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0. Summary:
Strategic recommendations to decision makers in politics in a nutshell

Core findings:

Mobility begins in the mind – and there's a great deal moving there. The USEmobility survey has shown that already today there is a lot of dynamism in people's modal choices. Almost half of all people belong to the group of so-called 'swing users', who switched in the last five years from the car to public transport or vice versa. This dynamism is an opportunity to motivate travellers to decide in favour of public transport and multimodality respectively. In fact the movements towards and away from public transport are still nearly balanced. This means: there is no automatism leading to a higher share of eco-friendly multimodal mobility.

Swing users’ behavioural patterns when choosing their means of transport are not only far more dynamic than expected, but also much more multimodal and much more pragmatic. Choosing one’s transport mode becomes more and more a dynamic case of opting for ‘both – one as well as the other’, and not so much a case of ‘either/or’. Changes to public transport are by no means always due to a person’s not owning a car. Seventy percent of swing users already use multimodal combinations, or decide flexibly as the case arises which mode of transport suits their purpose. Looking at swing users’ attitudes towards mobility, it is interesting to see that in all USEmobility countries mobility pragmatists comprise a considerable segment within the swing users. On average more than a quarter of swing users’ take a pragmatic point of view when choosing their mode of transport.

These results underpin the thesis that people's attitudes and values regarding mobility are changing remarkably. Basically one could say that ‘mobility’ is no longer automatically associated with the car, but with different types of mobility, including also mobile telephony and the Internet.

Considerable dynamism in people's modal choices. Openness to change is an opportunity, but not an automatism.

More familiarity with multimodality and more pragmatism than expected when choosing means of transport.
A further new and surprising insight of the USEmobility project has been how strongly changes in people's personal situation influence changes in their choice of means of transport. Over half of the survey participants stated that change in their personal situation (relocation, a new job, birth of children etc.) was a central motive for the process of reorientation.

The dynamism in people's modal choices, the ongoing change in users' attitudes towards mobility, as well as the influence of changes in people's personal situation have obviously been underestimated. The USEmobility project wants to contribute that these aspects are taken more fully into account when discussing future mobility.

It is clear, that besides users' attitudes and life situations further aspects are relevant to modal choices. In fact, the decision in favour of or against a certain means of transport is complex. Swing users usually indicate a mix of several factors in combination as relevant for their behavioural change.

The USEmobility project has made a comprehensive analysis of the relevant influencing factors. In order to make orientation easier for stakeholders, USEmobility has subdivided these factors into three main clusters:

1) User-related factors.
User-related factors are linked to the traveller’s personal circumstances and mobility experience, e.g. changes in the user’s personal situation and attitudes (for an overview see Appendix 1).

2) Offer-related factors.
Offer-related factors apply to the characteristics of the available transport alternatives (hard/soft factors, pull-in factors/push-out factors). Characteristics of central importance are for instance reachability, costs, journey time, frequency of connections, flexibility, but also environmental friendliness (for an overview see Appendix 1).

3) Transport policy related factors (framework).
This cluster addresses the impact of transport policy on people's modal choices.
The insights gained during the USEmobility project contribute to a better understanding of people’s modal choices and give useful orientation for further action to all players involved. For decision makers in politics, who work on different levels (from national level, to local levels and Public Transport Authorities), opportunities for action can be identified in all areas of action linked to the influencing factors. It is necessary that decision makers in politics start to work systematically on these influencing factors. Clear policy choices will increase the people’s willingness to change their mobility behaviour.

**Need for action:**

Since different policy levels as well as transportation companies take decisions in the public transport sector, cooperation and coordination between all players involved is a necessity. A permanent consultation and institutional cooperation should be implemented. A better integration of the users’ perspective is especially important.

People rethinking their mobility patterns need clear orientation and a reliable framework. However, people today receive mixed messages from transport policy. Although a higher market share for public transport is a policy objective in many countries, there are still many measures to support monomodal car use. This leads to considerable uncertainty not only for transport users, but also for the companies providing public and multimodal transport.

Transport policy should give priority to public transport and multimodality, instead of sending mixed messages. A coherent policy framework is the necessary basis for change. Different potentials in urban and in rural areas should be taken into account. Multimodality is a central issue in this respect. Crucial elements for a supportive policy framework are:

- Clear targets for a higher market share of public transport;
- Dual approach: On the one hand more and attractive public transport services and on the other hand abandoning incentives for monomodal car use;
- Better integration of transport into urban and spatial planning (land-use planning);
- Sufficient and reliable funding for public transport.

Better understanding of people’s modal choices discloses opportunities for action for all players involved.

Close cooperation between all players involved necessary, and better integration of the users' perspective.

Supportive and coherent policy framework for more eco-friendly multimodal mobility is necessary basis for change.
services and investments.

In order to achieve a higher market share of public transport and multimodality it is necessary to work on both, attracting new customers for public transport, and keeping current users from turning their backs on public transport.

People considering using regularly public transport and/or multimodal combinations expect services that are a real alternative to monomodal car use. The characteristics of the public transport offer are determined to a large extent by the providers of transportation services. However, transport policy also has a considerable influence on the offered services, since public transport authorities define the volume of services and standards as well as the level of funding. Crucial characteristics of an attractive public transport offers and well developed multimodal links are:

- **Satisfying ‘hard factors’**:  
  - Transport policy should improve reachability by public transport  
    (investments in infrastructure improvements and enhanced multimodality (stations / stops, bike and ride, park and ride, etc.));  
  - Transport policy should work on increasing the capacity of public transport (preparing for future growth);  
  - Public transport authorities should support and (co-) fund extended times of operation and integrated synchronised timetables;  
  - Public transport authorities should support competitive travel costs of public transport and common tickets for all public transport services (end-to-end tickets).

- **Satisfying ‘soft factors’**:  
  - Public transport authorities should integrate requirements for satisfying ‘soft factors’ (travel comfort, cleanliness, staff etc.) into the public service contracts and monitor these criteria during the contract period.

Habits and mobility routines play an important role in people’s daily mobility. In most cases people do not reconsider their mobility routines and modal choices until a far-reaching change in their personal situation gives an impulse (relocation, a new job, birth of children etc.). In all USEmobility countries swing

**Political support for attractive public transport services and well developed multimodal links necessary.**

**Transport policy must consider users’ personal circumstances and mobility experiences.**
users stated that changes in their personal situation had a major impact on their behavioural change. However, lack of experience with public transport is a considerable barrier for changes in the mobility-mix. Despite this a systematic assistance to people whose personal situation is changing is usually still missing. Furthermore, knowledge transfer and information about public transport for non-users provided by transport policy and authorities is still underdeveloped.

Transport policy aiming at more public transport and multimodality, should provide relevant information proactively. Information should take into account the needs of different target groups (e.g. younger / elderly people (demographic change), disabled users, different travel purposes, etc.). This can be achieved by:

- Directly addressing people, whose life circumstances have changed (welcome packages, info packages);
- Improving information about public transport and multimodality (integration of knowledge transfer into the education process, awareness-raising campaigns, mobility trainings and mobility management)
Overview: USEmobility recommendations to decision makers in politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of action</th>
<th>General recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Intensifying cooperation between all players involved (page 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitating consultation and cooperation (page 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrating the users’ view (page 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a common vision for future mobility on national level (page 22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of action</th>
<th>Area of action ‘policy framework’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations (by 2020)</td>
<td>Defining targets and establishing a coherent policy framework (page 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Targets for an increased market share of public transport (page 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving priority to public transport and multimodality – Dual approach (page 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear distribution of tasks (page 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovation (page 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gearing transport policy with other policies (page 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specifying existing policy objectives for the transport sector (page 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated approach (page 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Linking urban / spatial planning with transport (page 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safeguarding funding (page 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sufficient funding (infrastructure and services) (page 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Secure funding for longer periods (page 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficiency and incentives to attract more passengers (page 32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations (by 2050)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of action</th>
<th>Area of action ‘offered services’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safeguarding mobility with less traffic</strong> (page 57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paradigm change: Improved quality of life instead of more traffic (page 58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defining minimum reachability standards for car-free mobility (page 58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fiscal incentives for multimodal mobility (page 58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restricting car use in certain areas (page 58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improving reachability by public transport</strong> (page 35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investments in infrastructure improvements (stations, stops, lines) (page 36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced multimodality (page 36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimising the services offered</strong> (page 37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated synchronised timetables and extended times of operation (page 38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reducing travel times (page 39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less transfers / optimised transfer situations (page 39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth oriented capacity building (page 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offering a simple and user-friendly pricing system</strong> (page 41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common ticket for different services (ticket- or tariff-integration) (page 42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexible conditions of use (page 43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Making public transport attractive for different travel purposes and different user groups
(➔page 44)

- Tariff offers for specific travel purposes or specific customer groups
  (➔page 45)
- Information for specific travel purposes
  (➔page 46)

Taking soft factors seriously
(➔page 46)

- Quality requirements
  (➔page 47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of action</th>
<th>Area of action ‘travellers / customers’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommendations| Directly addressing people whose life circumstances have changed
  (➔page 49)
  - Welcome packages
    (➔page 50)
  - Packages for further target groups
    (➔page 50)

Improving knowledge about public transport and multimodality
(➔page 51)

- Mobility management (information and advice)
  (➔page 52)
- Training on mobility (workshops)
  (➔page 53)
- Transfer of knowledge about public transport in school teaching
  (➔page 53)
- Awareness-raising campaigns
  (➔page 53)
1. Introduction

1.1 USEmobility approach for strategic recommendations

These strategic recommendations to decision makers in politics are part of a series of strategic recommendations within the project “USEmobility – Understanding Social Behaviour for Eco-friendly multimodal mobility”. USEmobility is being funded by the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) of the European Commission.

USEmobility – Understanding Social Behaviour for Eco-friendly multimodal mobility focuses on regional and local mobility, as short- and medium-distance travel is the biggest part of people’s daily mobility. “Multimodal” refers to the use of more than one transport mode in people’s mobility patterns or transport chains, “eco-friendly” to the integration of public transport, as well as walking and cycling.

The central assumption of the USEmobility project is that a better understanding of social behaviour for eco-friendly multimodal mobility can contribute towards more sustainable mobility. On the question of what actually motivates people to use eco-friendly modes of transport, particularly public transport and multimodal transport chains more intensively, the USEmobility project has come up with a range of interesting new insights. It has also demonstrated that the potential for more eco-friendly mobility in Europe has in no way been exhausted. In view of the challenges that we are facing in the transport sector – the keywords here are climate protection, resource conservation and land-use, as well as demographic change – actually exploiting the potential for more public transport and more multimodality should not be left to chance.

Action is needed – and all stakeholders involved need to act together. When it comes to organising public transport and multimodal transport, many stakeholders are involved:

- Decision makers in politics, who work on different levels (from the EU, through national levels, to Public Transport Authorities) to determine the framework for our transport systems and finance the infrastructure and transport services;
- Transportation companies that offer and organise public transport;
- Civil society organisations, such as passenger and consumer groups, environmental organisations as well as trade unions, that articulate public interest in user-friendly mobility with low environmental impact and often provide valuable input for developing and improving the system.

In order to realise changes that will motivate more people to switch to public transport, all these stakeholders have to take action, and for this reason the USEmobility project addresses its strategic recommendations directly to the target groups named above:
1.2 Structure and aims of strategic recommendations

Chapter 1 and 2 describe the structure and aim of this publication and give a brief overview of the challenges and opportunities that exist in the area of passenger mobility. This part is the same for all addressees (stakeholders).

