 Today's issue

German spatial planning is currently undergoing a major shift in perspective. During the above mentioned ministerial conference, three 'leitbilder' (key concepts on the development of Germany) were determined. Focus point is the promotion of growth and innovation.

The new strategic approach to spatial development can be seen as a broadening of the designation of six 'European Metropolitan Regions' in 1995 that could receive financial aid to boost their position in Europe. The new strategy is built around these and other (metropolitan) regions as alliances for growth. This must be seen as a voluntary regional cooperation between different governmental authorities, creating so called 'communities of responsibility'. This is a result of the present situation, where recent interdependencies between agglomerations are not matched by administrative boundaries, as indicated before.

The general idea of these 'Verantwordungsgemeinschaften' (communities of responsibility) is an addition to the existing administrative structure. They form a new way of regional governance and, self-organized and taking shared responsibilities, they follow interdependencies that cut across administrative boundaries.

In this way the policy of equality is substituted by a vision that has a more competitive approach, where German regions should focus more on the competition within Europe. Central in the approach is the decentralized character that makes use of the polycentric structure of Germany. It is therefore not only aimed at larger agglomerations but also at the smaller one's. Although they have less international significance, smaller regions are encouraged to create more potential by making new connections (across administrative borders) with other smaller regions. Some smaller, even rural areas already account for a substantial share in economic development, through specialized technology or innovation clusters. Corporation at the regional level will use this potential and will strengthen the position in the international competition, is the new way of thinking in Germany.

The vision of the new German 'Leitbilder' shows an approach that recognizes the changing and growing relationships between cities. It doesn't force unwilling partners into strategic coalitions, but counts on the existing diversity of partnerships. Cooperation between politicians, economical and social actors in different German areas that acknowledge the need to unify and in that way be more competitive, is already leading to new initiatives in the fields of infrastructure, (public) transport and environment. The vision that is set by the government should be the basis of new alliances that bring out useful ideas on these arguments. This is being achieved through a broad discussion between politicians and other relevant actors about the priorities in new policy that should be taken on a wide array of arguments. Goals and strategies are hereby voluntarily set by all the partners and the federal government did not finance the regions with their new plans, with the exception of some specific pilot projects. Public Transport policy will profit from this in the future and will strongly be influenced by the new policy.

3.2 Public-transport minded cities

3.2.1 Karlsruhe

Karlsruhe is a city with 286.331 inhabitants and is part of Bundesland Baden-Württemberg. The way public transport is organized in the city is internationally well known as the "Karlsruher Modell". This public transport system was developed in the eighties and nineties by Deutsche Bahn together with the three main actors for public transport in the area; Karlsruher Verkehrsverbund (the public transport organization) and the Verkehrbetriebe Karlsruhe GmbH (VBK) that works together with Albtal-Verkehr-Gesellschaft (AVG) to actually run the public transport services. These are both 100 % in possession of the city of Karlsruhe.

The Karsruher Modell is a pioneering tram-train system to create a more attractive public transport system, without transfers as trams run on the regional railway network. Now transfer-free trips from the surroundings to the city center are possible. It is possible to reach other towns in the regions from the city centre and vice versa.

Karlsruhe succeeded to achieve the linkage of the routes of trams in the city to railway tracks of Germans main-rail network and other tracks. 'Heavy' railways were electrified so that it could be used by trams and heavy rail as well. This has a huge advantage over train/metro solutions because the building costs are much lower. These main-rail tracks could still be used by long-distance intercity and freight trains. A system what nowadays would have been called 'light rail' was created. The Karlsruhe Modell has lead to a strongly increasing number of passengers and therefore gets a lot of attention internationally. It has inspired a lot of other cities to develop lightrail sytems. The French term 'tram-train' that is nowadays common use is derived from the Karlsruher Modell.

Karlsruher Verkehrsverbundes (KVV) was founded in order to seize up the independent offers of 20 transport enterprises into one efficient network. It was preceded by the 'Tarifverbund' that was formed between the VBK and the AVG. After the creation of the KVV, besides uniform tickets it was possible to create an integrated public transport system making good use of the developing light-rail system. KVV is well known to perform interesting and successful marketing actions to promote the public transport in the area. Besides marketing and tariffs, it is also responsible for the planning of the services and the distribution of ticket revenues.

