

The Commons: Open Society Sustainability Initiative  
Le Frene, 8/10 rue Joseph Bara  
75006 Paris, France

Saturday, October 30, 2004, Paris, France, Europe

Dear International Colleague,

This note is to invite you to consider and eventually get actively involved in some way – or to help us find the right partners to do the job -- in an innovative public policy/sustainability action initiative still in its early stages of development, but which we believe has real potential in the until now hopelessly unequal struggle to move our cities toward something much closer to sustainable mobility.

Why are we contacting you on this today? Well, because we know from our past international experience that programs such as this require highly qualified, energetic, well placed *local* partners who know the terrain, the issues and the trade-offs well and have the technical capacities and networks to tailor and make this approach work in their city. As you will see here, at the end of the day this approach is as much political as it is technical, and its pioneering nature makes it rather more than just one more transportation project. And indeed it is for all these reasons that we have set out to look for implementation partners capable of facing these challenges in a first handful of cities ready to move ahead to prove these ideas for themselves and as pioneers showing the way to sustainable mobility when it is needed (which of course is now!).

A first round of efforts have just gotten underway in Toronto following up on their first New Mobility Week in the last week of September, but it is our view that other cities should not wait. The simple truth is that we know enough and the problems are grave enough to start work now. Not only that, we are hopeful that as a first group of pioneer cities begin to take this challenge and move ahead on their individual programs, we are hoping to put them into a light but efficient network so that they can communicate, share results, and generally learn from and support each other.

We are aggressively seeking support and feedback for this action program and the ideas that are set out here. If you wish more background or details on how all this works, this is the right place to turn. These notes plus the two web sites offer a fair amount of first background in support of these ideas, but they are incomplete and in any event it is creative interaction in each specific context which is needed to move this closer to reality. We are now discussing a first round of 20/20 projects with local teams in a first handful of cities and concerned organizations world-wide -- so why not with you?

Eric Britton

W. [www.newmobility.org](http://www.newmobility.org) and [www.ecoplan.org](http://www.ecoplan.org)  
E: [eric.britton@ecoplan.org](mailto:eric.britton@ecoplan.org) T: +331 4326 1323 F: +331 5301 2896  
IP Videoconference: 81.57.233.192

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative

---

*Bottom line:* Meticulous preparation of a highest-priority, broad-based, multi-level, phased city-wide collaborative action program that sets out to achieve (a) an explicitly targeted 20% area-wide reduction in traffic and associated public health impacts (CO<sub>2</sub>, accidents, etc.) in the city (b) within a target period of 20 months.

### 1. Introduction

---

Sustainable transportation should not wait. It is not a luxury nor should it be the object of one more time-less futures study or research project. The cost of the inefficiencies of today's dysfunctional transportation arrangements in environmental, life quality and economic terms has already outstripped the carrying capacity of many cities and the planet as a whole. But wait! We are making the transition to something a lot better much harder than we have to. Let's have a closer look.

Sustainable mobility at the level of a city or region – which is what this is all about – can be achieved in far less time than probably you ever thought. The means for achieving these ambitious objectives: a (a) targeted, (b) aggressive, (c) locally-driven, (d) coordinated, (e) now-oriented (f) pattern-break commitment on the part of local government and all concerned with the transport sector and its extensions and their impact on your city.

What is useful about this concept is that it is at once short-term, results-oriented, far-reaching, affordable and realistic. No less important, it targets highly ambitious near term efficiency and visible environmental improvements without requiring massive injections of hard earned taxpayer money. It also, with the right kind of preparatory work and support, can offer a very powerful political tool for mayors and city counsels who want to offer a better, safer, cleaner and more affordable city to their electorate.

This presentation is organized as follows, and supported by the two indicated websites.

1. Introduction
2. 20/20 Highlights
3. Why "Dysfunctional Transportation" is major public health threat for your city
4. A New Mobility 20/20 Target Initiative for Your City? In Brief
5. How does it work?

Annex A: The Old Mobility Impasse

Annex B: Participation Checklist

Annex C: New Mobility Agenda Precursors

Annex D - Epilogue: One 20/20 program that worked and why

- The New Mobility Agenda is at <http://newmobility.org>
- Toronto's New Mobility 20/20 Initiative at <http://ecoplan.org/toronto>