Subsequently, in chapter 3, a differentiated discussion takes place within each deliverable to determine which areas of action are particularly relevant to the individual stakeholder groups, and which specific strategic recommendations can be derived from these. Two time frames have been defined for the strategic recommendations: a medium-term time frame until 2020, and a long-term time frame until 2050. To facilitate the implementation of the recommendations, some are illustrated with best-practice examples to demonstrate how an expedient course of action can be conceived (knowledge transfer, inspiration).

The aim of these recommendations is twofold:
- To disseminate the USEmobility project’s insights into users’ reasons for choosing a mode of transport (inform the relevant stakeholders) and thereby to unlock the potential that lies in better understanding users’ decisions.
- To give the individual stakeholders a quick overview of the most important areas of action for increasing public transport / multimodality and to provide them with orientation and inspiration for their own actions by means of selected best-practice examples (‘learn more and get inspired’, making no claim to completeness).

As part of the USEmobility project, strategic recommendations will be formulated. Strategic recommendations are oriented towards potential and targets, and are of a general nature, which means that they are transferable and applicable to a variety of situations, countries and regions. In concrete situations there are, as a rule, different possible operative measures that can and must be considered locally on an individual basis.

In other words, these strategic recommendations cannot and should not replace the development of a strategy as a concrete basis for making decisions. The strategic recommendations should in fact help stakeholders to recognise opportunities in their own country or region, and inspire them to realise the potential in the user-oriented development of the public transport system, and therefore to increase eco-friendly multimodal mobility.

We hope all stakeholders will enjoy reading the recommendations and consider this document a helpful tool for their future work!
2. Turn challenges into opportunities

2.1 Challenges

“Still, the transport system is not sustainable. Looking 40 years ahead, it is clear that transport cannot develop along the same path.” was the unsurprisingly sober conclusion reached by the European Commission in its current transport white paper (see: White Paper on Transport COM(2011) 144 final). In view of the existing challenges, in fact a ‘business as usual’ mentality is for the transport sector neither desirable nor viable.

“The next decade is likely to be one of transition for the transport system”, the European Commission declared already in its 2009 report “A sustainable future for transport” (see COM(2009) 279 final). The structure of mobility in the future and the transition that we are facing require a clear overall concept. Mobility in the 21st century has to become more sustainable, in other words it must increase energy efficiency, reduce environmental impact, reduce pollution and noise emissions, and make more careful use of resources. But how can this transition be managed?

Technical innovation will not be the only factor having a major influence, but above all the course set out by policy makers, the decisions made by transport sector stakeholders and finally, and centrally, the behaviour and decisions of the users of transport systems.

Making mobility more sustainable is a challenge that cannot be met without fostering more eco-friendly modes of transport. In the case of passenger transport, these are public transport (bus, tram and rail), and also cycling and walking. The railways for example emit per passenger-kilometre considerably less CO2 than private cars. Rail transport performs better by a factor of between 2 and 11, depending on the concrete technology, the occupancy rate and (in the case of electrified rail) the energy mix in the power supply. Therefore, modal shift towards public transport is an important means of transport policy.

In order to achieve the transition needed it will be decisive to make sure that people are ‘on board’ when changes are made. To this end, the USEmobility project will make a contribution by examining the reasons why users decided to modify their modal choice. Focusing on people’s needs, and better understanding their decisions, is an important basis for taking action with the aim of structuring our transport system for the future.

2.2 USEmobility insights – opportunities for change

The USEmobility project focuses on regional and local mobility, as short- and medium-distance travel is the biggest part of people’s daily mobility. This area is especially important for eco-friendly modal choices. In this context the USEmobility survey (see USEmobility report D3.6
and, for an overview, appendix 1) has delivered a series of new and promising insights:

### 2.2.1 Dynamism in modal choice – many swing users

In choosing their mode of transport, users behave far more dynamically than one would expect when examining today’s modal split, which appears to be rather static. Almost half of the people contacted during the USEmobility survey said that they had modified their mobility mix in the last five years. This means that already today half of all people belong to the group of so-called ‘swing users’, who switched from the car to public transport or vice versa. This result shows that there is a lot of dynamism in people’s choice of transport mode. For practical purposes this insight is of great importance: Where there is a great deal of movement there is also the opportunity for policy makers and transportation companies to motivate travellers to decide in favour of public transport.

### 2.2.2 Openness to multimodality

Thirty percent of swing users are aware of the advantages of combining multiple modes of transport for a journey and use multimodal chains. A further forty percent of swing users now decide as the case arises which mode of transport suits their purpose. Choosing one’s transport mode becomes more and more a dynamic case of opting for ‘both – one as well as the other’, and not so much a case of ‘either/or’. For the majority of swing users, multimodal travel is already a reality. Overall, the change to public transport is by no means always due to a person’s not owning a car. Multimodal users of public transport make a conscious decision when to use cars, and when not.

### 2.2.3 Changes in personal situation often trigger shifts in the mobility-mix

A new and surprising insight of the USEmobility project has been how strongly changes in people’s personal situation influence changes in their choice of means of transport. Over half of the survey participants stated that change in their personal situation (relocation, a new job, birth of children etc.) was a central motive for the process of reorientation. Such changes in life circumstances relevant to the choice of transport mode do happen frequently. Greater consideration and individual attention shown towards people in a situation of change will, therefore, offer transport policy-makers as well as providers of transportation services, a good opportunity to attract new customers to public transport or multimodal combinations, especially where there is already a well developed public transport offer.

### 2.2.4 Interesting user segments

For users, the decision to change is based on their own personal background and attitudes. According to their attitude towards different modes of transport, swing users can be more precisely subdivided into various segments. The most important group of swing users covers the public transport / motorised individual transport pragmatists with 26 percent. These people
take a pragmatic point of view when choosing their mode of transport. They make different decisions according to the situation they are in, and are the most dynamic group in their behavioural patterns. It is interesting to see that in all USEmobility countries (except the Netherlands) pragmatic swing users cover a considerably bigger segment than the group of clearly car oriented swing users. Another important segment covers the advocates of public transport who are somewhat reserved in their attitude towards motorised individual transport. This insight is also of great importance. Where there is great openness to public transport and multimodality there is also the opportunity for policy makers and companies to motivate travellers to decide in favour of public transport.

The insights gained are very similar in all project countries, suggesting that they are also applicable to other European countries that did not participate in the USEmobility project.

3. Strategic recommendations to decision makers in politics

3.1 Areas of action and relevance for stakeholders

The USEmobility project has focused on reasons for behavioural change in European citizens’ mobility. As a main result, USEmobility has identified the most relevant influencing factors that have motivated people to change their mobility behaviour.

The decision in favour of or against a certain means of transport is complex. Usually swing users indicate a mix of several factors in combination that are relevant for their behavioural change. These influencing factors can be subdivided into three main clusters:

- User-related factors
- Offer-related factors
- Transport policy related factors (framework)
From a strategic point of view, better understanding the key influencing factors is the basis for further action. If stakeholders work systematically on improving these factors, people’s willingness to change their mobility behaviour will increase.

USEmobility derives three areas of action from these main clusters. The strategic recommendations in this document are structured according to these areas of action. Recommendations that cannot be specifically assigned to one of the three areas are defined as general recommendations and precede the other recommendations.
Developing ways towards more sustainable mobility is a structural task that makes demands on many stakeholders. The exact constellation of stakeholders and their respective levels of authority differ from country to country and even from region to region, and must therefore be determined on an individual basis. It is obvious that not all areas of action are of the same relevance for all stakeholders addressed by the USEmobility project, as different stakeholders have different responsibilities. And, as already noted, it is important to keep in mind that in the mobility sector responsibilities of different stakeholders often overlap. Nevertheless it is possible to define core areas of responsibility for specific stakeholders.

3.2 Political action is needed – the role of transport policy

Decision makers in politics and administrative bodies, who work on different levels (from national level down to regional or local Public Transport Authorities), play a decisive role when it comes to future eco-friendly multimodal mobility. The political influence on the transport market and mobility behaviour has three main dimensions. In all of these, political action is needed, if the institutions involved want to tap the potential for more public transport and multimodality.
- Policy defines objectives and sets framework conditions:

The framework set for the entire transport policy has a strong impact on the future development of public transport and multimodal mobility. The framework conditions reflect political priorities, influence costs and conditions of use for the different modes of transport and also determine, whether there is a level playing field between the competing transport modes.

In all USEmobility countries, remarkable attempts are made to make public transport and multimodality more attractive for users and an increasing market share is stated as a transport policy objective (for details see USEmobility report D2.2). However, it can’t be said that transport policy already focuses clearly on fostering the use of public transport. Quite on the contrary, there are still many measures to support individual car use, such as subsidies for car purchase, tax benefits when using company cars, free parking, road-oriented urban and spatial planning, etc. (for details see USEmobility report D4.4).

Such mixed signals lead to considerable uncertainty not only for transport users rethinking their mobility behaviour, but also for the companies providing public and multimodal transport. A coherent policy framework is necessary instead of mixed signals.

- Policy decides on infrastructure investments:

For all transport modes transport policy decides on infrastructure investments. The ability to offer transport services depends on the density, capacity and quality of the available infrastructure. Intermodal connections between different transport modes (e.g. park and ride facilities) are becoming more and more important. This means that the future of public transport and multimodal mobility is strongly influenced by political decisions concerning infrastructure investments.

- Public transport authorities define targets and standards for the transport services offered and decide about the level of funding:

In most European countries, national and local authorities and administrative bodies play an important role when it comes to local and regional public transport. Although the situation differs from country to country, in recent years a stricter separation of responsibilities between transport policy and administrative bodies (public transport authorities) on the one hand and transportation companies on the other hand can be observed. While the authorities define targets and standards and decide about the level of funding, the companies act as providers and organisers of services in the transport market. The responsibility assignment between authorities and companies is now often based on public service contracts. In some European countries public service contracts are subject to a tendering process. Independently from the organisational structure, which differs from country to country, this means: The political will of the responsible authorities – including the willingness to fund – therefore determines to a large extent whether public transport meets the users’ expectations.

It follows from the above that the strategic recommendations for decision makers in politics will not focus on the area of action ‘policy framework’ alone, but will also address the areas of action ‘offered services’ as well as ‘travellers / customers’.
3.3 Recommendations and practical examples medium-term (by 2020) in detail

Based on the insights gained in the USEmobility project, the strategic recommendations identify the most important topics that are relevant to addressees in the individual areas of action. They are intended to aid the addressees in the decision-making process by offering them orientation as to priority (importance) and potential of the individual topics. In this chapter only those recommendations have been chosen, which can realistically be implemented by 2020.

The recommendations and the measures given by way of example (best practice, but also new ideas) illustrate the possibilities for action. The examples make no claim to completeness but are intended to inspire addressees to develop their own mix of measures, by offering them a ‘toolbox’ for fostering public transport and multimodality.

3.3.1 General strategic recommendations

3.3.1.1 Intensifying cooperation between all players involved

**Context / Relevance:** As different authorities and companies take decisions in the public transport sector, cooperation between all players involved is a necessity already today. Moreover, the importance will grow, if multimodality is developed further and for example car sharing or bike rental offers will be integrated into public transport. Further aspects with a considerable need for cooperation, but so far rarely addressed systematically, are for example: regional development and strategies for public transport and multimodality, or demographic change and mobility. Good cooperation resulting in more flexibility and well coordinated services (intra- and intermodal) is of high influence on the users’ decision towards public or multimodal transport. So the potential for fostering the use of public transport and multimodality is considerable, while the costs for permanent consultation and cooperation are comparatively low.
Facilitating consultation and cooperation

Transport policy aiming at more public transport use and multimodality, should try to facilitate a permanent consultation and institutional cooperation between all players involved, on local, regional and national level. A starting point should be measures, facilitating consultation and cooperation on local or regional level, which is close to the transport needs of most people.