With the Karlsruher Modell, public transport in the city and the region got a lot of (inter)national attention and high ridership. Also in recent years, the network was extended and improved. It substantially influenced the approach to public transport in the area and made it a serious alternative for private transport. Both citizens and businesses attach a great value to locations near the public transport stops.

3.2.2 Integration of transport and spatial planning

In the Bundesland Nordrhein-Westfalen (North-Rhine Westfalia), we can find an interesting example of housing development in coordination with public transport.

North-Rhine Westfalia is – in terms of population – the biggest federal state in Germany with 18 million inhabitants. With about 800 train stations it also has a very high density of railways and stations. The development of the settlement structure, especially in the de-industrializing

Ruhr-Area, is characterized by the continuous suburbanization of housing and growing decentralization of working places that cause long-term growth in traffic. In the city centre, the loss of population is reinforced by negative natural population tendencies. These diffused and functionally divided settlements make it difficult to offer adequate and efficient public transport.

Integration
Lack of good accommodation is a main reason for many people to move out of the cities. Therefore, in the first place, building new and upgrading existing buildings became very important for North-Rhine Westfalia. Secondly, to tackle the problem of strong traffic-growth as indicated above, stimulate public transport and make sustainable growth possible, the ambitious amounts of new and improved buildings should be developed next to existing rail infrastructure. This was adopted as a clear strategy for the whole state. The basic idea is to create development areas that are inexpensive nearby stations, and thereby shifting traffic.

Relevant programmes in the state are the;

- 'Social house building law'. Since 1998, grants for building rental flats are concentrated to the vicinity of rail stops and stations (1.000 m). Accordingly, the transport supply and services were improved. The state program was launched by the State Ministry of Urban Development, Housing, Culture and Sports and is implemented in close cooperation with the State Office of regional planning, the Ministry for Transportation, the municipalities, and the German national railways, DB.
- 'Urban renewal program'. The urban renewal program gives grants to the cities for building multi-storey housing and land-saving semi-detached and terraced houses if the investment includes more than 150 housing units within a catchment area of 1.000 m near regional trains and of 500 m near trams and subways.

In total around 130 towns in the state identified suitable potential land along railway lines according to both programmes. Interesting is the notion that building is increasingly taking place not only around single stations and stops within a single municipality, but at a regional level along existing or reconstructed rail tracks.

The above examples show an interesting cooperation between diverse actors and a reach across traditional (administrative) boundaries. These are elements that we found also above, in the 'Leitbild' that reflects the new vision of spatial development in Germany.

Experience
The programmes are so far not as successful as intended, because for example not all of the new housing units have been established within the radius of 1.000 meters. Of course, we have to take into account also the fact that a lot of other aspects influence the modal choice. But, in terms of built housing units along rail lines it is Germany's most successful approach. It has become clear though, that besides the presence of infrastructure, additional measures have to be taken. Some of the following have been implemented throughout the state, to complement the two programmes, and have proven to make the policy more effective:

- There is a need for basic supply and a mixture of functions around the stations. This is why the retail trade in certain areas has been subsidized for a period.
- A high quality supply of rail and bus services, including marketing is necessary.
- Restrictions for the private traffic are just as important and adequate infrastructure for walking and cycling has to be provided.

Of course, the coordination between all the actors is difficult. The state initiated a forum ("Forum Bahnflächen NRW") where the involved actors can meet regularly and discuss their problems. More and more cities join this process. They set together goals for a public transport-oriented regional development.