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### 2. 20/20 Highlights

---

- The most effective way of understanding the full extent of the dysfunctionality and costs of our current transportation arrangements is to view it as a broad based ‘public health’ problem, to our minds more useful and powerful than looking at it as one more transportation or even environment challenge. To get a feel for how this works read on.
- Your city can, if it decides to, make significant near term inroads in congestion, pollution and life quality on its streets, without waiting for more international treaties to be signed, draconian anti-car policies from ‘eco-terrorists’, new technologies to appear from heaven, or large piles of hard earned taxpayer money to build new roads, intersections, metros, LRT or fund costly, deficitary public transportation operations that invariably end up either half empty or stuck in traffic.
- The solution? Meticulous preparation of a highest-priority, broad-based, multi-level, phased city-wide collaborative action program that sets out to achieve (a) an explicitly targeted 20% area-wide reduction in traffic and associated public health impacts (CO<sub>2</sub>, accidents, etc.) in the city (b) within a target period of 20 months.
- There is a prudent process by which the 20/20 program’s ambitious aims can be checked for consistency and do-ability, and which lends itself, indeed depends on, very specific local tailoring and participation. But any eventual remedial action program along these lines that is going to yield results has to be accompanied (“sold”) by a clear target and process that the voters and public can understand, want to work toward, and which they are confident will yield visible near-term results.
- Does this imply 20% new money on top of everything? No! But it does require rethinking, redeploying and repackaging. And yes, a certain number of new synergistic initiatives as well, including some which perhaps you have not yet considered.
- Is this to suggest that the entire content of the 20/20 program must be new? Not at all. It is recognized that in many cities there are already projects and programs that are moving in this direction, or at least many elements of it. However the contribution of the 20/20 program is that it provides a broader underlying structure, higher visibility and a sense of urgency and support which has thus far been lacking.
- The planning period to develop a 20/20 program blueprint? Well, we propose a two week advance planning mission leading into an intensive focused 3 month effort, but only if there is major backing by and commitment of local government and the volunteer sector. Half-hearted support will just not work. Also requires considerable technical expertise on the part of transport planners and energetic entrepreneurship from both public and private sector actors in the city, to allow us to use their expanding toolkit to better understand and provide for the impact on the streets of the many changes that together constitute the New Mobility Agenda for the city.
- This is not to say that there is no place for long term thinking and action in the New Mobility Agenda, but rather the level of urgency of the problems in most places requires immediate remedial actions. Thus, all longer term programs and thrust must be supported by aggressive and broadly supported near term actions, for which the scope

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

is in fact very large. (Which by the way should not do you a great deal of harm if you happen to be mayor or councilman with an election in the wings).

### **3. Why "Dysfunctional Transportation" is major public health threat**

---

There can be little doubt that the best way of gauging the seriousness of the mounting problems of our present dysfunctional transportation arrangements – and hence the need for fast and effective remedies and adjustments -- is not so much from a purely transportation lens, or public works, nor even that of "environment" or land use - though all these are of course critical components of the challenges we need to resolve. Rather, above all we should be prepared to look at this from a public health perspective. It is only from this vantage that we can begin to appreciate the full range and degrees of severity of the problems that we are, in fact, resolutely refusing to face.

**Impacts:** Public health broadly defined - as it must be - is heavily impacted by the dysfunctional parts of our transportation arrangements in every city in the world. Here are ten broad areas in which these impacts are being felt, and which therefore should make it clear why this is a challenge that needs to be addressed immediately as a very high priority for the city and its region.

1. **Time Pollution:** This is the first thing we all see and feel. As a result of our dysfunctional transportation arrangements in 2004, we are all spending far too much time stuck in traffic. This is taking away from the time we should be spending with our families, with our own personal development, on our neighbors, doing important work. The stress that is related to this significant time-deprivation does little to improve our health or that of our families.
2. **Air pollution** Clean air must be a priority for the health of our citizens and their children - and more than 50% of air pollution comes directly from cars. (Closer to 75% for Toronto at present where the number of respiratory deaths due to road air pollution has been charted at 1800 for the last year alone. Look at the stats for your city. They have to be comparable if not worse.)
3. **Traffic Deaths and Injuries:** We need to achieve major reductions in traffic deaths and injuries, most of which occur in or because of cars. We can do this if we chose to (and if you need a real world example check out the results of the French example of the past two years which have been sensational and entirely a function of political will and commitment from many levels of society).
4. **Destruction of urban form and quality of life:** Roads and traffic are the life blood of a city, but too much of both threatens the city's livability in many ways.
5. **Climate Modification:** Everybody needs to do their bit to cut back on global warming. Rather than decreasing emissions by grams each year to get us back to 1990 levels - itself a proposal so timid as to warrant deep soul searching, -- our cities, all of them, are steadily doing worse every year when you look at the bottom line (e.g. CO2 emissions

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

resulting from increased traffic volumes). Moreover there is no end in sight. If we cannot somehow come up with something that is consequential and will get these basic trends back in line, it will just continue to get worse year after year and the planet, Canada and Toronto will all passively go to hell in a handbasket.

6. **Traffic noise** is a public health problem too. And while we are at it there are also such intrusions as odors and light pollution, each of which eat away at the health of those who are directly inflicted.
7. **Life Styles:** Promote healthier, more active life style. And in the process cut back on obesity for children and adults
8. **Economics:** Indeed if we add up the annual cost to society of these, let us call them "transport dysfunctions" - and I will address them shortly - we have a very very large number which at the very least should get our fullest attention.
9. **Medical Resources:** Puts unnecessary pressure on our hospitals and public health programs - crowding them with patients and problems who really should not be there, and taking scarce resources that are much needed for other uses).
10. **More costs:** And finally, we need to find ways to get a lot more bang per buck for the huge amount of money we spend on transport (so that we can free it for more important uses such as education, health, culture and more)

Does this bring us to the end of our list? Far from it, but working with this as a opening step, you will be able to take it much further for your own purposes

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### 4. A 20/20 Target Initiative for Your City? Further background

---

**In Brief:** The 20/20 policy consists of a coordinated, quite sizeable complex of time-phased ‘carrots and sticks’, all of which are geared to making more efficient use of the **existing** transport infrastructure of the city. In a sophisticated city like Toronto (and surely yours) we have seen that many of these measures are well known, but not all of them. It is the combination of packages of new measures, new ways of applying and coordinating known ones, and the creation of an overall coordinating framework with strong and extensive public commitment and corresponding technical competence that lies at the heart of this approach.