Integrating the users’ view

In order to integrate the users’ view it is crucial to include customer organisations in consultation and cooperation directly, e.g. by establishing passenger advisory boards.

Creating a common vision for future mobility on national level

Consultation and cooperation must be tackled on a national level too, which implies that national governments are the main responsible for facilitating this cooperation. A concrete measure could be the development of a master plan for passenger transport. The master plan would create a common vision for affordable and environmentally friendly mobility in the future. Multimodality and public transport must play a central role in the strategy, as well as spatial planning concepts fostering alternatives to individual car use. The national government has to coordinate such a master plan in cooperation with regional and local political levels, the providers of transportation services and relevant civil society organisations including customer organisations.
Learn more and get inspired

Integrating the users' view

In the Gelderland region (the Netherlands), it is mandatory for public transport authorities and transportations companies to ask passenger organisations for their opinion before making decisions about timetables, tariffs or public service contracts. For details see:

http://www.rocovgelderland.nl/over-rocov

The Rhein-Main-Verkehrsverbund, which is responsible for organising and coordinating public transport in Rhine-Main-Area in Germany, is an example of how the users' view is taken into account by establishing a passenger advisory board. Represented in the board are individuals as well as civil society organisations such as passenger associations. The advisory board meets four times a year, and has already initiated concrete improvements. For details see:

http://www.rmv.de/de/Verschiedenes/Informationen_zum_RMV/Der_RMV/Wir_ueber_uns/Struktur_des_RMV/33022/RMV-Fahrgastbeirat.html

Master plan for affordable and environmentally friendly mobility

In December 2012, the Austrian Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology adopted a master plan for transport (“Gesamtverkehrsplan für Österreich”). The aim is to make the transport system more environmentally friendly, more social, safer and more efficient. More public transport plays a central role in the strategy, as well as enhanced multimodality. A nationwide integrated synchronised timetable (clock-face schedule) should be introduced and better traveller information systems.

For details see:
http://www.bmvit.gv.at/verkehr/gesamtverkehr/gvp/
and http://www.bmvit.gv.at/presse/aktuell/nvm/2012/1214OTS0129.html

3.3.2 Strategic recommendations in the ‘policy framework’ area of action

Framework conditions set by transport policy have considerable influence on users’ mobility patterns and modal choices (see USEmobility reports D2.1, D2.2 and D4.4). The following recommendations focus on aspects relevant to the achievement of framework conditions that will motivate more people to switch to public transport and multimodality. These aspects should be given priority within the ‘policy framework’ area of action.
3.3.2.1 Defining targets and establishing a coherent policy framework

**Context / Relevance:** Although an increasing market share of public transport and multimodality can be found as a policy objective in many European countries on national or local level, a clear strategy and a coherent policy framework are missing in most cases (see USEmobility reports D2.2 and D4.4). The main problems are:

- **Conflicting concepts / mixed messages.**
  In most cases, transport policy still adheres to isolated decision making for the different means of transport, resulting in fostering monomodal car use and public transport/multimodality at the same time. This lack of coherence in transport policy leads to wrong incentives and uncertainty for all players involved.

- **Sometimes unclear distribution of tasks between the stakeholders involved and the different policy levels.**

- **A lack of concrete measures and targets, even when fostering public transport and multimodality is stated as a general policy objective.**
**Figure 5 – Strategic recommendation: Defining targets and establishing a coherent policy framework**

**Targets for an increased market share of public transport**

A coherent transport policy should be straightforward and transparent and offer a clear concept for the further development of public transport and multimodality. The starting point should be to **define targets for a higher market share of public transport** as well as a time frame for reaching the targets. Clear targets give orientation and planning reliability to all players, not least to the users themselves. Furthermore, clear targets are the necessary basis for decisions about infrastructural development and capacity planning.

**Giving priority to public transport and multimodality – Dual approach**

The next step is to **give priority to public transport and multimodality**. This requires a dual approach: on the one hand improving the attractiveness of the offered services, which should be a real alternative to private car use (for details see the following chapters 3.3.3 and 3.3.4) and on the other hand abandoning incentives for monomodal car use. It is necessary to establish a good combination of both, incentives for using public transport and multimodality and abandoning incentives for motorised individual transport. Today, transport policy still takes many measures stimulating monomodal car use, e.g. missing or insufficient speed limits on motorways, tax benefits for private use of company cars, tax benefits for commuting by car, generous road network and free infrastructure use, especially free parking space, as well as the duty for house owners or companies to provide a certain number of parking spaces. These
measures influence the modal choice massively, as they strengthen decisive pull-in factors towards monomodal car use (reachability, flexibility and costs, see USEmobility report D3.6), and should therefore be stopped.

Clear distribution of tasks

For a sound policy framework it is crucial to define clearly the roles and responsibilities: who decides what and who pays for which costs? A clear distribution of tasks is necessary between transport policy and the providers of transportation services but to the same degree between the different political levels (national, federal, regional, municipal).

Innovation

Finally, a user-oriented multimodal transport system needs constant innovation. Therefore transport policy should support research and innovation with regard to public transport and multimodality.

Innovation should not be understood in a technical sense only, but should also include innovative mobility concepts. Public institutions should support such innovation. For instance it should become mandatory for public employers to develop and implement sustainable mobility plans for their employees. The choice of location should be made with regard to a good reachability by public transport, cycling and walking; car parking space should be reduced while more and better parking facilities for bikes should be offered. In cooperation with the providers of transportation services attractive fare conditions should be offered for commuters. The obligation to establish public transport and multimodality oriented mobility concepts can be expanded also to private enterprises with a larger number of employees.

Learn more and get inspired:

**Targets for an increased market share of public transport:**

Luxemburg has recently defined such a target. By 2020 the market share of public transport is set to rise to 25 percent from today's 14 percent.

For details see:

The city of Berlin has set the target that by 2025 eco-friendly mobility (walking, cycling, public transport) should cover 75 percent of all passenger movements in the city.

For details see:
Dual approach:
The city of Zurich has developed a comprehensive mobility strategy. Eco-friendly mobility (walking, cycling, public transport) is fostered, while incentives for car use are reduced: The number of public parking areas will be limited and the obligation for house owners to build parking places will be partly abandoned.
For details see: http://www.zuerich.ch/content/ted/de/index/taz/mobilitaet/mobilitaetsstrategie/teilstrategien.html

Innovative mobility concepts:
In the Brussels region in Belgium mobility plans are now mandatory for all employers with more than 100 employees. By implementing mobility plans a modal shift to public transport, cycling and carpooling is to be fostered. The general aim is reduction of car traffic in the Brussels region by 20 percent by 2018.
For details see: http://www.ejustice.just.fgov.be/cgi_loi/change_lg.pl?language=nl&la=N&table_name=wet&cn=2011040708

3.3.2.2 Gearing transport policy with other policies

Context / Relevance: Any approach to foster eco-friendly multimodal mobility can only succeed if there is an effective coordination of the different policy levels and the different policies. National and regional governments are responsible for coordinating the different policies and for supporting local authorities when taking action. A need for better integration exists especially with regard to environmental policy as well as to energy policy, which are closely linked to transport. Furthermore, transport and mobility play an important role for social inclusion. Finally, there is a strong interdependency between mobility patterns and urban and spatial planning, which must be addressed by transport policy more intensively.
Specifying existing policy objectives for the transport sector

In order to achieve tangible results, objectives in other policies should be specified for the transport sector. For example, the national targets for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions will hardly be reached, as long as a significant reduction of CO₂ emissions from transport is missing. Therefore specific targets for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions should be defined for transport, as well as strategies how to meet these targets. The same applies to targets for reduction of energy consumption.

Integrated approach

In order to meet reduction targets in the transport sector an integrated approach is necessary. An integrated approach shouldn’t focus on technical improvements within the individual modes of transport alone, but must also take into account the potentials for modal shift and traffic avoidance.

Linking urban / spatial planning with transport

Special attention should be paid to a better integration of transport into urban and spatial planning, as here the influence of political priorities on the users’ decision making process is most direct. The keyword is reachability. The USEmobility survey (see USEmobility report D3.6) has shown that reachability (near access to public transport and good reachability of

Figure 6 – Strategic recommendation: Gearing transport policy with other policies
destinations and places by public transport) is one of the most decisive pull-in factors towards public transport. Transport policy therefore should decide to abandon road-oriented urban and spatial planning concepts. The alternative are urban and spatial planning concepts, which intend to establish structures facilitating the use of public transport and multimodality. Effective elements are establishing axial structures (locating new residential or industrial areas so that these are arranged along and/or directed to public transport routes), the concept “city of short distances” / “compact city” (which avoids unnecessary traffic and promotes walking, cycling and public transport), parking space management or car-free districts.

Such urban and spatial planning concepts also contribute to social inclusion and affordable mobility as the need for motorised transport is lower.

When it comes to new concepts for spatial planning, of course a differentiated approach is needed for urban and rural areas. Generally speaking, offering a public transport chain from start to destination is far more feasible and (cost-)efficient in urban areas than it is in the countryside. Therefore especially in rural areas, multimodal solutions move into the spotlight. Regular line-bound public transport like regional rail should in rural areas form the backbone of a multimodal transport chain. For bridging the ‘last mile’ (or ‘first mile’ respectively) the user can combine these line-bound services with other modes of transport, like bike, e-bike, hailed shared taxis or private car. Therefore for rural areas spatial planning should ensure a basic public transport offer, as well as good multimodal connections to other means of transport (park&ride, bike&ride, etc.).

Learn more and get inspired:

Specifying existing policy objectives for the transport sector:

In its current White Paper on Transport, the EU has for the first time stipulated concrete targets for reducing the CO₂ emissions of the transport sector in Europe: by 2050, the transport sector must reduce its green house gas emissions by at least 60 percent, compared with the year 1990. In a first step, the transport sector must reduce its green house gas emissions by at least 20 percent by 2030, compared with the year 2008.

For details see:

In 2010, the German government adopted an Energy Concept with targets for the reduction of energy consumption. The targets have been specified for the transport sector: In the transport sector, final energy consumption is to decrease by about 10 percent by 2020 and by about 40 percent by 2050, the baseline in this case being 2005.

For details see:
http://www.bmwi.de/English/Redaktion/Pdf/energy- concept.property=pdf,bereich=bmwisprache=en,nwb=true.pdf
or
http://www.bmwi.de/BMWi/Redaktion/PDF/Publikationen/energiekonzept- 2010.property=pdf,bereich=bmwisprache=de,nwb=true.pdf
**Holistic view: Linking urban / spatial planning with transport:**

In 1989, the so-called ABC planning has been introduced in the Netherlands, which classifies urban development areas according to the conditions of transport. Office buildings or other facilities with a large number of employees and many visitors are mainly located in A zones. These are places with excellent public transport and poor car accessibility (e.g. only 1 parking place for 10 employees). The aim is to reduce the amount of traffic and to increase the share of public transport and cycling.

For details see: http://www.eltis.org/studies/leda10.htm

The district Vauban in the City of Freiburg in Germany is a district with restricted car accessibility. Car owners must park their vehicles in one of the two parking lots on the edge of the district. Mobility is guaranteed by good public transport (tram) and car-sharing.

For details see: http://www.vauban.de/info/verkehrsprojekt/index.html

### 3.3.2.3 Safeguarding funding

**Context / Relevance:** Sufficient and constant funding is of particular importance for the future development of public transport and multimodal mobility. Especially the infrastructure for public transport (as well as the road infrastructure), but also attractive local and regional transport services, which are a real alternative to private car use, cannot be financed by the users alone and therefore need public (co-)funding. The two aspects, infrastructure (reachability) and attractiveness of the offered services are highly relevant for the users’ decision towards public transport and multimodality (see USEmobility report D3.6).
Sufficient funding (infrastructure and services)

When it comes to funding issues, it is clear that transport policy has a difficult situation. Many other policies have financing needs and budgets are limited. Due to the financial crisis in many European countries the situation even has become more difficult. Nevertheless adequate (co-)funding is the prerequisite for the development of public transport and multimodal mobility in the future. Basically, today’s transport infrastructure investments determine tomorrow’s modal split.