References

- BMVBS (Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs) http://www.bmvbs.de
- BAG-SPNV (National organization of regional rail traffic) http://www.bag-spnv.de
- Derichs, Anka (2003), Report of Conference on Good Practice; Integration of Environment into Transport Policy
- Euronatur (2004), Establishing Public Transport Authorities in Central Europe.
- Forum Umwelt & Entwicklung (2004), Kommunale Verkehrspolitik und Klimaschutz.
- Karlsruher Verkehrsverbund, http://www.kvv.de
- Sinz, Manfred (2007), A new German approach, in: Nova Terra, 1-2008.
- Umweltbundesamt zu Verkehr in Kommunen (State environmental agency on traffic policy in local government) http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/verkehr/mobil/publikationen.htm

4 Italia

This case-study will first address some characteristics of the Italian political system, a system that differs quite a lot from other European countries. It gives a short overview of the governmental structure of the Italian Republic and the governmental setting of Milan.
This serves as an introduction of a recent 'master plan', consisting of a series of interesting measures that are recently being taken in Milan to fight an increase in traffic-, health- and environmental problems that the second-largest city in Italy is facing. A much-debated electronic toll-system, following examples from London and Stockholm, is part of it. At last, the case study focuses also on the recently changed setting of actors that are responsible for the public transport in the city.

4.1 State organization

The Italian State is divided in 20 regions with extended powers. Five regions (Aosta Valley, Friuli-Venezia Giulia, Sardinia, Sicily, Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol) have special powers granting them varying degrees of autonomy. The reason is in most cases the presence of linguistic and cultural minorities, or bordering to other countries. The other 15 regions were in practice established in 1970, even if the idea was much older. The five recognised special regions are endowed with specific legislative powers while the others are not, though all regions are governed by a 'giunta regionale' (elected council) and president.

The regions are then further divided into 103 provincial areas (modeled on the French département), which since 1993 elect their own council and president under proportional representation. They are also supervised by a prefect appointed by the national government in Rome. While the number of regions is somewhat stable, there has been a tendency in later years to create new provinces.
The Italian 'commune' (municipality) plays a central role in national life and is a settled feature of the political system. Over 8 000 in number, the communes are each headed by a 'sindaco' (mayor) and 'consiglio communale' (elected council). In addition to civil registration and local public services, including roads, the municipalities are able to run their own local police forces and provide local healthcare services.

Italy furthermore distinguishes the 'Area urbana' (Urban area) and the 'Città metropolitana' (metropolitan city). Adjacent provinces (Area urbana) and those strongly related with the city (città metropolitana) are included in these bodies. This is a reaction on international definitions of large agglomerations and these divisions exist foremost statistically and are lacking real powers. The establishing of some sort of city-states keeps being subject of heavy debate. In the meantime, strong cooperation between provinces, cities and regions in certain areas is under way. A good example is the master plan that will be discussed below.

It could be said that Italy's set-up of regions simultaneously binds and fragments the country due to inherent tensions within the system, mostly made clear by the very popular right-wing party Lega Nord. Italy was one of the last states in Europe to embark upon nation-building and consolidated the various tiny states and papal entities in 1861. The newly unified Italy opted for a highly centralized system modeled on the French state, ignoring demands for

federalism. Its fragmented nature can be traced back throughout the ages and nowadays there still exist big differences in culture and language between the regions.

An additional dimension arose from the annexation of territory such as ‘Alto Adige’ (South Tyrol) by treaty in 1919, now one of several regions with special arrangements to reflect the German speaking populations. The centralization was continued to extremes under the fascist period of Italy’s history. The post-fascist constitution of 1948 then guaranteed regional autonomy and this was augmented in 1970 with direct elections.

A key debate in Italian local government is showing the tension between the wealthy north and the less wealthy south. The regime of equalization is still contested by the northern regions, who would like to see large reductions in the subsidies paid to the southern ones. The tendency over the past decade therefore has been towards fiscal decentralization, with regions being able to retain their tax receipts and the introduction of some new regional taxes and fiscal levers. In 2001, a major reform was enacted with the introduction of the ‘principle of constitutional subsidiarity and legal parity between central and regional governments’. The process underpinning this is expected to last until 2013 however, rather than take place overnight. A referendum in June 2006 on reforms to give regions greater power over education and health saw voters reject them by almost two-thirds. It was feared that if enacted, the reforms would place Italy on a federal footing.