**Hmm.** At first glance this sounds a bit unlikely, at least for our city (“we are different”) but is it...

1. **Desirable?** *Something that seems to you and the voters in your city consider to be desirable?* Or is it so far off the political screen as to merit no attention?
2. **Realistic?** *Is it an impossible goal for your city?* We would certainly expect that your initial reaction should be at the very least skeptical. But hold on. Are you all that sure? Might it not be a good idea to have at least a closer look?
3. **Divisive?** *Is it a policy that is going to divide your population into two divisive groups and involve many negative, anti-car measures?* Well, we think not, but this is certainly something that needs to be kept in mind as you move head in preparing any eventual program in this often conflict-ridden area of public policy and private practice.
4. **Costly?** *Is it going to require major increases in the amount of money available to the sector?* The answer is, quite simply: No!

#### **The Four Keys:**

- (1) Carefully setting clear, understandable, ambitious but safely meetable performance targets.
- (2) Strong commitment of local leaders from the top -- at least to take this through the first Blueprint Go/No-Go phase.
- (3) A very broad base of public support and participation.
- (4) A highly committed local implementation partner with the technical virtuosity needed to get the fine detail planned carefully, executed and then consistently fine-tuned -- and the open community spirit and orientation needed to get the job done.

**How to get this done?** The answer is: very carefully. The 20/20 program requires strong leadership and communications skills, because behind there must be a broad based public/private/community partnership that will bring together and integrate the active participation of a far broader number and range of groups and interests than traditionally involved in the planning and implementation process. The preparatory and planning process – which we advise should be carried out in an intensive, broad-based 3 month “Blueprint Go/No Go Decision” effort – must be highly inclusive and carried out in an Open Society initiative. It should target to bring into the process not only those groups that traditionally favor environmental initiatives, but also those who have their doubts,

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

including groups and interests who traditionally have opposed anything other than the now suddenly old-mobility process (i.e. and in brief: build and spend your way out of the problem).

**An important difference:** As you will note this approach breaks many of the ‘established rules of the transportation game’, to the extent that it may well appear as ‘foreign’ or even uncomfortable in light of existing administrative and planning routines in the sector which have tended to be much longer term in general. We are talking about a project that is to be decided, fully planned, implemented and evaluated for next stages within the time period that most transportation projects are just starting to get off the drawing boards. This is going to make the partner search more challenging for sure.

**The Downside:** It is our firm belief that if you approach this with the care, energy and commitment needed, there is no downside. It may turn out that after your pre-study, you will elect different objectives and levels of ambition. But who can criticize a city for taking this challenge seriously and spending a relatively small amount of money and time to see if they can get on the right path?

**Variations:** It may be that after the careful Blueprint Implementation plan is completed, a rather different set of targets will emerge. One distinct possibility is that a consensus that 20/20 per se is simply too ambitious for your city. Fair enough. The team might end up proposing instead a 10/20 or even 5/20 program. Would that be a problem? We don’t think so. Even if “all” the city were to target and achieve would be, say, a 5% reductions over twice as many months, they would still be inching toward what we call “Kyoto Compliance”. Indeed, such a performance would be notable and offer great improvements which would mark your city apart from the rest who are simply and passively submitting to what they believe to be their destiny.

**Please note:** We are well aware that in many cities there is a lot already going on to make specific point improvements and if the city is lucky many qualified citizen groups and associations that are getting involved and trying to make their contribution both in terms of steering policy in the direction of being more sustainable, and in terms of specific actions on their part to make this happen. The objective of the New Mobility Initiative is not to get in their way or supplant their efforts in any way, but rather to reinforce them and define a consistent and supportive overall structure within which their energies and projects can be better supported and coordinated.

**International Networking:** We are hopeful that we will be able to set up a small but highly efficient IP mediated network to permit the first group of pioneer cities to share materials and results in an international co-learning exercise. It is also intended that projects will be open to representatives of visiting cities, who will be invited not only to observe but also to share their critical comments and recommendations to the host team.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### 5. 20/20. How does it work? A Conceptual Overview

---

What you have here is a quick conceptual outline of what I consider to be some of the main pillars of the New Mobility Agenda 20/20 approach. I have been asked by several people if I could make a stab at putting these high points into a short piece so that they could better appreciate how this is intended to work. Obviously one cannot get into any kind of detail without bringing in the specific operational context of the city and its unique problematique. That said, the five-stage preparatory and follow-up routine briefly set out here is in fact the proposed means for sorting out these critical details in each case and the intense technical preparations that are needed to make the whole program work.

#### A. Implementation Highlights:

1. 20/20 program to take top priority in transportation policy and expenditures for period
  - Open Society Initiative with broadest public support and active participation
  - Explicit targeting and checkable, open reporting on performance
  - “Packages of measures”
  - Carrots and sticks (for respectively inefficient users of street space and efficient)
  - Time phased, with time allowed for adaptation as system morphs toward more sustainable mobility
2. Infrastructure and financial management:
  - The bottom line here is that the whole system has to be shifted radically to favor space-efficient transport in cities.
  - No new infrastructure construction under program
  - Aggressive and innovative management of the existing transportation infrastructure
  - Zero increase of total transportation and related budgets (environment, public health, etc.)
  - New infrastructure delineated via ‘thousands of pounds of paint’, signing, and control mechanisms
  - No (or few and those very strategic) purchase of vehicles, etc. for taxpayer funded public transport operations
3. New mobility choices
  - A new climate of experimentation and opening for new shared services
  - Innovative push for new private and community transport services providers (people and goods)
  - Tighter integration of IT throughout
4. Implementation: 4 step process, see below for summary