Transport policy wanting to support the necessary change should therefore give priority to funding of public transport and multimodality. This includes more funds for infrastructure investments, as well as for services. The funding should aim at more capacity and quality in order to enable further growth and modal shift. As funds are limited, other priorities for road investments are necessary, too. Transport policy should partly earmark the road infrastructure budget for projects fostering public transport and multimodality, for example for building separate lanes for buses and trams, park and ride facilities, bike and ride facilities or multimodal hubs. Investments in new road infrastructure to be built parallel to existing public transport infrastructures (e.g. a new motorway parallel to an existing railway line) must be avoided. This will prevent unwanted incentives for shifts towards monomodal car use and also contributes to tackling budgetary limitations.
Secure funding for longer periods

The continuity of (co-)funding is as important as an adequate amount. Reliable financial relations between transport policy (public transport authorities) and providers of transportation services are a prerequisite for good service quality and attracting passengers.

On the one hand, financial stability is needed by the users. If users can’t rely on a constant availability of services, they will quit public transport. Examples from USEmobility countries show that reduced offer due to funding cutbacks will lead to a significant loss of passengers (see USEmobility report D4.4). This can result in a downward spiral, as the remaining services will be less in demand. On the other hand, providers of transportation services need planning reliability. Uncertainty about future funding will hamper necessary investments, for example in rolling stock. Therefore it is crucial that transport policy commits itself to assure funding for longer periods.

Efficiency and incentives to attract more passengers

If transport policy decides in favour of more funding for public transport and multimodal mobility, it is important to ensure efficiency and to establish structures, which provide clear incentives to attract more passengers. Such incentives are especially important for public service contracts between public transport authorities and providers of transportation services and should encourage transportation companies to be innovative and customer- and market-oriented.

The German example shows that sufficient and secure co-funding can contribute to both, more efficiency and more passengers. Since the mid 1990s, there is a permanent public co-funding for regional train services (so called ‘Regionalisierungsmittel’) in Germany. From 1997 to 2011 the funding has risen by 12.8 percent, while the number of passengers in regional trains has risen by 50.9 percent.

Learn more and get inspired:

Secure funding for longer periods:
Since the mid 1990s, there is a permanent public co-funding for regional train services (so called ‘Regionalisierungsmittel’) in Germany. For details see:

http://www.allianz-pro-schiene.de/service/glossar/regionalisierungsmittel/
http://www.forschungsinformationssystem.de/servlet/is/298720/
3.3.3 Strategic recommendations in the ‘offered services’ area of action

The USEmobility project has chosen the following recommendations according to the importance of the related influencing factors for the users’ decision making process. For the ‘offered services’ area of action they hence cover the aspects with the highest potential for a shift towards public transport and eco-friendly multimodal mobility. These aspects should be given priority within the ‘offered services’ area of action.

The USEmobility survey (see USEmobility report D3.6) has investigated the users’ reasons for modifying their modal choice. As most relevant for their decision the swing users usually cite a mix of

a) changes in personal situation (user-related factors) and
b) influence of offer-related factors.

The offer-related factors can be further subdivided into

- **pull-in factors** (attractiveness of a mode of transport, resulting in a more frequent use)
- **push-out factors** (dissatisfaction with a mode of transport, resulting in a less frequent use).

While the user-related factors will be addressed in the following chapter 3.3.4, in this chapter strategic recommendations will be given with regard to offer-related factors.

The USEmobility survey has shown that classical ‘hard’ offer-related factors influencing the modal choice (like reachability, costs, journey time, waiting times, number of transfers, frequency of connections) have the highest decision relevance in both, the decision to use public transport and multimodality more often or, on the contrary, to quit public transport.

The influence of so-called ‘soft’ offer-related factors is less pronounced than the influence of ‘hard’ factors, but still considerable. Unsatisfactory soft factors can be decisive for a decision to quit public transport. Among the soft factors, flexibility, planning effort, availability of information and environmental friendliness have the highest relevance, followed by comfort of travel, atmosphere on the journey and staff.

For an overview of the most relevant pull-in and push-out factors concerning public transport see appendix 1.

Both hard and soft factors can influence the decision making process as pull-in factors or push-out factors. For example, a high frequency of public transport connections will influence the decision making process as pull-in factor towards public transport, while a poor frequency of public transport connections will work as push-out factor.

Transport policy aiming at more public transport and multimodality, should work on both, attracting new customers for public transport, by strengthening pull-in factors towards public transport, and keeping current public transport users from leaving the system by minimising push-out factors of existing public transport offers. It is important to keep in mind that transport policy should also take responsibility by no longer stimulating monomodal car use (coherent policy framework, see chapter 3.3.2).
The characteristics of the public transport offer are determined to a large extent by the providers of transportation services. Nevertheless, transport policy has a considerable influence on the transport offer since public transport authorities define targets and standards and decide about the level of funding (see above chapter 3.2). The following strategic recommendations reflect this influence, not denying that in most cases a close cooperation with the providers of transportation services is necessary.

Figure 8 – Overview: Strategic recommendations in the ‘offered services’ area of action
3.3.3.1 Improving reachability by public transport

**Context / Relevance:** Reachability is the most crucial offer-related pull-in factor for a user’s decision to start or to increase the use of public transport. 52 percent of the swing users, who decided to shift towards public transport, stated that good reachability had a strong or decisive influence on their behavioural change (near access to public transport and good reachability of destinations and places by public transport; see USEmobility report D3.6). Accordingly, unsatisfactory reachability is one of the most relevant push-out factors regarding public transport.

Obviously reachability is closely linked to infrastructure investments. The need to invest in reachability by public transport services becomes even more clear when considering that in European countries reachability by motorised individual transport has improved significantly in recent decades due to massive road network extensions, while public transport infrastructure in most cases suffers from underinvestment (see USEmobility report D2.2).

![Figure 9 – Strategic recommendation: Improving reachability by public transport](image-url)
Investments in infrastructure improvements (stations, stops, lines)

Effective measures to improve reachability by public transport are well-directed infrastructure improvements and a better combination of different modes of transport (enhanced multimodality).

With regard to both measures transport policy can and should take action. Transport policy should invest in infrastructure improvements, which open up new potentials for more passengers. This means that the need for new stations or bus stops needs to be systematically considered in residential areas as well as at industrial estates, near commercial centres, schools etc.

Improvements in terms of reachability should not only focus on new stations or stops, but also on establishing new connections, if there is a sufficient potential for more passengers. This could mean a need for new infrastructure (new lines), for upgrading existing lines or for reactivating lines currently not in use.

Enhanced multimodality

Multimodality is a central aspect when it comes to improving reachability. It is obvious that it will not be possible to link each possible starting point or destination of a journey directly to a public transport service. In many cases, for ‘the last mile’, multimodal transport chains are a sensible solution. For most swing users multimodality is already a reality today (see USEmobility report D3.6), which indicates that combining public transport with other modes of transport is an attractive alternative for many people when direct access to public transport services is not available. Again, transport policy should contribute to enhanced multimodality by investing in necessary multimodal infrastructure. For a better combination of different modes, especially more park and ride facilities are needed as well as bike and ride facilities. While parking space for cars should be concentrated at bigger stations or central bus stops, a good reachability for people cycling or walking is necessary for all stations and stops.

Learn more and get inspired:

New stops for better reachability

In 2003 the new “Ringzug”-concept started in the Black Forest region in Southwest Germany. The aim was to improve the attractiveness of regional rail services. Investments in 41 new stops for regional rail have been realised and the number of passengers has risen significantly.

For details see:
http://www.ringzug.de/cms/de/9/Ringzug
New services on old tracks

In the Schönbuch area near Stuttgart in Germany in 1996 a local railway line was reactivated after 30 years without passenger services. The number of daily passengers almost quadrupled in comparison to the former bus service.

For details see:

Enhanced multimodality

In the Netherlands the bike sharing offer OV-fiets (Public Transport Bicycle) is available at almost all important train stations (180 stations). Travellers can now easily combine train and bike for multimodal transport chains. For details see:
http://www.ov-fiets.nl/

In many regions, new park and ride or bike and ride facilities are fostered by transport policy. An example is the “Park&Ride-Strategy” in the Austrian Federal state of Steiermark (Styria). For details see:
http://www.verkehr.steiermark.at/cms/ziel/28465402/DE/

In the Berlin-Brandenburg region in Germany the authorities started a “Bike&Ride-Programme” in cooperation with the transportation companies. For details see:
http://www.s-bahn-berlin.de/unternehmen/firmenprofil/mobilitaet.htm

3.3.3.2 Optimising the services offered

Context / Relevance: Attractive public transport services are highly relevant pull-in factors for a user’s decision to start or to increase the use of public transport (see USEmobility report D3.6). Especially short travel times, the availability of direct connections, frequency of connections and flexibility are key factors. 38 to 40 percent of the swing users, who decided to shift towards public transport, stated that these aspects had a strong or decisive influence on their behavioural change.

If users are dissatisfied with these aspects, their importance as push-out factors is even higher. For example 48 percent of the swing users, who decided to quit public transport, stated that overly long travel times had a strong or decisive influence on their behavioural change (see USEmobility report D3.6).
Integrated synchronised timetables and extended times of operation

Optimising the services offered is a task, which makes demands on transport policy, as well as on the providers of transportation services. Most promising is to prioritise those improvements, which enhance the attractiveness of the entire system. The role of transport policy and public transport authorities here is to define requirements and to assure the necessary funding.

In most cases public transport authorities have direct influence on timetables. When defining requirements, public transport authorities should pay special attention to this issue. One of the most effective measures to optimise the services offered and the flexibility of use is the introduction of integrated synchronised timetables (clock-face schedule).

An integrated synchronised timetable or clock-face timetable is a concept where public means of transport run at consistent intervals (e.g. every two hours or every hour or every 30 minutes...
etc.). This means that the minute of departure (as well as the minute of arrival) for a given service is the same every hour. Timetables based on this principle contribute significantly to the flexibility of use, as services are offered at regular intervals all day, not only during peak hours. They are easier to memorise for passengers, because departure times repeat themselves in a regular rhythm. Furthermore, connections to other services are the same all day, as their departure times also repeat themselves. Both easy to memorise departure times and repeating connections to other services will reduce planning effort and contribute to enhanced flexibility and simplicity of use. Optimised transfer times are a further advantage (see below).

Integrated synchronised timetables (clock-face timetables) can be attractive for public transport authorities, funding the services, as well as for transportation companies, because the repeating pattern makes more efficient use of personnel, infrastructure and vehicles, and can make resource planning easier.

Integrated synchronised timetables can be introduced step-by-step. The final aim should be the integration of all public transport modes, in order to make the multimodal combination of different services more attractive for the users. The concept of integrated synchronised timetables should be combined with extended times of operation and an adequate frequency of departures. Together, such measures will enhance the gain in flexibility and attractiveness.

Reducing travel times

Transport policy should also take action to reduce travel times for public transport users. Infrastructure improvements usually result in shorter travel times, either when upgrading an existent infrastructure or when building a new one. For bus or tram, separate lanes make the services independent from congestion. Additionally, public transport services should be given priority at crossroads with traffic lights by establishing systems influencing the traffic lights when a bus or tram is approaching. For rail services, electrification is a possibility not only for shorter travel times as electric trains accelerate much faster, but also for further improvement of the environmental performance.