4.2 Milan

Milano is a city in the north of Italy, capital of the province of Milan and capital of the region Lombardy. It is the second largest Italian city with 1,4 million inhabitants and it forms the core of the ‘area urbana’ and ‘area metropolitana’ of Milan that has more than 7 million inhabitants and includes surrounding provinces that depend highly on Milan in terms of jobs, education and entertainment. The vicinity of the metropolitan area of Turin (less than 150 km), has provoked the lobby for a narrow cooperation that is being set up by politicians and famous inhabitants of both cities. They believe that by linking both areas the competitive advantages are huge. The mayor of Milan is the charismatic centre-right candidate Letizia Moratti. She was elected in 2004 with 52 per cent of the votes. The first female mayor in the city, Moratti previously served in the cabinet of Berlusconi as education minister and like him has a background as a media executive.

4.2.1 Health, environment and sustainable development plan

The ‘Piano Salute, Ambiente e sviluppo sostenibile’ is an ‘integral program’ aimed to improve the standard of living in Milan. It reflects the vision of the local government, backed by other governments, on issues concerning health, environment and transport in the city. This plan was agreed upon in September 2007 and made public right away with a big marketing campaign in October last year. Characteristic of the plan is the concrete list of measures that is announced, covering different kind of subjects related to environment and transport. Mayor Letizia Moratti was the person that always fought hard to establish such a plan.

It was presented shortly before the ‘Ecopass’ road pricing system (see below) got underway. The plan describes a wide array of measures aiming to improve the quality of life in the city, protect the environment and respect the health of the inhabitants of the city. There are four mayor policy goals stated in the plan, covering 30 smaller and larger projects. The most important projects of each policy goal are mentioned.

1. Improving public transport: The construction of two new subway lines and the extension of the existing lines, more frequent and cleaner bus services in the region and in the city, dedicated bus lanes, more frequent tram services
2. Green energy: The promotion of the use of green energy for the heating of houses, the planting of 500.000 new trees in the city
3. Limiting the use of private transport: The ecopass toll-system (see below) is one of the better-known projects, others include initiatives for car sharing, extension of paid parking areas, reduction of parking spaces, and the realization of 20 new park and ride areas in the suburbs.
4. Bicycles: The construction of 50 km new dedicated bicycle lanes and improvement of the existing 67 kilometers.

So it is clear that the plan comprises measures on very different kind of subjects, which makes it a very interesting project. It is also good to notice that besides this plan, regular initiatives on the environmental or transportation field are however going through. This plan is a separate list of comprehensive actions that can start on a short-term basis and where immediate funding is provided. The plan wants to underline the fact that successful transport or environmental policy can only be achieved by taking diverse, interrelated measures. A toll-system for private cars and less inner-city parking spaces as written in the plan, are for example combined with a substantial improvement for the public transport and park/ride-facilities to make the measures more effective. Also, a good cooperation between different actors is necessary. Together the plan gives the city the interesting possibility to at least make a start in tackling traffic and environmental problems Milan is facing.

The total budget for the plan is 3,5 billion Euro. This sum will be spent in three years time. The municipality of Milan pays around 600 million Euro, the regional government of Lombardy and the province of Milan will participate with a total of around 1,5 billion Euro. The central government in Rome has committed itself for the remaining 1,4 billion Euro, underlining the great importance of the urban area of Milan for the whole country.

Some of the destinations for this money include 900 Million that is available for the improvement of frequencies in public transport and 550 Million more for the subway-system improvements, 550 Million goes to new central heating in houses, new trees and other smaller environmental initiatives.

A revolutionary way of working together, a result of the ‘tavolo milano’ (discussions on Milan) in Rome that was held in September 2007. The city, nearby towns, province, region and state together agreed on the budget and the measures that had to be taken, in cooperation with others like the transport operators. During the whole process of formulating the master plan, the relevant administrative bodies were closely involved. But a major influence on the successful process has been the mayor of Milan, Letizia Moratti, who has always been a driving force behind the lobbying with all the cooperating parties. This is the first time in Italy that on such a big scale, with such diverse measures and different actors, a plan has been agreed upon and has been presented with great pride among all the actors.