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### B. Infrastructure Shifts and Management: (Basically the ‘sticks’)

1. Major and aggressive push to increase road space available to “high efficiency users” (HEU)
  - a. Example: If today in city HOV lanes and the like account for 2% of total infrastructure – the 20/20 approach will increase this by x 10 within 20 months.
  - b. HEUs included not only traditional forms of public transportation but also human powered transport and both new and older forms of shared vehicles (example: carsharing, car pooling, group taxis, organized hitchhiking and the like)
2. This will require aggressive control of abuses, which can be carried out by a combination of harder-hitting enforcement, cost effective monitoring technologies, and more draconian penalties for abuse.
3. Strategic parking programs aimed specifically to reduce end point access in peak periods.
4. Infrastructure and environment monitoring (major push to x10 increases)
5. Open public reporting on the costs and inefficiencies of the system (including open information on pollution levels, accidents, respiratory illnesses due to traffic, road rage and other forms of dangerous uncivic behaviour, associated medical costs, etc.
6. Road pricing programs – for example - while certainly desirable and appropriate in the longer run, are unlikely to be able to be properly prepared and brought on line within this short implementation horizon. That said they are obvious candidates for next stage enhancement and extension.

*Note:* Any expensive longer term projects will need to be reviewed and possibly revised within the new perspectives opened up by the New Mobility System, which are sure to be very different from the old thinking and priorities.

### C. Aggressive Expansion of New Mobility Choices: (More the ‘carrots’)

1. **‘Car-like mobility’<sup>1</sup>**: It will be immediately apparent that if we are to put pressure on inefficient solo-driver cars in the city, we must be able to offer convenient high quality alternatives, including new services that provide something approaching (or improving on) ‘car like mobility’. Which is what this pillar is all about.
2. **New Mobility ‘Protocol’**: It is understood that the response pattern is based on (a) forceful (b) scale upgrading of all space-efficient suppliers (on the understanding that ‘space-efficiency’ must correlate with environmental efficiency as well), and that these must be (c) modulated and coordinated so as together to make up the backbone of the city’s New Mobility ‘Protocol’ (as in a medical protocol for treatment).

---

<sup>1</sup> “Every [place nationality of speaker here] loves their cars and there is no way they will ever give them up,” we are consistently told. Not quite we are seeing. What everybody loves/wants/demands is ‘car-like mobility’. Hmm, not cars but ‘car-like mobility’. Think about it. That changes everything.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

3. **Building blocks of the new system:** A hallmark of the old mobility system (see Annex) is that it is almost always seen by politicians, the public and the media as purely binary: private transport (i.e., cars) and public transportation (deficit financed large vehicles plying fixed routes on schedules). That is badly wrong, and in the New Mobility paradigm we take this old thinking apart and start to view the transportation system as offering many more options and far more varied. Here are some examples of transportation sub-systems that need to be orchestrated into the new movement cocktail: cycle access and safety, carsharing, car pooling, telework and other teleservices, efficient goods delivery, taxi patronage (including a careful shift to shared taxis), E&H transport, improvement of intermodal, walking/cycling to school, green travel planning, improving the pedestrian environment, better public information systems and services (including via mobile phones), improved system integration (all purveyors), DRT, community bus and minibus services, new private purveyors, unified fare schemes, driver training (all services), support of promising new near term services, and the list goes on.
4. **Target “x10” increases in everything that works:** The first step planning goal in a 20/20 program is to identify and stimulate these much more varied services, each of which will be an important part of our new multi-level integrated transportation system. Indeed, a good place to start is to see if and how the program might target “x10” increases in each of these within the 20 month implementation period
  - (When we say x10 here, it is above all symbolic. The actual increase if any will of course need to be the object of careful analysis and preparation. That said, the point we are trying to get across is that promising concepts need far more forceful support than they would ‘normally’ get within the old mobility paradigm. Have a look at how this might be achieved in your city.)
5. **Public transport?** Main public transport (throughput) improvement in the New Mobility Agenda will be achieved via greatly enhanced (x10) and more efficient access to city’s road space, better enforcement of priorities, improved passenger interfaces, easier and probably a lot cheaper) fares, careful use of IT, etc.
  - a. *Note:* “Public transport” as traditionally defined and practiced offers something of a potential trap in this context, since in most places it has habitually been seen as the *only* alternative to private cars. This is a dangerous and debilitating assumption, which needs to be rethought and remedied if the new high quality, much more demand responsive services that people will need if they are ever to be tempted out of their cars (which they will find ever more stuck in traffic) and still get to work on time, fresh and, why not?, and lower costs than in the old space-inefficient paradigm.
6. **The New Transport Players:** Here is where virtually every city is still coming up short, for reasons that make sense in the old mobility paradigm but which now have to be altered so that new forms of ‘car like’ mobility can begin to take on their fare share of the burden of the shift as people get out of their cars (for something better). How might that work? For one telling example, consider what happens if every traveler has a mobile phone interface that provides both latest travel and schedule information and plugs her into a range of services, prices and levels of convenience. These new services are going to change the nature of transport in cities. Stay tuned.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### D. Execution:

There is no reason why any city and team cannot undertake to plan and execute a terrific 20/20 or similar program on their own. Thus far, the only discussions that we have had however – and these are just getting underway now – is with groups that have expressed interest in working in some way with us to get their own city project going. To this end, we summarize here how we see it from the perspective of a project we are working with and supporting from the beginning. But believe us, you can do it on your own.