It is important to note that measures to shorten travel times result not only in more attractiveness for users, but also in lower operation costs, since less rolling stock is needed for the same frequency of services.

Less transfers / optimised transfer situations

In most cases public transport authorities have direct influence on the introduction of direct services as well as on transfer situations. They should support more direct connections, which will improve the attractiveness for the users significantly.

However, in many cases transfers cannot be avoided completely. Therefore special attention should be paid to the transfer process. Short distances at transfer points and short waiting times are decisive success factors. When it comes to transfer points, connections at the same platform should be realised wherever possible. In some cases operational changes will be sufficient, in other cases redesigning stations or the implementation of new intermodal hubs is necessary in order to link different public transport modes at the same transfer point. Short waiting times can be achieved by means of a well coordinated timetable. Of course, timetable coordination should not be limited to rail services only, but should integrate all public transport
modes in order to facilitate multimodal transport chains. Again, synchronised timetables are a very suitable basis for better integration of all public transport modes (for synchronised timetables see above). Consistent intervals offer the opportunity to concentrate at hubs arrivals and departures of different lines in a very tight time frame, resulting in short transfer times.

**Growth oriented capacity building**

For transport policy aiming at a higher market share for public transport and multimodality, capacity is an important issue. Already today people decide to quit public transport or to use it less often, if they are confronted with overcrowding (see USEmobility report D3.6). It is important not to neglect capacity building, especially if (as recommended above) measures are taken to attract new customers by strengthening pull-in factors. Otherwise there is a risk that the success of these measures could be compensated by declining travel comfort. Therefore it is crucial that public transport authorities base their medium term decisions about frequency of services and seat capacity not only on the status quo demand, but also on future growth.

**Learn more and get inspired:**

**More passengers owing to better services**

There are many examples of improved services, including more frequent, faster and / or more direct connections, which have led to significantly more passengers. Further information about several German examples can be found here:


Further examples from all USEmobility countries can be found in USEmobility report D2.3:

http://www.usemobility.eu/sites/default/files/resources/usemobility_wp2_d2.3_region-selection_110505_v03.pdf

**Examples of integrated synchronised timetables and extended times of operation**

In many regions, integrated synchronised timetables with extended times of operation have been introduced. An example is the German Federal State of Rheinland-Pfalz, where the number of passenger kilometres travelled in regional trains has doubled since the mid 1990s:

http://www.der-takt.de/ueber-den-takt/idee-und-ziele/

Another example is the German Federal State of Bayern (Bavaria). The demand for regional rail transport has risen here by 62 percent. For details see:

http://beg.bahnland-bayern.de/die-beg/projekte/bayern-takt
Programme for better transfer situations

The public transport authority in the German Federal State of Sachsen-Anhalt (“NASA”) has started a programme to optimise transfer situations at regional railway stations (“Schnittstellenprogramm”). For details see:

http://www.nasa.de/oepnv/foerderung/foerderprogramme/schnittstellenprogramm/

3.3.3.3 Offering a simple and user-friendly pricing system

Context / Relevance: Travel costs are an important factor in users’ decision making processes (see USEmobility report D3.6). Competitive travel costs of public transport have been identified as a strong pull-in factor. Apart from the price level as such, the fare structure is of high importance. Of special interest is the very positive effect of ticket- or tariff-integration, which means that passengers need only one end-to-end ticket, even when they use services of different providers during a multimodal journey (e.g. in a transport chain combining train and bus).

Accordingly, non-competitive travel costs, and equally the need for several tickets for one journey or overly difficult ticket purchase are decisive push-out factors.
Common ticket for different services (ticket- or tariff-integration)

For both attracting new customers for public transport and keeping public transport users from leaving the system, competitive travel costs of public transport and a simple, easy to understand fare structure are crucial. When it comes to the pricing system, the providers of transportation services are the key players. Nevertheless, in many cases public transport authorities are involved in the decision making process, so they have to work on that issue, too. Furthermore, transport policy decides about the framework conditions, which have a considerable influence on price level not only for public transport but also for the competing modes, especially private car use (see above chapter 3.3.2.1).

The most important measure that should be supported by public transport authorities, is without doubt the introduction of a common ticket for all public transport services (end-to-end ticket), which allows passengers to use different services with only one ticket regardless of the providing company. The options vary from ticket-integration, adding the fares of different providers, to tariff-integration, where the same tariff applies to all providers in a given area (transport association – Verkehrsverbund).
Flexible conditions of use

Another strong instrument to make people start to use or increase their use of public transport is offering more flexible tickets. Season tickets (e.g. monthly tickets), which are valid not only on a specific line, but for the entire public transport system in a given area are a successful example. Making season tickets (e.g. monthly tickets) transferable is another way to enhance flexibility and simplicity of use. Similar to car use, different persons living in a household can use a transferable season ticket alternately. Transferability can be allowed permanently or for specified time frames only (e.g. weekends or off-peak hours only). The possibility to take other people along in specified time frames (e.g. weekends or evening hours) when using a season ticket works as a pull-in factor as well.

When it comes to ticketing technologies, a considerable dynamism is noticeable. Electronic ticketing with smart cards is already available in many regions, as well as online tickets or tickets via mobile phones. From a user’s perspective new technology is welcome, if it makes ticket purchase and payment easier. New technologies also offer the chance to reach new customer groups, especially younger technically oriented people, and can facilitate the integration of further multimodal services like car sharing or bike rental. Nevertheless, from the users’ perspective an attractive fare structure is more important than technology as such.

Learn more and get inspired:

Inter-regional cooperation for common tickets

People’s mobility needs are usually not limited to administrative boundaries. Therefore the Halle/Leipzig region in Germany, which forms one regional mobility area, but belongs to three different Federal States, has decided to establish a common transport association. Now passengers can use all public transport services with only one ticket regardless of the administrative boundaries.

For details see:
http://www.mdv.de/inhalte/verbundgebiet.php

One ticket for multimodality

In many regions, common tickets for all public transport services (end-to-end tickets) have been introduced successfully. The next step is to integrate further mobility offers like rental bikes or car-sharing. GVH, the transport association of the Hannover region (Germany) offers now an extended season ticket (“HANNOVERmobil”), which includes not only all public transport services in the region, but also a free of charge registration for the local car-sharing offer, a free of charge ‘BahnCard 25’ (giving 25 percent fare reduction for all train tickets in Germany) and a 20 percent fare reduction for all taxi rides in the region.

For details see:
http://www.gvh.de/hannovermobil.html
The transportation company Rheinbahn in Düsseldorf (Germany) offers since 2012 an extended season ticket (“Mobil in Düsseldorf”), which includes not only all public transport services in the region, but also 90 minutes free of charge car-sharing per month and four hours free of charge bike rental per day. For details see:
http://www.rheinbahn.de/tickets/Seiten/MiDTicket.aspx

3.3.3.4 Making public transport attractive for different travel purposes and different user groups

Context / Relevance: An aspect often neglected is the fact that public transport is used for different travel purposes and by different user groups. The USEmobility survey has shown that the swing users’ patterns of change clearly depend on the travel purpose. If people switch to public transport or use it more often, then commuting is the dominating travel purpose, while the travel purposes ‘running errands/shopping’ and ‘leisure activities’ are less pronounced. When it comes to the type of change (step-by-step or overnight) and the freedom of choice, remarkable differences between the age groups can be observed (see USEmobility report D3.6).
Figure 12 – Strategic recommendation: Making public transport attractive for different travel purposes and different user groups

Tariff offers for specific travel purposes or specific customer groups

Making the use of public transport more attractive for travel purposes like ‘running errands/shopping’ and ‘leisure activities’ and for specific user groups like for example elderly people has promising potential, which should be recognised by transport policy. Usually the demand for these travel purposes exists in different time periods than the demand for commuting. More demand in off-peak hours contributes to a more efficient use of resources like personnel, infrastructure and vehicles.

Possible measures to exploit this potential are tariff offers for specific travel purposes or specific customer groups, not valid in peak-hours (see also above chapter 3.3.3.3). In cooperation with event managers or recreation facilities the purchase of a ticket for public transport can be included in the admission fee. In case of public mega events (sport or cultural events) with a huge number of visitors, the responsible authorities should make it mandatory for the organisers that a public transport ticket is already included in the ticket for the event in order to avoid road congestion.
Information for specific travel purposes

Specific tariff offers for different travel purposes can be combined with offering specific information on how to combine public transport and leisure activities or shopping. Examples are maps, showing hiking trails which can be reached by public transport, or shopping guides, showing how to get there by public transport.

Learn more and get inspired:

Attractive ticket offers for tomorrow’s customers

Special season tickets for teenagers are an interesting example for tariff offers for specific customer groups. The transport association Verkehrsverbund Rhein-Ruhr offers pupils the so-called ‘SchokoTicket’, which is valid not only on the direct way from home to school, but for all public transport services in the entire area from the Lower Rhine to the eastern Ruhr Area. The aim is that pupils as tomorrow’s customers get familiar with public transport for all their mobility needs from travelling to school to all kinds of activities in their spare time.

For details see:
http://www.vrr.de/imperia/md/content/schokoticket_engl.pdf

Information for specific travel purposes

The public transportation authorities in the German Federal State of Rheinland-Pfalz offer comprehensive information on how to combine public transport and various travel purposes. The travel purposes range from shopping to leisure activities like hiking. Different target audiences are addressed (different age groups, individuals, groups, clubs etc.). The information is provided via various communication channels, amongst others via internet (for details see: http://www.der-takt.de/freizeit/tourentipps/) or via printed publications (for details see: http://www.der-takt.de/broschueren/freizeitbroschueren/).

3.3.3.5 Taking soft factors seriously

Context / Relevance: Soft factors like atmosphere or social contact are more often a reason to leave than to enter public transport (see USEmobility report D3.6). Nevertheless, flexibility, environmental friendliness and travel comfort can work as decisive soft pull-in factors towards public transport. Soft factors often have the character of a booster, if hard factors meet swing users’ expectations. Users expect satisfying soft factors to be in place if they are to remain true to a mode of transport.

However, in case of a poor performance soft factors can have a strong push-out effect. Especially if characteristics like cleanliness, smell, temperature, personal safety or travel
comfort fall below the tolerance levels and an alternative is available, users will decide to quit public transport or use it less often. For example 29 percent of the swing users, who decided to quit public transport, stated that lacking travel comfort had a strong or decisive influence on their behavioural change.

Figure 13 – Strategic recommendation: Taking soft factors seriously

Quality requirements

A good performance regarding soft factors is crucial for customer retention. Although the providers of transportation services are the key players when it comes to satisfying soft factors, public transport authorities also play a role here. For example, public transport authorities can integrate minimum requirements for aspects like travel comfort or cleanliness into the public service contracts and monitor them during the contract period. If there are in certain areas or on certain lines security problems, it is up to the authorities to take action, e.g. by increasing police presence. Finally, public transport authorities can enhance the environmental performance of public transport further by integrating (and funding) environmental requirements into the public service contracts.
Learn more and get inspired:

**Minimising push-out factors: regular quality management**
In order to guarantee that characteristics like *cleanliness, passenger information, personal safety or travel comfort* are satisfying for the passengers, the public transport authority in the German Federal State of Bayern (Bavaria) has introduced a quality management for all regional train services. The results are published regularly.
For details see:
http://beg.bahnland-bayern.de/qualitaetssicherung

**Better perceived security: Ban on alcohol**
In order to improve the cleanliness in the trains and the perceived security for the passengers, the transportation company Metronom in Germany has established a ban on alcohol in its trains in 2009.
For details see:
http://metronom-alkoholfrei.de/public/

**Strengthen soft pull-in factors: Even greener rail transport**
The suburban railway system (S-Bahn) in Hamburg is operated completely by green electricity since 2010. The public transport authority supported this decision by taking part of the additional cost.
For details see:
http://www.s-bahn-hamburg.de/s_hamburg/view/service/oekostrom.shtml

### 3.3.4 Strategic recommendations in the ‘travellers / customers’ area of action

Transport policy also has several options to influence so-called user-related factors. These are factors related to the travellers’ personal circumstances and mobility experiences. Discussed below are the elements with the highest potential for motivating people to shift towards public transport and eco-friendly multimodal mobility respectively. These aspects should be given priority within the ‘travellers / customers’ area of action.
3.3.4.1 Directly addressing people whose life circumstances have changed

**Context / Relevance:** New circumstances in the personal situation are the most important trigger for changes in the individual mobility mix. More than half of the swing users interviewed in the USEmobility project cited changes in the personal situation as a central motive for the process of reorientation.