4.2.2 Ecopass

Ecopass is a toll-system for the central area of Milan. Mayor Moratti also adopted this idea as one of her most important goals to achieve during her term. Supported by the slogan: “Less traffic, more clean air” this large-scale road-pricing initiative is mainly focused on the reduction of pollution by charging heavy polluting vehicles during daytime in the center of Milan. Modern, clean vehicles are free to enter at all times. For older vehicles, the price you

have to pay will increase based on the extent in which your vehicle pollutes. It came into effect on 2 January 2008 and was presented as a logical consequence after the successful examples of road-pricing schemes in London and Stockholm.

Older and polluting cars pay based on the European 'Euro' certification that has been given to every car. They pay from 2 to 10 euros to be allowed to travel through the restricted area during one day. This is necessary from 07:00 till 19:00 hours during weekdays. Access to the restricted area is supervised by an automatic system that controls the 43 possible entrances to the area with many cameras. Payment can be done up to the day after access. It is important to realize that all Ecopass charges will be used for projects in the field of sustainable traffic and a sustainable environment. It is remarkable that in every press release of the project it is emphasized that the improved public transport should be seen as a part of the project and that concrete, alternative travel options are offered for those who choose not to take their car.

Ecopass has had three goals from the beginning:

- make the air cleaner by reducing traffic emissions in the central area of the city by 30%, with a positive fallout on the surrounding areas of the city as well;
- relieve congestion by reducing the number of incoming cars by 10% and thereby speeding up public transport in the area;
- boost public transport

In addition to the Ecopass plan, during weekdays till April 2008 the whole city centre of Milan is closed during daytime for vehicles that are in the 'worst' class; euro-0. This is to alleviate the worst problems that exist today. So for the owners of these vehicles it is temporarily even impossible to buy an Ecopass ticket. This measure is initiated by the region of Lombardy.

Similar but simpler and smaller road-pricing schemes are effective in other Italian cities, for example Rome and Verona. Certain streets in the center are only accessible if you obtain a permit beforehand that is only available to residents, tourists from hotels and companies inside the restricted area, and telephone/energy companies that have to work in the area. Camera's control automatically if you are in possession of the permit.

The Ecopass-initiative fits perfectly in the health and environmental plan discussed before, contributing if successful to a less polluted city, with less cars and more space for public transport. The introduction of the Ecopass-system was combined with a substantial increase in frequency on almost all the metros, trams and buses. Also, the connections between the city and its surroundings got a frequency 'boost' of at least 50%.

4.2.3 Actors responsible for Public Transport

This paragraph shortly focuses on the most important actors responsible of public transport in the city. Recent reform, driven by possible new policy of the EU and possible tendering of services, led to a reform inside ATM, the municipal operator of public transport, and to the creation of three parties who promote themselves as the 'mobility holding' of the city;

- Metropolitana Milanesi (MM), planes and realizes new infrastructure.
- Agenzia Mobilità Ambiente (AMA), planes, controls mobility and environmental issues.
- Azienda Trasporti Milanesi (ATM), operates public transport in the city.

The three agencies belong to the municipality of Milan and each of them recently firmed a contract with the municipality, stating their duties and goals.

MM
MM is a Joint Stock Engineering Company entirely controlled by the Municipality of Milan. Founded in 1955 to design and build the Milan Metro, it is now the leading Italian Company in civil and plant engineering sectors for urban and suburban rail transit networks. In July 2003 the Municipality of Milan has put Metropolitana Milanese also in charge of the Integrated Water Service. Over the years MM has broadened its field of interests and diversified its work and market areas, applying its know-how to other important cities, in Italy and abroad.

ATM
This public agency controls all public transport modes in the city. It also is responsible for a large amount of paid parking spaces, a car sharing system and it operates the Copenhagen automated subway system. ATM is since 2001 'societa per azioni', when they issued shares that are all in possession of the municipality. Since 2007 the structure is further changed, it consists of a holding company with 8 different firms since. The holding company has the ownership of the infrastructure and the buses/trams/metros. Biggest firm under the holding is 'ATMServizi'. This is the part that is responsible for the public transport in city and parts of the region with 23 tramlines, 3 subway lines, 53 busroutes and 2 cable cars.