1. **First Step – City identification:** Locate a well placed city partner willing to collaborate in order to plan, implement and then to evaluate the results of a 20/20 demonstration project in their city and prepare to build on this further as a next step. The city partner must have a high level of local backing because this is, at the end of the day, a project which is as much political as it is technical. (Which is why we call it an Open Society Initiative.)
2. **Advance Planning Mission:** This typically will take one or two weeks and require the financial support needed to bring a two man team to the host city to work with all those concerned locally in order to determine if and how this approach can be tailored to make its best contribution to the host city (and others concerned).
3. **Implementation Blueprint Stage:** Far the greater part of the work at this critical stage is carried out by the local team, including a wide range of organizations and groups that need to be brought together to make this ambitious program work. To the extent that external assistance or cooperation is needed this will be defined at the time of the Advanced Planning Mission.
4. **The 20/20 Pilot Project:** The requirement for external support and financing will be defined in the Blueprint Stage, but once again these are above all **local** action programs and which in addition do not require new infrastructure construction. Moreover, it is to be hoped that a substantial part of the planning and implementation activities are going to be carried out on a volunteer basis.
5. **Evaluation and Follow-up:** This is the final phase of the program as we see it today, and this in turn will come out of the various preceding stages.

Finally, we need to take into consideration that this approach is based on the understanding that a high degree of urgency surrounds the problems, which means that many of the more traditional planning and support routes and routines are not so appropriate in this case. This requires new patterns of behaviour and a higher sense of urgency from most of the established actors, including of course above all for government agencies at all the various concerned levels since they normally have little flexibility of the sort that is so important here. As we say, sustainability is today's problem, not tomorrow's when it will be at least a bit too late. And today is ... today!

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### **E. External finance for pioneering projects in Developing World**

It is our belief that this approach is sufficiently promising and potentially effective and important that for cities in need (in the developing or Accession countries for example) it is worthy of external financing during the initial stages at least until such time that the model is clearly there for all to see, appreciate and seize it for their own. Clear demonstration of unfamiliar new concepts is very important, as we have seen in many cases in the sector in the past. Among the most recent of these is London's successful experience in pioneering Congestion Charging (incidentally a project which has in the target area obtained result that are on the scale of the 20/20 objectives), which is now there for other cities to see and consider – and believe me they are.

That said, we do not propose that you as a city or concerned group wait around for someone to show up to bankroll your project. Indeed as you move ahead to define it and then make your plans and targets more broadly known, the possibilities of support become far more likely.

### **F. And what about the “Long Run”**

Not more metros? LRT construction? ‘New energy’ demonstration projects. Even new infrastructure building or improvement? Not quite. But . . .

References to Maynard Keynes aside, we hope that you will understand that the fact that we strongly advise that over the next two years the overwhelming thrust and attention of the city be to meeting these ambitious and demanding priority objectives. And through this process to initiate this effective move to an entirely new transportation paradigm – and it is indeed no less than that – should not be interpreted as suggesting that we once and for all bury all long term construction projects and the like. But, we do advise that they will need to be rethought radically given the emerging new policy and performance frame.

Once your city has shifted gears and achieved at least parts of these objectives, it is likely that your perspectives as to what is needed in the longer haul in terms of more expensive, taxpayer supported transportation investments will be rather different. But we can see about that in time. For now, let's get started on what is the most important!

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### Annex A: The Old Mobility Impasse

---

Here you have a quick and crude but I hope both fair and essentially correct characterization of planning, etc under the 'Old Mobility paradigm'. As we inspect this list, let's bear in mind that all the news is not bad. Over the last decades there have been great technical strides in the profession, which are going to be extremely important as we move to switch to a new paradigm of transport in cities. In fact, we can say with confidence that without the full and imaginative use of this expanding toolkit, there will be no New Mobility.

To characterize the present arrangements very broadly, the main characteristics are:

1. Closed system
2. Hierarchical
3. Top-down
4. Centralized
5. Authoritarian
6. Supply oriented
7. Expert based
8. Engineering-based (i.e., working "within the box", but with high technical competence)
9. Statistics based (historical)
10. Bounded
11. Reductive
12. Binary (private/public transport)
13. Costly
14. De facto car-based
15. Hardware and build solutions, technology oriented
16. Treats ex-car solutions as (very!) poor cousins
17. Sharp divide between planning, policy and operations
18. Obscure (to the public) decision making processes
19. Focuses on bottlenecks impeding traffic flows
20. Attempts to anticipate them and build to forestall
21. End-state solution oriented
22. Searches for large projects to "solve" the problems
23. Still too much separation from underlying land use realities.
24. Increasingly technical and tool oriented (this to the good)
25. Anachronistic, and finally. . .
26. Not doing the job that we need in 2004 and beyond!

In making this characterization we are not trying to condemn or belittle our policy makers who are working with this old model, and certainly not our respected transport and traffic planner colleagues. They are applying the skills they learned in school and which long have had the approval of their professional associations, their employers and present institutional and legal arrangements. Rather we are well-trying to understand what is going on, with both eyes focused on the fact that if we look at actual results in city after city in both the advanced economies and even more so in the developing world, we cannot honestly say that this approach is in itself proving adequate for our collective decision making and actions.