The type of change that is most decisive (although not most common) for a modified modal choice is relocation to another city/town. For more than half of the swing users, who have moved to another city, the relocation had a decisive influence. Also highly relevant and at the same time very common is a change of job or work location; while relocation within the same town is less decisive (see USEmobility report D3.6).

This result of the USEmobility survey reflects the fact that habits and mobility routines play an important role for the modal choice. In many cases people do not reconsider their mobility routines until they are forced to do so because of a far-reaching change in their personal situation. From a strategic point of view, people’s openness to new solutions in such a situation of change is a great chance to influence their modal choice towards public transport.
Welcome packages

Regarding mobility, today a systematic assistance to people whose personal situation is changing is usually missing. Transport policy aiming at more public transport and multimodality, should provide relevant information proactively. For example people who have just moved to a new town should be sent details on public transport and the multimodal services on offer, incl. prices, in their new area (welcome packages).

The relevant players are, for example, local or municipal authorities, who usually have information on citizens who have recently moved to the area, as well as public transport authorities. Here it would seem prudent to ensure that there is close cooperation with the providers of public transport services, and also with CSOs such as passenger and consumer groups and environmental organisations.

Packages for further target groups

Assistance to people, who have relocated, is a good starting point for action. But there are several options to extend the concept, for example to people who have finished school or university, who changed their job or have retired, or to families, who had a baby recently.

Directly addressing people whose life circumstances have changed opens up significant potential for increasing the utilisation of public transport and multimodal transport chains, at a relatively small cost. As this approach is based on the existing services, it contributes to a better use of the capacity and therefore to a more efficient use of personnel, infrastructure and vehicles.
Learn more and get inspired:

Cooperation with housing enterprises to contact potential new customers

The USEmobility consortium is happy to see that the insights gained during the project already had practical consequences. Inspired by a meeting of the USEmobility Business Advisory Group, the Austrian transportation company ÖBB (S-Bahn Salzburg) has started in 2012 cooperation with housing enterprises. People moving in receive a comprehensive information package about the S-Bahn services including a gift coupon for public transport tickets. The method is currently being rolled out to other regions in Austria. For details see:

http://konzern.oebb.at/de/Presse/Presseinformationen_au/...n_Vohnen_und_saubere_Mobilita...et.pdf

and

http://konzern.oebb.at/de/Presse/Presseinformationen_au/...tmark_Willkommenspaket_Bru.pdf

3.3.4.2 Improving knowledge about public transport and multimodality

Context / Relevance: Even when there is no change in the personal situation, the availability of information and knowledge about public transport and multimodality have a remarkable influence on users' decision making processes. Most swing users base their decision towards public transport on their own experience with public transport or on information they have received from personal contacts (family, friends, acquaintances or work colleagues). In comparison the influence of information provided by authorities or providers of transportation services is clearly underdeveloped (see USEmobility report D3.6).
Mobility management (information and advice)

In many cases, the intensity and quality of the information supplied by different authorities as well as by providers of transportation services themselves have room for improvement. Two aspects are equally important: Simple access to all relevant information for people already using public transport, and offering information to people who are not yet familiar with the system.

When it comes to better information for customers, the providers of transportation services are the key players. But regarding better knowledge about public transport and multimodality, not least for non-users, transport policy is also in charge.

Transport policy can take action here by offering comprehensive mobility management, most appropriately in cooperation with the providers of transportation services. Mobility management should provide information and advice on all mobility related questions not only to individuals, but also to companies, employers, and schools. It is a promising instrument to motivate people to rethink their daily mobility and to support a shift towards public transport. It is important that mobility management offers differentiated advice according to target group (age, attitudes, life circumstances, etc.), region (urban and rural) and different travel purposes.

Aspects like image and emotions should be included. Traditionally public transport tends to
address its customers rationally and factually. Today, however, a more emotional, lifestyle-oriented approach certainly has potential, especially if one considers that not only among younger people new attitudes and new values can be observed. Public transport has the opportunity to be associated with modern mobility, which means more than just moving from A to B. Public transport includes the freedom to be online, to work, and to relax, and is accompanied by a good environmental performance.

Training on mobility (workshops)

Uncertainty regarding practical and/or technical aspects is a considerable psychological barrier for non-users. In fact, in an ageing society, there is an increasing need for more practical advice on mobility, for example how to use a ticket vending machine or how to buy a ticket online. The need for that kind of information can be addressed by offering workshops, which give a practical training on mobility.

Transfer of knowledge about public transport in school teaching

An aspect often neglected is the influence of education on the modal choice. Today, if transport is mentioned in school teaching, knowledge transfer is usually restricted to road safety education. This road-oriented approach should be replaced by a more balanced concept. Comprehensive information on how to use public transport and practical experiences should be a mandatory part of school teaching. As most pupils are familiar with cycling, aspects concerning multimodality can easily be integrated. The environmental advantages of public transport and multimodality can be linked to several school subjects, e.g. geography, physics, chemistry and biology.

Awareness-raising campaigns

Transport policy can also improve knowledge about public transport and multimodality by organising awareness-raising campaigns. Especially with regard to environmental awareness it is interesting to take a look at the USEmobility survey results concerning the influence of environmental aspects on the decision making process. The better environmental performance is already today the most decisive soft pull-in factor towards public transport (see USEmobility report D3.6).

Awareness-raising campaigns could therefore be an effective instrument to motivate more people to rethink their mobility behaviour and to switch to eco-friendly public transport and multimodality. Transport policy can cooperate here with civil society organisations and providers of transportation services.
Learn more and get inspired:

**Mobility management for better modal choices**
Especially on the municipal level, mobility management has developed rapidly in recent years. A good overview of recent developments with many good practice examples can be found here: [http://www.epomm.eu/index.php](http://www.epomm.eu/index.php)

**Removing psychological barriers: Trainings on mobility**
Public transport and multimodality seems to be complex and complicated to non-users – until the system and how to use it is explained to them.
The German transportation company AKN (operating in the Hamburg region) offers trainings on mobility for non-users. For details see: [http://www.akn.de/service/mobilitaetstraining/](http://www.akn.de/service/mobilitaetstraining/)

In the city of Munich, senior citizen mobility trainings are offered especially to elderly people. For details see: [http://www.aeneas-project.eu/?page=munich](http://www.aeneas-project.eu/?page=munich)

**Government campaigns for eco-friendly and health-conscious mobility**
The Ministry for the Environment in the German Federal State of Saarland has in 2011 run the campaign ‘stop ozone – take bus and train’. The aim was to improve the air quality in the region by motivating people to switch from car to bus and train.
For details see: [http://www.saarland.de/59845_81194.htm](http://www.saarland.de/59845_81194.htm)

The city of Freiburg in Germany has started the awareness-raising campaign ‘CO₂LIBRI’ for climate protection in 2009. Part of the campaign is providing information on how to switch from car to bus and train.
For details see: [http://www.co2libri.freiburg.de/servlet/PB/menu/1230226_l1/index.html](http://www.co2libri.freiburg.de/servlet/PB/menu/1230226_l1/index.html)
Making improvements visible: Introductory campaigns

The authorities in the Austrian Federal State of Steiermark (Styria) accompanied the introduction of the new suburban railway system in 2007 by a comprehensive awareness-campaign. Car drivers were informed via traffic messages on the radio. A manual “How to use public transport” was sent to all households in the region together with the timetable. For details see:

http://www.verkehr.steiermark.at/cms/beitrag/11099454/41537773
3.4 Recommendations and practical examples long-term (by 2050) in detail

Many experts contacted during the USEmobility project representing different stakeholder groups (politics, transportations companies, CSOs, science and consultancy) found it difficult to discuss the details of mobility in 2050 on the basis of today’s knowledge (see USEmobility report D 4.4). Indeed, 2050 is still very far away. By then a lot of changes will have taken place and new structures will have been established.

The necessary transformation of our transport system is without doubt a challenge, as the status quo, which is still dominated by road transport, is the result of long-term development. Short and medium-term action cannot change all structures and policy choices established in the past at once. But it would represent immense progress to lay down now a basis for transportation to develop along a more sustainable path in the next decades.

Especially when it comes to framework conditions and infrastructure planning, a long-term approach is usually needed to achieve change. All the players involved should, therefore, already start a discussion about long-term perspectives today, in order to ensure that measures taken in the short- and medium-term will reach their full potential in the long run. It is highly desirable that short- and medium-term measures should interact with long-term strategy in this way.

Provided that consistent action is taken by 2020 in order to achieve a public transport oriented policy framework, enhanced services and better integration of user perspectives, transport policy will have more options and will be able to focus on new aspects by 2050. Improving services and supporting modal shift will remain on the agenda. However, an aspect which is likely to become more important after 2020 is traffic reduction.

This does not mean that traffic reduction should not be addressed before 2020. On the contrary, traffic reduction is already present in the debate today, and there are already local examples for measures aiming at traffic reduction in residential areas. But from today’s perspective this approach requires considerable changes to the status quo, which remain on the agenda for initiation by 2020.
3.4.1 Strategic recommendations long-term in the ‘policy framework’ area of action

3.4.1.1 Safeguarding mobility with less traffic

Context / Relevance: Different aspects are important in the context of traffic reduction: Shorter travel distances, higher occupancy rates and less frequent motorised travelling. When discussing traffic reduction, it is important to keep in mind that mobility is not the same as traffic. Mobility means the ability to reach various destinations. The more destinations that can be reached, the higher the degree of mobility. This definition implies that reaching destinations is the decisive factor for mobility, not the distance travelled. And the shorter the distance travelled, the less the need for motorised transport (for short distances walking and cycling will gain in importance). The same level of mobility can be achieved with much or with little traffic. Thus traffic reduction does not mean curbing mobility.

![Diagram showing Safeguarding mobility with less traffic]

Figure 17 – Strategic recommendation: Safeguarding mobility with less traffic
Paradigm change: Improved quality of life instead of more traffic

Safeguarding mobility with less traffic is certainly a challenge. The determining factor for mobility is the range of activities offered within an individual’s radius of action. If transport policy wishes to safeguard sustainable mobility in the long term, it has to improve opportunities for activities near home rather than widen the radiuses of action. This paradigm change will not only help reduce traffic, but also has a high potential for improving the quality of life for most people. People will benefit from lower mobility costs, time saving, improved urban quality, less land-use, less noise and fewer environmental problems.

Already existing trends such as working from home will help avoid unnecessary traffic. Ongoing demographic change leading to an ageing society, and the trend towards (re-) urbanisation, will also result in less demand for long travel distances and more demand for activities near home. When it comes to the younger generation, changing values can already be observed today, with new status symbols gaining in importance. “Mobility” is becoming more frequently associated with mobile telephony and the Internet than with car use.

