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STARTING POINT:

In 90-ties a dynamic increase of motorization was observed - much faster then increase of personal incomes.

**Reason:**

- Difficult access to private cars in the past.
- Purchasing of car was easier then house - easier way to increase social status.
- Costs of car purchasing and its operation increased slower then costs of other products and services.
CAR OWNERSHIP veh./1000 inh.

In Warsaw:
1960 - 10
1980 - 157
RESULT:

- More vehicles on roads.
- Increase of the traffic volumes, mainly in cities.
- Peak hours covering every year bigger and bigger areas and longer periods.
- Transport system not prepared.
- Transport budgets not big enough.
IMPACT TO:

- Quality of travel (congestion, time loss, parking problems)
- Effectiveness of public transport (fuel consumption, operational costs)
- More accidents (50,532 in 1990; 57,331 in 2000 - increase 13%)
- Quality of environment
## Accident rates in selected countries in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Car ownership/1000 inh.</th>
<th>Killed in accidents/100 000 inh.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: IRTAD International Accident Database*
Positives:
- Better situation in cities with existing rail and tram systems - with tracks separated from streets.
- There is a good lesson - transportation problems observed in Polish cities earlier experienced in many European cities.

Conclusions:
- In highly urbanised areas road network extension and increase of parking capacities will not solve problems.
- Instead adjusting capacity of the system to increasing traffic demands it is better to adjust demand to supply
Map of Sustainable Transport Policy

Bialystok 1996

Poznan 1998

Warsaw 1995

Lodz 1997

Wroclaw 1998

Katowice 1999

Krakow 1993
WARSAW CASE

- 1,62 million inhabitants (2,5 mln in agglomeration).
- Area: 495 km²
- 460 automobiles/one thousand inhabitants
- Mobility: 2.6-2.8 trips/inhabitant per day
- Modal split 34IT/66PT
- Average travel time to work - 35 minutes
WARSAW CASE - Transport system

Metro line: 14.2 km/68 veh.
Tramways: 122 km/334 veh.
Railways - 231 km
Bus ways - 850 km/1075 veh.
WARSAW CASE - Policy Resolution

- Traffic census - 1993
- Transport study - 1994
- Process of reviewing and approval - 18 months
- Warsaw City Council voting - 27 November 1995

52 votes for, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.
Principles of Transport Policy 1/2

Policy differentiated on the basis of area character:

ZONE I: areas generating and attracting traffic/city centre
  • Priorities for PT and pedestrians;
  • Automobile traffic restricted - even eliminated

ZONE II: other intensively built-up areas:
  • Greater freedom for automobiles with PT priorities

ZONE III: other areas:
  • Roads and supply of parking adapted to needs resulting from the level of motorization.
Principles of transport policy 2/2

• Better **urban planning and development control**.

• Particular attention to the **quality of PT** linking Zones.

• More effective **utilisation of existing infrastructure and facilities** (repairs, modernisation, and maintenance)

• New investment projects - when rapid project execution is possible with appropriate outcomes.

• Much more attention to **environment and safety**

• Implementation is dependent on **understanding and acceptance** - information campaign
Implementation examples
Attention concentrated on one project – metro construction.

The first part of the 1\textsuperscript{st} line (in 2003 – 14,2 km) is being expanded to the north center.
Policy implementation - Public Transport Priority

Tramways modernization program was elaborated in 2001 - implementation was not started.
Trams suffer because of lack of priorities in traffic control at intersections.
Bus dedicated lanes have been introduced in few places, but not properly enforced what reduces their efficiency.
Policy implementation - Public Transport Priority

Bus (and taxi) streets
No example after 1995.
Better use of tram corridor (Wroclaw, Krakow, Warsaw)
Policy implementation - Public Transport Priority

Fleet renewal
Policy implementation - Public Transport Priority

- Rationalization of routes and time schedules
- Adapting the system for use by the disabled
- Increasing role of railroads in agglomeration
- Reform of the tariff system
- Passenger information system
Policy implementation - Traffic Management System
CEZAR - Traffic Management System including:

• Traffic operation center;

• Area traffic control system - 550 signalized intersections;

• Traffic information: internet, radio, VMS signs;

• Traffic monitoring: cameras, loops, controllers;

• Traffic database

• PT priorities
### Policy implementation - Traffic Management System

**HISTORY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1997</td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1998</td>
<td>T.o.R ready for tendering procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2000</td>
<td>Tendering procedure starts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2001</td>
<td>9 offers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Negotiations with 3 system deliverers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2002</td>
<td>Final technical specification - funds foreseen in city budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2003</td>
<td>Still no action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

ZONE I: Central
- parking charging,
- no illegal parking,
- limited parking development.
- parking normatives,
- parking information system

Zone II: Other intensively built up areas
parking charging in selected areas,
- P+R
- investor obligation to build parking on their own plot

Zone III: Other areas
- P+R
- Investor obligation to build parking on their own plot
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

After years of preparations, parking charging in central zone were introduced in 1999,
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

No system extension and zone differentiation
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

Car is a king!
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

No space for pedestrians
Restrictions on access by heavy vehicles into selected areas of the city

Full implementation depend on completion of ring roads.
No action to create new pedestrian traffic areas.
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

Elimination of illegal parking

Practically no enforcement. If any connected with charging zone.
Policy implementation - Car restrictions

Elimination of illegal parking
Results

44 detail policy objectives:

• none was fully implemented,

• 20 partially implemented/preparations advanced,

• 10 minimally implemented,

• 14 no action or action couldn’t be taken for objective reasons such as lack of legal basis.
Conclusions

In other cities situation similar.

Adoption of ambitious policy is not sufficient

Implementation is difficult!
Implementation slow and incomplete because:

- In transition countries the society as a whole is not prepared for constraints/restrictions - policy-makers are afraid of reaction to radical measures.

- Spectacular new investment projects attract more attention.

- With limited financial resources new projects are draining city budgets. Financial and economic viability of competing projects and actions is not always taken into account.
Conclusions 2/2

Implementation slow and incomplete because:

- New, expensive projects are supported by some interest groups (construction industry).

- Conservative thinking of professionals - example: no support for considered as old-fashioned tramway system in Warsaw.

- Inadequate communication with the public and policy-makers. The role of mass media was crucial.