What we have with the existing arrangements is at its best an excellent technical approach for managing an ordered system -- which is however by no means the case of transport in cities, which is as we know marked by enormous systemic complexity, a multiplicity of highly diverse actors, values and decisions, ever-adaptive organic behaviour, and a situation in which it is ever more apparent that it is the non strictly transport issues that are now going to have to be factored into the highest level of the planning and decision hierarchy.

In a phrase, our challenge now is to get out of that old box.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### **Annex B: Participation Checklist**

---

The following is a generic check list of organizations, groups, agencies and eventually people to be brought into the discussions, planning, implementation and follow-up. It is intended to be useful to guide the search for inclusive cooperation in Toronto for the New Mobility Summit and its proposed follow-up in the months to come.

The normal practice in most transport projects in the past has been, unfortunately, to work with a greatly reduced list of partners and contributors. Over time however we are learning that it is vital to bring to the table as wide a range of groups and interests as possible, from the city and in the surrounding region in each case. This must include those whose views may be negative about any of the kinds of major shift in today's transportation arrangements (no matter how unsatisfactory. It is not hard to figure out whose they are, which in most cases boils down to opposition from those who fear that the event or what might follow, will reduce their revenues. But in a diverse, pluralistic and open democracy they too need to be brought in from the beginning. Which requires no little political savvy and communications and negotiation mastery.

#### **Concerned local/regional government agencies**

- City hall(s)
- Communications, public information specialists
- Community development programs
- Energy, conservation
- Environmental services (including monitoring stations and services)
- Fiscal and economic policies
- Mayors (personal commitment)
- Ombudsman
- Other towns and municipalities in region
- Parking policy and administrating
- Police and traffic authorities (local and regional)
- Public health
- Public space management
- Related incentive programs
- Social services
- Special event management
- Street vendors, kiosks, etc.
- Taxes and charges
- Transport and traffic planners
- Urban development/master planners
- Other concerned agencies, services?

## **The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction**

### **Mobility purveyors, representatives**

- Carshare operators
- Cycling and walking groups
- Emergency transporters and services
- Goods/Freight delivery
- Message/courier services
- Package delivery
- Paratransit providers
- Parking providers (public and private)
- Public transit operators (rail and road)
- Rental cars, vehicles
- Rideshare and hitch-hiking services
- School and other special buses
- Taxis, limo and chauffeur services
- Transport services for elderly, handicapped
- Transport shelters
- Other?

### **Movement substitutes, Demand Management**

- Car/free housing
- E-meeting technologies (videoconferencing, voice conferencing, other)
- Teleshopping (and delivery)
- Telework, telecommuting programs
- Travel diaries, logs
- Trip chaining
- Urban patterns - clustering
- xWork (new ways of organizing distance work)

### **Other key and potential actors, supporters**

- Anyone interested or involved in earlier CFDs or similar car free projects or demos in region
- Board of Trade and other industry groups (including infrastructure)
- Automobile associations and related industry groups (get them on board early)
- Chambers of commerce, Business groupings, Downtown associations
- City boosters
- Clubs, churches, synagogues, mosques
- Consultants, university/research groups working in these areas
- Developers, real estate agencies,
- Employers
- Financial community, banks, insurance companies
- Foundations, individuals and others able to provide financial support or backing
- Fundraisers

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

- Green Maps (Toronto has a fine one)
- Hospitals and health agencies (including public health)
- Including eventual sponsors and sources of active participation and support
- International, national, regional environment, mobility, etc. agencies and associations
- Local and regional media (old and new)
- Local merchants, chambers of commerce, downtown associations
- Media: traditional and new
- NGOs, Public interest groups, associations
  - - Environmental, ecological, public health, clean air groups
  - - Non-motorized transport: Pedestrian, cycling, skating, running groups
  - - Associations concerned with elderly, handicapped and poor
- Out of town commercial centers
- Polling organizations
- Red Cross, emergency services and public information programs
- Schools and educational institutions
- Specialized consultancies, working in these areas
- Street performers, musicians
- Transport user groups
- Urban development, public spaces,
- Women's groups
- Youth, sports and recreation groups

### Big House/Open Doors

Do you engage only "friends" in this process? Here the answer is very simple. If all too often in community based or local government events such as car free days, the trend has been to concentrate efforts on organizing the project and various events in close working relationships with people and groups who a priori like the idea, we have now accumulated enough experience to be able to advise a more ambitious course.

We are all basically inertial creatures and as such adverse to change. Especially if we have the impression that the changes are being imposed on us by people who are indifferent to our problems and priorities. Nobody likes that, and if you happen to have some economic or political leverage, you are quite naturally going to use it to block these unwelcome proposals.

The answer to that is to take a Big House/Open Doors approach, and make sure that you bring in all those who are going to be impacted, positively or possibly negatively, from the beginning. In another phrase: better to have them inside the tent.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### Annex C: New Mobility Agenda Precursors

---

*"If I have seen further [than others] it is by standing on the shoulders of giants."*  
- Isaac Newton, in a storied letter of 1675 to Robert Hooke

The more we discuss this approach with knowledgeable colleagues around the world, the more we are hearing that it strikes them as plausible that a city should target something on the order of 20% reductions of peak hour traffic and pollution within a 20 month target period. But in many ways, there is nothing altogether new in this (other than the package).