In order to achieve short travel distances, urban and spatial planning is one of the most influential instruments of transport policy. As mentioned above (see chapter 3.3.2.2), spatial planning has a major impact on transport needs for work-related as well as leisure-related travel. Best practice measures are establishing axial structures (locating new residential or industrial areas so that these are arranged along and/or directed to public transport routes), and introducing the concept of the “city of short distances” / “compact city” (which avoids unnecessary traffic and promotes walking, cycling and public transport), as well as parking space management and car-free districts.

Defining minimum reachability standards for car-free mobility

If people start to live in “areas of short distances” / “compact districts”, the number of car-free households will rise. This will lead to a higher demand for public transport or multimodal transport offers, even if the total volume of traffic declines. Transport policy should prepare for those shifts in demand. Therefore more capacity for public transport and for multimodal transport offers like car pooling or car sharing is needed. With regard to the level of public and multimodal transport services, transport policy should define minimum reachability standards for all urban and rural areas. This gives long-term planning reliability to both providers of transportation services and users, so that they can base their own strategic long-term decisions on this knowledge.

Fiscal incentives for multimodal mobility

Transport policy must also set clear and consistent price signals. Fiscal measures like tax relief for commuters, which stimulates urban sprawl, and tax benefits for private use of company cars should be abolished and replaced for example by tax benefits for car-free households. Internalisation of external costs of transport is a further effective instrument.

Restricting car use in certain areas

Finally, incentives for non-motorised short-distance mobility should go along with restrictions for
private car use. For example, private cars could be banned from certain areas completely or temporarily, when adequate reachability is already guaranteed by public transport and multimodal services. Another effective instrument is to restrict the number of parking areas.
4. Conclusions

A better understanding of users’ social behaviour regarding choice of transport mode, as well as their willingness to change, is opening up new opportunities for transport policy to foster a modal shift towards more eco-friendly multimodal mobility.

This publication points out relevant areas of action and suggests possible measures related to the factors influencing users’ modal choices. Now it is up to the decision makers in politics on the different levels to develop a suitable strategy for every country or region.

The given status quo (legal framework, financial potentials, available infrastructure, technical situation, level of public transport services etc.) determine the point of departure which is different from country to country. Nevertheless, basic elements for a strategy towards more eco-friendly multimodal mobility are very similar in all countries.

First and foremost, it is up to the decision makers in politics to make clear policy choices in favour of more public transport and multimodality. All governmental levels must find the courage to set new priorities in transport policy. This is a prerequisite for the necessary transition in the transport system.

The next crucial element is coordination and integration. A strategy towards more eco-friendly multimodal mobility can only succeed if it is effectively coordinated and integrated with other policies on all policy levels. It is important that all players will pull in the same direction. A balance must be found between the user expectation, political requirements and innovative and market-oriented transportation companies.

On this basis it will be possible to work systematically on improvements that will motivate more and more people to switch to public transport or multimodal combinations. It is crucial to strategically manage the interdependence between different areas of action:

Improving the public transport services offered should be combined with measures to stop existing incentives for monomodal car use. The better the offered public transport services, the more important soft factors and user-related factors become. All measures taken must be accompanied by a clear communication towards users and non-users of public transport. Communication should not only address the relevant facts, but also aspects like image and emotions, as well as the benefits of eco-friendly multimodal mobility for the users and the society as a whole. When due to the measures taken the demand for public transport or multimodal combinations is increasing, then further steps to increase the capacity and to implement innovative concepts will become necessary.

This means the development of more eco-friendly multimodal mobility must be understood as an ongoing process.

By following such an integrated approach a virtuous circle of enhanced eco-friendly multimodal mobility can be achieved.
The virtuous circle of enhanced eco-friendly multimodal mobility

Towards more eco-friendly multimodal mobility

Build upon the success achieved:
- Constant dialogue with the users
- Further capacity building for public transport/multimodality
- Integrating new aspects (e.g., traffic reduction)

Enhanced customer orientation:
- Addressing user-related factors:
  - Contacting non-users proactively
  - Optimising soft factors / Minimising push-out factors

Creating an attractive offer:
- Strengthening pull-in factors:
  - Good reachability and enhanced multimodality;
  - Short travel times;
  - Well-coordinated services (intra- and intermodal);
  - Integrated timetables;
  - User-friendly pricing systems.

Basis:
- Political will and coherent policy framework
- Close cooperation of all players involved

Figure 18 – The virtuous circle of enhanced eco-friendly multimodal mobility
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Appendix 1:
Abstract: USEmobility survey of users who have changed their mobility-mix

1. Introduction

1.1 Aims of the Survey
USEmobility surveyed citizens in six European countries to analyse their behavioural patterns when choosing their mode of transport. A representative picture has to be drawn of the findings. The aim of the survey is to discover the individual reasons that lie behind selecting a mode of transport. Particular focus is placed on the reasons that, from the point of view of the survey participant, led them to decide to make more use of an eco-friendly mobility mode, such as public transport. The analysis is set up to reveal the extent of the role played by multimodal travel.

The survey is very comprehensive. It deals with factors relating to the range of mobility services on offer as well as with factors rooted in the mobility needs and the traveller's personal circumstances. It highlights public transport's potential for attracting new customers and simultaneously examines factors relating to customer retention.

1.2 Survey Approach
The survey is solidly anchored in a representative selection of citizens who have changed their preferred mode of transport in the last five years. We call these travellers swing users. We understand this as including both, people who have completely changed to another mode of transport as well as travellers who have altered the weighting (of a particular mode) within their mix of multiple transport modes ('mobility-mix').

From the perspective of users who have already shifted their use of modes, we asked travellers for their main reasons for changing. Participants were additionally asked about detailed reasons for change to find out, which motives are behind the main reasons already stated.

All the travellers who have shifted their use of modes are placed within a USEmobility palette of socio-economic, socio-cultural and psychological characteristics. The analysis concentrates on the following dimensions: cause for change, direction of change and the environment in which the change took place. What was the situation that led to the change? Was the reason external and did it therefore not primarily have anything to do with mobility issues? Altogether, it is important to factor the user's personal circumstances into the analysis as broadly as possible. From which position did the user change, and where to? The ebb and flow between public transport and motorised personal transport is of particular importance. What mobility choices were on offer when the change was made?

Once this analysis has been completed, a clear distinction can be made between different circumstances: was it the attractiveness of the new transport mode (pull-in factor) or was it...
unhappiness with the old transport mode (push-out factor), which primarily influenced the decision? As potential factors for change, the questionnaire did not just list hard, clearly definable parameters such as punctuality and cost, but also 'soft factors' like feeling safe or design issues.

An analysis of the information provided by users made it possible to develop a profile for those users who simultaneously show characteristic behavioural patterns for change and great potential for making increased use of multimodal transport chains. These groups are especially interesting when it comes to making recommendations to policy makers or transport companies.

The USEmobility survey covers issues relevant to transport policy and was carried out in cooperation with six European countries from Belgium to Croatia. It focuses on the similarities found in Europe but also identifies characteristics distinctive to a specific country. In addition, ten surveys were carried out, mainly in regions where particularly successful public transport or multimodal transport services had managed to become established.

1.3 Scope and Limits of the Survey

USEmobility is following an innovative approach and does not simply rely on the users' stated intentions to make the desired decision on their mobility. To take part in the USEmobility survey, users had to say that they had actually changed their behaviour within the last five years. Depending on the reason for travelling, this was the case for up to 50 percent of those who were initially asked, so that it can be stated that almost half of all travellers can be regarded as swing users.

The USEmobility team chose a survey methodology that enabled it to reconcile aspects of psychology and sociology, which are hard to grasp, with hard facts. The remarks made by users and other parties in the ten chosen regions with the best public-transport practices were particularly valuable.

Decisive questions guided us through this process: Does the choice of transport mode have a more static and personal character? Was the decision in favour of a new transport mode made suddenly or was the change gradual? The answers to such questions are critical with regard to attracting new customers. Why was the user's role in making the decision to change hitherto not considered? Is it enough to offer a good range of services? Was the importance of soft factors influencing the decision to change previously underestimated? Are there distinct factors for attracting and retaining customers?

Most of the conclusions of the survey are representative of the motivation and behaviour of swing users. Only a few of the questions were formulated to be representative of all citizens. In contrast with the survey covering a whole country, the regional surveys make no claim to be representative.

Whereas official transport forecasts use transport-performance reference values that make it possible to state the exact market share (modal split) of the different modes of transport, the reference value applied by USEmobility is the change in frequency of use as perceived by users. The survey is not designed to collect data on the exact quantity of transport-kilometres and therefore cannot be used to determine any changes in the modal split.

However, better understanding behavioural change-patterns is a basis for recognising further
potential for increasing the modal split of public transport.

2. Central Statements

2.1 New Insights

Our survey delivered a series of new, partly surprising insights: When choosing the mode of transport, users' behaviour is far more dynamic than examining the modal split, which appears to be static, would lead us to believe. Almost half of the participants said that they had changed their mobility behaviour patterns in the last five years. This throws a new light on the prevalent market share analyses, which show that overall there is very little dynamism in the choice of transport mode. For practical purposes, this insight is of great importance: Where there is a great deal of movement there is also the opportunity for policy makers and companies to motivate travellers to decide in favour of public transport.

Today, already half of all people belong to the group of swing users. Within this group, only 30 percent travel using mono-modal transport, compared to 40 percent who are pragmatic in deciding which mode of transport suits their purpose. Most rearrangements in the personal mobility-mix were made when the participants were deciding how to travel to work.

Thirty percent were aware of the advantages of combining multiple modes of transport for their journeys and changed their behaviour accordingly. Choosing the transport mode is therefore not so much a case of either/or, but a dynamic case of 'both, one as well as the other'. For the majority of swing users, multimodal travel is already a reality.

If people decide to make greater use of public transport, the share of those who completely change to public transport and no longer use any form of personal motorised transport is nevertheless nearly 30 percent. Overall, the change to public transport is by no means always due to the person not owning a car. Multimodal users of public transport make a conscious decision when to choose their cars, and when not. Altogether, with increasing age, there is a higher degree of freedom-of-choice among swing users. Older people often own a car but, nevertheless, show a greater flexibility in deciding whether or not to use public transport in any given situation.

Above all, the cause for shifts in the mobility-mix is characterised by changes in users' personal and private circumstances. Over half of participants stated that personal reasons were the motivation for their reorientation. Such changes in life circumstances relevant to the choice of transport mode do happen frequently. On average, almost three such relevant changes occurred within the last five years.

The top ranked reasons, in terms of frequency and relevance, are changing jobs and moving home, whether to another town or within the same town. This insight offers providers of transport services a good opportunity to attract new customers to public transport.

The circumstances for change are characterised by factors that cause users to feel unsatisfied and therefore motivate them to shift away from their preferred mode of transport (push-out factors), as well as, of course, by encouraging factors that motivate them into changing to a
new transport mode (pull-in factors). Both types of factors are characterised by what the transport companies offer users. For public transport, pull-in factors have a greater effect than push-out factors, which means that travellers are more likely to decide to make changes for reasons of satisfaction as opposed to making changes because they are dissatisfied.