AMA
AMA is a firm that helps ATM and the municipality planning the transport services in the city. They also monitor exactly the state the environment is in and provide other researches on the field of pollution, traffic flows. They control on behalf of the municipality if the operator is delivering the service that is agreed upon in the contract. Following the reforms, if future private operators should become responsible for the operation of services, AMA can help the municipality in its role as transport authority by providing support on the planning of services on tactical level.

References

- ATM-Milano (Milan transport agency), http://www.atm-mi.it/ATM/Azienda
- Ecopass system, Municipality of Milan, http://www.comune.milano.it/dseserver/ecopass
- Ecopass per combattere inquinamento (2007), http://www.italiensk.info/article/article.php?itemID=1228
- Milano promuove l'Ecopass e piano per ambiente (2008), http://www.repubblica.it/2008/02/motori/motori-febbraio-2008
- Health and environmental plan, Municipality of Milan, http://www.comune.milano.it/dseserver/salute_ambiente
- Italian Government, http://www.governo.it
- Local government in Italy (2005) http://citymayors.com/government
- L'Agenzia Milanese Mobilità e Ambiente (Milan office of mobility and environment), http://www.ama-mi.it/agenzia
- Metropolitana Milanese (Milan construction agency), http://www.metropolitanamilanese.it
- Region of Lombardy, http://www.lombardia.it

- Interview by telephone with Ecopass-office, PR department, Milan

5 Storbritannia

The set-up of local government in the UK is both confusing and interesting. This case study speaks about the set-up of UK local government and is meant as a short discussion of a few actual topics where only the headlines will be discussed. It starts with an overview of the local government and it then focuses on three important actual issues concerning the local government:

- Local Government White paper (2006) and creation of the 'Unitary Councils'
- Lyons enquiry (2007) into financing and functioning of local government
- PTA's/PTE's

5.1 Local government set-up

In general, the set-up of UK Local Government can be considered confusing, especially with respect to other European countries. We follow a clear step-by-step explanation and introduce all the definitions.

At the top level England is divided into nine regions. The regions were created in 1994 and all have the same status. However London is the only region with any substantial devolved power in the form of an elected mayor and the Greater London Authority. The regions also vary greatly in size, both in their areas covered and their populations.

A further division brings us to county level. The distinction that needs to be made here is between 'two tier' or 'single tier' local government structures as it always existed in the UK.

- Outside the major urban areas, services were provided by *two tiers* of councils in England; 'County Councils' (covering each a population in a range of around 500,000 - 1,500,000) and 'District Councils', between 4-14 within each County Council area (covering a population about 100,000). The county council provides county-wide services such as economic development, education, strategic planning and the police service. District councils provide more localized services, including planning and housing, environmental health, waste collection and recycling, and some leisure services. There are around 34 County and 238 District councils.
- In the major urban areas London, West Midlands (around Birmingham), Greater Manchester, Merseyside (around Liverpool), South Yorkshire (around Sheffield), West Yorkshire (around Leeds) and Tyne & Wear (around Newcastle-upon-Tyne there is a *single tier* of councils responsible for all the services listed above. The names for these are 'Metropolitan district councils', besides in London where they are called 'London borough councils'. There are around 170 of these authorities in England.
- In the 1990s the Central Government's view was that the two tier model of service provision was inefficient and confusing, and that County Councils were too remote from those they served; and therefore that County Councils should be abolished and their functions transferred to District Councils, with some of the smaller Districts being merged. In England there was a process of local consultation which led to the single tier model being implemented in some places and rejected in more. Where single-tier councils have been implemented, they are called 'Unitary councils'. Some responsibilities which formerly were within the jurisdiction of County Councils are now exercised by 'joint boards' appointed by the Unitary councils. The Unitary councils are recently again subject of discussion, more below.

- ‘Parish and Town councils’ cover areas that are smaller than Districts (up to 30,000 inhabitants but usually less). They have very limited responsibilities for local services and environmental improvements, and do not exist in large towns and cities. There is no difference in powers between both councils. Very small parishes may not have an elected council, in which case decisions are taken by open Paris meetings. There are around 10 376 parishes in England.
- ‘City’ and ‘Borough’ are titles of honor which do not affect the responsibility of a local authority. The titles may be conferred by a Royal Charter, which is generally done for a very large and important town but in some cases the term City seems to be traditional usage and the meaning is lost in time. In particular it is generally used of any town containing a Cathedral and is often applied to a District. The title of Borough is only applied to Districts.