20/20 and the New Mobility Agenda are part of a decades-long process of sustainability innovation in the transportation sector, where brave and far-sighted innovators have gotten behind a new concept and make it work. The truth, as another Englishman William Blake put it long ago, is that "God is in the details". That said, it gives us great pleasure to take this final moment to identify what we regard as some of the most outstanding precursors to the ideas that are presented in these pages. Of course everyone will have their own list, but here is ours. (We are sure that you will have corrections and candidates of your own, and if so please do let us hear from you.)

#### New Mobility Honor Roll

1. **Circa 120 A.D., Rome.** The Emperor Hadrian purported to say of Rome traffic: "This luxury of speed destroys its own aim: a pedestrian makes more headway than a hundred conveyances jammed end to end along the twists and turns of the Scared Way." (That said, he then proceeded to do nothing about it. Sound familiar?)
2. **1958, New York.** Demonstrations of neighbors of the Washington Square Park block proposed extension of Fifth Avenue, which would have eliminated this popular park and social oasis. One of the ringleaders of the 1958 demonstration, [Jane Jacobs](#), then publishes
3. **1961, New York.** . . . the path-breaking [The Death and Life of Great American Cities](#), Vintage Books opening up the [discussions of car restraint in cities](#) as one of the first challenges to the Old Mobility.
4. **1950s-1970s, German, Austrian, Swiss** cities hold on to their tramways while the rest of the world "modernizes" with diesel buses. ROW takes a full generation to learn the lesson.
5. **1950-1960s, Washington D.C.** City holds on to its shared taxis, permitting it to offer cheap, frequent friendly transport while others look on and scratch their heads.
6. **1960s, Sweden.** Färdtjänst (*I need a bit of Swedish help on this*). Provision of 'car like' transport for elderly and handicapped via community deal with taxi drivers. Now operating daily in virtually all cities in all Nordic countries and spreading.
7. **1965, Amsterdam.** Witte Fietsenplan -White Bicycles Community Bike Project. Established by Luud Schimmelpennink with city government. Press announced that project had "failed" within a year as all the old bikes pretty much disappeared. Failure? Today there are scores of such community bike projects in cities around the world drawing on this path-breaking example.
8. **Mid-1960s, Hamburg.** City creates a unified fare/pass system for all public carriers. Other cities look on and . . .
9. **1968, Groningen, Netherlands.** First neighborhood Woonerf. The goal of this at first entirely illegal project led by local residents was to claim back the street for cars and create safe space for people, after several mortal accidents involving children and cars. Sets off an international street reclaiming and slow speed movement that is still gaining force.
10. **1969, Copenhagen.** City engineer decides to attack traffic build-up in city by using congestion as traffic control tool. Thus in number of cases when a specific traffic bottle neck was reported, his decision was to do nothing about it, or to make it worse. When asked where it went, he responded: "Traffic is smart. If it can't move it just does away". (And he was and is right.)

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

11. **1965, Curitiba.** City launches first round of attempts to integrate transportation, land use and urban development in its first Master Plan, later leading to one of the developing world's premier model of innovation in the sector.
12. **1970s, USA.** HOV (high occupancy vehicle) reserved lanes and roads slowly come into being, with the goals of travel time savings and improved trip reliability of to provide incentives for individuals to change from driving alone to carpooling, vanpooling, or riding the bus. Currently, there are 96 HOV projects on freeways and in separate rights-of-way in 30 metropolitan areas in North America. These account for approximately 2,000 centerline miles of HOV lanes.
13. **1973, Portland, Oregon.** Mayor Neil Goldschmidt's administration, following the move of the Oregon Legislature to adopt the US's first set of land-use planning laws, puts them to work in their city and goes on to become one of US's outstanding sustainability practitioners, emphasizing mixed use, walkable neighborhood located rail transit. Residents tend to own fewer cars and drive less than in more automobile-oriented communities
14. **1973, Zurich** U-Bahn project voted down in referendum. Leading the city to tackle its transport problems on the surface and in time to create one of the world's most sustainable transportation system. (See. <http://ecoplan.org/politics/general/zurich.htm> for details.)
15. **1973, Vancouver.** Livable Region Strategy provides path-breaking example of the new approaches to citizen involvement in urban planning that began to develop, focusing attention on government/expert plans for major new development proposals such as freeways, subways and expansion of the airport.
16. **1974, Paris.** The massive "Voie Express Rive Gauche" urban highway project of French government abandoned by incoming President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing under pressure from environment activist led by Rene Dumont.
17. **1974, Amsterdam.** First Witkar electric carsharing station (another Schimmelpennink project) opens for business. Project hung on for close to a decade with minimum government support, and by end had more than 4000 users.
18. **1974, USA.** TDM -- Transportation-demand management: "the art of influencing traveler behavior for the purpose of reducing or redistributing travel demand." Concept institutionalized as part of transportation management system requirement and joint planning regulations set by Federal Highway Administration and Urban Mass Transportation Administration
19. **1975, Paris.** Carte Orange, monthly transport pass provides unlimited access to all parts of public transport system to pass holders.
20. **1975, Singapore.** Area Licensing Scheme (First road pricing scheme.)
21. **1982, Gothenburg,** Sweden. First Taxi-80 centralized, computer-based roving fleet dispatching system deployed by Volvo Transportation Systems. Over the decade spread to several dozen cities across mainly Europe where it is today increasingly standard practice.
22. **Late 1980s, Germany and Switzerland.** After years of small scale projects carsharing begins to emerge as a significant transportation option.
23. **1989, San Francisco.** Construction of Embarcadero Freeway of Interstate 480 terminated by public reactions and political pressure after earthquake. Only The Stub was left.
24. **1994, Toledo, Spain.** Thursday: Breakthrough Strategies for Transport in Cities". First international call for Car/Free Day experimentation.
25. **1994, Hertfordshire, UK.** First small scale Walk to School program meets some small success and by 200 leads to International Walk to School program. This year more than 3 million children walked to school in more than 30 countries during the 2-4 October celebrations.
26. **1995, Lancaster UK.** *Journal of World Transport Policy and Practice* founded: aims to provide validated information about latest developments in sustainable transport policy and practice to enable local authorities, governments, consultancies, NGOs and supra national organizations to speed up policy development and implement new ideas from around the world.
27. **1996, Reykjavik, La Rochelle, and Bath** organize first car/free day projects.
28. **1997, UK.** Clear Zones program created to reduce pollution and traffic in towns through partnerships between cities, industry, academia and Government.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

29. **2000, Bogota.** First mega-carfree day project in third world city takes 850,000 cars off the city streets for 13 hours, leads to a major revision in the transportation system, and wins Stockholm Challenge Prize for Environment with The Commons.
30. **2003, London.** Congestion Charging Scheme (changes the face of road pricing as a policy tool for transport in cities). Awarded the World Technology Prize for Environment for outstanding achievement in San Francisco celebration on 5 October 2004.

Before we leave this behind us, let's take a moment to reflect on what these couple of dozen brave innovational approaches have in common as we look ahead to ways in which each and all of us can do our bit to advance the New Mobility Agenda and all it stands for:

- Relative to most Old Mobility projects, they cost very little money.
- Most of them had small beginnings, and only once the principals behind them are proven do they take off.
- None of them have any of the "magic bullet" connotations that many of the larger old mobility projects often conjure up (and use to get support needed to get funded and built).
- All are intensely political.

Overall: all of these projects and experiments are moving in a board common direction -- and that is straight toward what we call the New Mobility Agenda: each as one small part of interactive complexes of transportation arrangements that work together to get us out of traffic and out of our cars when they simply no longer make sense, and still get us where we want to go, if anything quicker, fresher, healthier and cheaper than ever.

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

### Annex D - Epilogue: One 20/20 program that worked and why

---

In 2002 7,242 people died on the roads in France. The country was stuck at the tail-end of EU countries, three times more than the Swedish rate of deaths per million inhabitants and more than twice that of Britain where population and motorization levels are about the same.

The causes were well known: speed, a factor in 50% of fatal or serious accidents—almost 60% of cars, 66% of heavy goods vehicles and 76% of motorbikes thought to exceed the speed limit—and alcohol, implicated in more than one in three fatal accidents. Failure to wear a seat-belt, moreover, was responsible for 10% of deaths. Then, suddenly and quite unexpectedly, it became a national priority to do something about this and fast. And this a nutshell is what happened.

During the highly contended presidential elections of 2002, the candidate Jacques Chirac, who had broken a leg in a car accident in 1978, made road security a priority of his re-election campaign. Starting immediately after his election, he avowed that this was going to be among his highest priorities of his government. Refusing to let things continue go this way, on 14 July the incoming Head of the State showed his determination to make the fight against road violence a "national project for the five year term".

He then proceeded to make this happen, and today two years later, the number has dropped to 4,900. President Chirac's initiative has resulted in an unprecedented 20% reduction in road traffic deaths. In our 20/20 perspective, it is useful to see if we can spot what were some of the things that made this work.

This achievement is in fact due to a whole web of factors and a large number of actors:

- A efficient national media campaign, relaying the president's message, with reports daily and in high and vivid profile portraying reckless drivers' behavior and other news coverage from road safety activists
- The French police force has proven to be key to making changes. The Interior Minister has doubled the police force on the roads, focusing on drug- and alcohol-impaired driving and on wearing seat belts.
- The installation of a fast growing network of photo radar on the roads, highways and in unmarked police cars has also been instrumental.
- Each year, over one million fines are dodged by French motorists with friends within the police force and the bureaucracy. The government has taken steps to stop these interventions, and now no one is being spared, regardless of who they are or who they know (a new situation in which several ministers have now had direct personal experience)..

## The New Mobility 20/20 Emergency Target Initiative: An Introduction

- The law has been made more strict and fines more severe, with a jail sentence of up to seven years against those who cause a fatal crash. People driving under the influence such as drug and alcohol are being sentenced to jail.
- Probationary licenses for new drivers, and novice drivers may have their license revoked if they make too many mistakes during their 3 years probation.
- Senior drivers over 75 will soon be requested to take a mandatory medical test to keep their driving privileges.
- A greatly stepped-up road safety program in schools.

Fair enough and bravo!, but what is the point in the present context. The fact is that we are seeing here in this one concrete case what political will and continuous application, including a selling of the program and its objectives to the citizens at large, can do to crack one of the severest cars/people problems of modern society. A more than 20% improvement in a bit more than 20 months.

We can do the same.