Each council, no matter what its structure, is made up of two groups of people. ‘Councilors’ make policy decisions. They are voted into office by the public in local elections and may also be known as ‘Members’. ‘Council staff’, also named ‘officers’ deliver services and implement policies. These are paid positions, while councilors often work on a voluntary basis. Councilors represent geographically determined ‘wards’ (in County councils also called ‘electoral divisions’) and serve for four years before needing to seek re-election. A ward may be represented by 1-3 Councilors. County Councils and London Boroughs elect all their Councilors at once, every 4 years. Metropolitan Districts elect one-third of their Councilors in each of the 3 years out of 4 which are not County Election years. Two-tier District councils and the Unitary councils were given the choice of the two methods.

At last, we have the role of ‘Mayor’ that has changed recently. The Mayor of a Borough or City (also called ‘Lord Mayor’ in the largest cities) has been appointed by the council from its own members and combined the role of chair of Council meetings with a ceremonial role. There is now provision for councils to have a directly elected mayor responsible for most decisions in association with a small ‘Cabinet’ of Councilors.

5.2 Actual issues

White paper

The Government released a Local Government White Paper on 26 October 2006, named ‘Strong and Prosperous Communities’. It deals with the structure of the UK Local Government. The White Paper does not deal with the issues of local government funding, that is awaiting the final report of the Lyons inquiry (see below) into local government funding.

The White Paper emphasizes the concept of "double devolution", with more powers being granted to Councils, and powers being devolved from town halls to community levels. It proposes to reduce the level of central government oversight over local authorities. This would be achieved by removing centrally-set performance targets, statutory controls of the Secretary of State over Parish councils, bye-laws, and electoral arrangements.

The white paper proposed that the existing prohibition on parish councils in Greater London will be abolished and making new parishes easier to set up. The White Paper proposes that "community council", "neighbourhood council" and "village council" may be used as well for the Parish council. The White Paper proposes to strengthen the council executives, and provides an option between a directly-elected mayor; a directly-elected executive; or an indirectly elected leader; with a fixed 4-year term.

The white paper allows for structural changes to local government in England. This goes back to the 1990s, when the Local Government Commission for England recommended a number of unitary authorities to be created in England, as written above. Following the plan, during 2009 there will be more structural changes to local government in England, whereby a number of new unitary authorities will be created in parts of the country. Elections to the new authorities are planned to take place in 2008, with them taking up their powers on 1 April 2009. The local government will thus undergo a major re-structuring with the creation of the five so called ‘flagship’ Unitary Councils.
It is estimated that the five new unitary authorities could save over £75million per year which can be used to directly improve front line services or reduce council tax bills.

Lyons inquiry

The Lyons Inquiry into local government funding discusses issues of local government funding, the contribution from the state and the discussion about the replacement of the Council Tax. It was a thorough and extensive research and motive for a lot of recent debate on local government. The report that is greatly valued by a lot of involved actors contains a lot of concrete improvements that we will discuss below. However, according to some Councils, the report falls short of the radical reform that they wanted to see; the full return of the business rate to local government and the restoration of the balance of funding between central and local government.

On Wednesday 21 March 2007, Sir Michael Lyons published the final report of his independent inquiry into the role, function and funding of local government. It is named ‘Place Shaping - a shared ambition for the future of local government’. The Inquiry was commissioned by the Chancellor and Deputy Prime Minister to consider the current and emerging strategic role of local government and in the light of that, how it should be funded. Now is the time for the government to act on the recommendations and set out a clear timetable for reform. Sir Michael sets out medium term proposals, so councils face acute pressures and need to see substantial growth in the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review to get them through the period until Lyons is implemented.

The most important conclusions from the report are:

- The call for a new partnership between central and local government.
- Council tax is not 'broken', but is seen as unfair and has been put too much under pressure.

Sir Michael presents a lot of reforms which tackle a complex set of problems. They include essential reforms in the short-term to tackle the most urgent problems and more radical reform options for future governments. They include:

- greater flexibility for local authorities to place-shape with less control from the centre - by reducing specific and ring fenced grants, a new power to levy a supplementary business rate in consultation with business, and a new power to charge for domestic waste to help manage pressures on council tax, and an end to capping of council tax;
- changes to improve fairness of council tax, recognizing that council tax benefit is a rebate, automating the system to ensure 1.8 billion pounds in unclaimed benefit helps the poorest households, and raising the savings limit for pensioners to 50,000 pounds;

- improving transparency in the funding system by being clear about the contribution made by national taxation, and ensuring a more independent voice to inform Parliament and the public; and
- improving incentives for local authorities to promote economic prosperity and growth, initially through reform of the Local Authority Business Growth Incentives Scheme.

In the medium term the Government

- should revalue the council tax to update the tax base and improve fairness; at the same time, reform the council tax by adding new bands to reduce bills for those in the lowest value properties, paid for by increased bills for those in higher value properties paying more - there should be no increase in average council tax bills as a result of this;
- consider assigning a fixed proportion of income tax to local government;
- find ways to improve the incentives within the grant system; and
- consider introducing the power to levy a tourist tax if local government makes a strong case based on local public support - this would be appropriate only in some areas.
- In the longer term, future governments could consider more radical reform options such as local income tax or re-localization of the business rate, but these reforms may require greater public support and understanding than currently exists.

Sir Michael concluded: "This package of reforms is designed to set out a developmental approach towards a more devolved and ambitious future for local government, based on improving relationships between central and local government, better local choices, more effective management of pressures, and greater public trust in the system as a whole."

5.3 PTA's/PTE's

In the United Kingdom, Passenger Transport Executives (PTE's) are local government bodies which are responsible for public transport within large urban areas. There are six PTE's in England, one for each of the metropolitan counties. In London, there is a similar organization, called "Transport for London".

The Passenger Transport Authorities (PTA's) are the bodies which administer the executives, they are made up of Councilors representing the areas served by the PTE's. They are responsible for funding the PTE's, and make the policies which the PTE's carry out on their behalf. Then PTE's secure services on behalf of the PTA but it is the PTA that pays for them. In the Metropolitan counties, councilors are appointed to the PTA's by the metropolitan boroughs. The Passenger Transport Authorities are not "precepting authorities", so they have to negotiate a levy every year that is applied to council tax collected by the local authorities in the areas that they serve. The Executive usually requests a budget and the council representatives on the PTA's negotiate from this position.

It is worth bearing in mind that PTE's do not, strictly speaking, own anything. Their role is a statutory one to provide services using the resources provided to them by the PTA's. Before the 1986 deregulation of local public transport in Britain, the PTE's used to be themselves public transport operators.

Local transport bill

Provisions in a proposed Bill are intended to support the Government's strategy to tackle increasing road congestion and to improve the quality of local bus services. A number of changes to PTE/A's are to be made under the Local Transport Bill currently passing through parliament. The policy context and related background were set out in the consultation document 'Strengthening Local Delivery: the draft Local Transport Bill' (May 2007). If passed the main changes to be made will be:

- Passenger Transport Authorities (PTA's) would to be renamed as Integrated Transport Authorities (ITA's) although PTE's would retain their current names.
- The bill would allow for the possibility of new PTE's being created, and for the areas of existing ones to be altered.

The bill would strengthen the powers of PTE's/ITA's to regulate bus services, and would make ITA's the only transport planning authorities in their areas.

In the before mentioned White Paper, it is also promised that the Department for Transport will put forward proposals for a reform of the Passenger Transport Authorities.

References:

Comments on White Paper (2006), http://www.citymayors.com/politics/uk_whitepaper06.html

- Green light for five flagship Unitary Councils (2007), http://www.communities.gov.uk
- Local government in the UK, http://www.local.gov.uk
- Local transport bill, http://www.publications.parliament.uk
- Lyons inquiry, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4807616.stm
- Lyons inquiry into local government funding, http://www.lyonsinquiry.org.uk
- Structure of local government, http://www.statistics.gov.uk