**Importance of selected Push-Out and Pull-In Factors concerning Public Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Push-Out Factor</th>
<th>Pull-In Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reachability of bus stops, stations, destinations</td>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of journey time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey (transfers, short waiting times, ...)</td>
<td>Frequency of connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of use</td>
<td>Environmental friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, availability of information, ticket purchase</td>
<td>Reliability / punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel comfort (quiet journey, seat, luggage, ...)</td>
<td>Safety from accidents / crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well equipped stops / stations</td>
<td>Accessibility (ramps, ...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere (temperature, cleanliness, ...)</td>
<td>Good staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For such decisions, 'hard' factors such as availability, price and travel time were obviously of central importance. In order to attract new users, providers of public transport must create good conditions. However, there are only few factors - apart from cost - inherent to motorised individual transport that will dissuade people from using their cars or motorcycles. Especially in terms of user satisfaction, 'soft' factors also play an important role alongside a given transport-mode's 'hard' factors. The former include aspects such as flexible and easy to plan journeys, as well as the environmental impact. Overall, participants evaluated sustainability and eco-friendliness as important issues. This was demonstrated by the fact that,
Among other things, 88 percent of the swing users were willing to pay a certain amount of additional cost for improved environmental performance of a mode of transport. Users expect satisfying 'soft' factors to be in place if they are to remain true to a mode of transport. In particular when new, comparable transport alternatives are offered, these factors once again become the subject of users' attention, and aspects such as comfort, personnel and atmosphere become relevant factors when decisions are being made.

It is interesting to note that compared with public transport providers, the automotive industry puts far more emphasis on emotions when addressing its customers. As a result, for swing users, motorised individual transport usually has a positive, but in any case a distinctive image profile. Public transport retains its customers in a far less emotional way. At most, the participants associate dimensions such as urbanity, rational behaviour and communality most strongly with public transport. Public transport could certainly gain some leverage from projecting a more emotional image.

2.2 Swing User Profile

For citizens who change their previously chosen mobility-mix from time to time, the shift takes place in all directions, but can be observed above all between the categories motorised individual transport, bicycle and public transport. In cases where there are changes, there are some occurrences where the participants have generally reduced or generally increased their level of mobility. Mostly however, the emphasis on one particular transport mode is shifted to another mode in the mix.

For users, the decisions to change are based on their own personal background and attitudes. According to their attitude towards different modes of transport, the swing users can be more precisely subdivided into various segments.

The most important group of swing users covers the public transport / motorised individual transport pragmatists (segment 1) with 26 percent. These people take a pragmatic point of view when choosing their mode of transport. They make different decisions according to the situation.
they are in and are the most dynamic in their behavioural patterns. Another important segment covers the advocates of public transport who are somewhat reserved in their attitude towards motorised individual transport (segment 4). The distribution of the attitude segments is specific to the country. For example, German and Dutch swing users focus on quite different priorities.

The swing users can also be characterised according to their life circumstances because change here also follows definite patterns. In most cases, a cause for change already existed that motivated the user to think about shifting to another transport mode. This could have been moving home or a new phase in their working life, from starting the first job to retiring altogether. In such situations, the survey participants thought about whether they were satisfied with their previous choice and looked to see if there were any better alternatives available.
Occurrence and Importance of Factors related to the personal Life Situation

Alongside personal attitudes and the cause for change there are additional attributes characterising swing users.
Those in urban environments, for example, tend towards making greater use of public transport; in rural areas, there are a greater number of changes towards motorised individual transport.
3. **Country Portraits**

The insights gained are very similar in all the countries that were surveyed, suggesting that they are also applicable to other European countries that did not participate in the project. Nevertheless, we also observed a series of characteristics specific to individual countries. Whereas the characteristics of change and reasons for change showed hardly any deviations, user characteristics displayed large differences. Satisfaction with public transport also varied from country to country, although there were also large differences between regions in individual countries.

3.1 **Belgium**

Belgium has, with the capital Brussels, its political and administrative centre and at the same time, if the prevalent clichés can be believed, one of the most heterogeneous communities in the EU. The USEmobility project did actually find indications for this: while 30 percent of Flemish swing users were satisfied with public transport services, in the Walloon region and Brussels it were only 20 percent.

Altogether, public transport in Belgium is regarded as being mainly an urban transport mode. Typical push-out factors for Belgian public transport are lack of punctuality (for ca. 50 percent a decisive factor) or journeys that are too complicated (changing, waiting times etc. for ca. 60 percent). However, motorised individual transport also displayed stress factors, for example, the high risk of traffic congestion, which is the reason behind 84 percent of those swing users who high-ranked the MIT push-out factor "punctuality problems. Safety from accidents is in Belgium a considerably larger factor in favour of public transport than, for example, in the Netherlands. The opposite is true for safety from crime.

3.2 **Germany**

Among Europeans, Germany is regarded as being well-organised - public transport included. For example, Germany's railways are considered very punctual. At the same time, the opposite view holds that Germany is a country that is completely dominated by the car. In fact, our survey showed that motorised individual transport in Germany has a strong image linked with mainly positive attributes such as fast, spontaneous, exciting. In contrast to the cliché, that Germany is a nation of car drivers, the USEmobility survey also showed that the frequency of change in Germany is particularly high. For journeys to the place of work, more than 50 percent of those surveyed have made changes to the way they use public transport in the last five years. Additionally, Germany also has the highest rate of multimodality (77 percent) out of all surveyed countries in Europe. When it comes to multimodal journey chains, 42 percent of swing users travel with multiple modes, usually in a combination of cars and public transport.

Satisfaction with personnel still has some issues in Germany. On average we have recorded 10 percent less swing users who are happy with personnel than in the other countries.
3.3 Croatia

The rest of Europe regards the acceding EU member Croatia's transport infrastructure as being in need of modernisation: Public transport is underfunded; its citizens have a lot of catching-up to do in terms of individual transport; environmental issues tend to have a low priority.

The USEmobility survey did not confirm this picture. It even showed that Croatia has the lowest swing user rate, and there is only a very small image difference between public and motorised individual transport.

Whereas those surveyed characterised Croatia's public transport as 'social' and 'less aggressive', switching to motorised individual transport is actually considered less attractive than in other countries. As a reason, people cited the high cost of purchase and repair, and the running costs.

In comparison with other countries, the willingness of Croatians to increasingly organise mobility in line with sustainability and environmental considerations is actually particularly high. 28 percent of participants are planning to do so, with 31 percent stating that they are not willing. 70 percent of swing users state that they would be prepared to pay 10 percent and more for a transport that was more environmentally friendly.

3.4 The Netherlands

The Netherlands are seen by Europe as a country of cyclists. The Dutch are liberal and open-minded towards public transport it is said. Judging by the USEmobility survey, the very opposite is the case. It shows that in the Netherlands, 43 percent of swing users make strictly mono-modal journeys, more than in any other country in the survey. Overall, more than half the swing users regularly use a bike (78 percent are regular cyclists); however, 65 percent use motorised individual transport (mono and multi modal). Only 45 percent of those who switched to make more use of public transport were motivated by their own experience - in comparison with 66 percent in Germany. Only 13 percent of those surveyed are unhappy with their current choice of transport mode.

The segmentation based on attitudes shows that only 15 percent of Dutch swing users are pragmatists; 19 percent have an affinity with cycling but astoundingly display a very reserved attitude towards public transport. Seven percent of swing users are planning to use public transport more often in the future; however, 40 percent rejected this idea.

3.5 Austria

Transport in the Alpine state Austria is characterised by a typically strong contrast between urban and rural areas. The fact that the mountains restrict the space available for transport is more than a simple cliché. However, the rest of Europe regards Austria's public transport system as being well funded and properly organised by the state.

Largely this view correlates with the results of our survey: Austria displays a high level of multimodality (75 percent). Within one journey, almost 40 percent of swing users travel combining multiple modes and, by doing so, demonstrate the flexibility with which Austrians counter the difficulties in travelling in the geographically challenging Alpine state.

Customer satisfaction with public transport is high in Austria, with a 43 percent satisfaction rate and only 7 percent stating that they are unhappy with services. The aspects good availability of
destinations, low environmental impact and good accessibility of services were particularly important here.

Overall, public transport has a positive image and is perceived as being social and urban. 31 percent of swing users have an affinity with public transport while simultaneously having reservations about individual transport. For this group, a series of soft factors also count against motorised individual transport. They feel there is less time to relax or spend on other activities. In addition, the parking situation is often bad, which is something that puts many Austrians up against using motorised individual transport.

3.6 Hungary

Similar to the Croatian case, Europeans believe that Hungary needs to modernise. According to the cliché, the country’s public transport system is poorly developed and uses out-of-date rolling stock; there is a lack of funding for appropriate infrastructure measures; Hungarians have to be pragmatic about the services available to them. In fact, the results of the USEmobility survey show that the Hungarian transport market is highly dynamic. However, in the competitive environment between public transport and motorised transport, the ratio of strict swing use is balanced at 20 percent for each direction of change. The picture is similar for satisfaction / dissatisfaction with the current mode of transport: 20 percent are satisfied compared with 18 percent who are dissatisfied. The rate of change is high with the share of swing users reaching almost two thirds.

In cases, where Hungarians perceive a public transport service to be modern, this is a result not only of low costs, but also soft factors such as safety from crime, or clean carriages with air-conditioning. However, if there is a lack of cleanliness or comfort, or if bus stops and stations are inadequately equipped, travellers will decide against public transport.

34 percent of swing users are pragmatists. 28 percent are planning to use park & ride facilities once they’ve become available; 32 percent are not planning to do this. The Hungarian transport companies seem to have missed an opportunity regarding their information policy: Only 7 percent of swing users stated that they had received information from transport providers about their services.

4. Regional Success Stories

Surveying travellers in mainly railway-based public transport systems in selected European regions delivers highly interesting insights into the choice of transport mode in environments with best practice cases. Here are several examples:

Efficiently networked rapid-transit train systems such as the S-Bahn in Salzburg and the S-Bahn Rhine-Neckar guarantee a high degree of multi-modality. Less than 10 percent of swing users of the S-Bahn Salzburg use only the S-Bahn. For almost 40 percent, the S-Bahn is a permanent component of a combined journey chain comprising several modes of transport. Just 4 percent of the Rhine-Neckar swing users are solely S-Bahn users. For 80 percent the decision to use the S-Bahn or another mode of transport depends on the journey’s purpose. For customers of the S-Bahn in Breisgau, their primary reasons for changing show a typical profile for swing users in well-developed regional transit systems. Hard factors such as cost,
frequency of service and accessibility of train stations are important reasons for change for more than half of those questioned. However, for 40 percent of those surveyed, soft factors such as travel comfort, flexibility, eco-friendliness and easy-to-plan journeys are also decisive for increasing their use of public transport.

Public transport customers in the Croatian capital Zagreb are more satisfied with the services on offer (45 percent) than in the rest of the country (on average 32 percent). 60 percent of those surveyed in Zagreb saw particular improvements in travel comfort and accessibility. When deciding to change transport mode, ease of accessing trains is 20 percent more important in Zagreb than in the rest of Croatia.

In most cases, choosing the mode of transport is a process. This is not so in Gelderland in the Netherlands: 60 percent of users of the Valleilijn train service made their decision from one day to the next. Particularly significant factors here were change of workplace (68 percent) and moving home (70 percent).

Among users of the S-Bahn Steiermark or the rail-connection Varazdin-Medimurje in Croatia there were a disproportionately high number of young people who had just completed their job training (43 percent in Steiermark and 41 percent in Croatia). This customer group cited 'cost' as one of the most important reasons for the increased use of train services. In addition, satisfaction with the performance of the S-Bahn is high at 75 percent.

75 percent of users of the route between Budapest and Esztergom in Hungary were motivated into using the train service by friends, family or colleagues. This 'word-of-mouth' was particularly significant since most of those questioned (80 percent) already had alternatives. For users of the Metronom service between Hamburg and Cuxhaven, motivation again was not a result of their own experience with the railways, as is the case for the average swing user. In this case, other information channels played a larger role: For example, information made available by the service provider, or even by employers for people starting new jobs, were decisive factors for changes in the choice of transport mode.

Metropolitan regions such as greater Brussels show a typical urban background. Many swing users have recently moved to the area (65 percent) and many do not have (or no longer have) a car (75 percent). The reasons for switching to the public transport system STIB/MIVB are mainly the transport-mode’s eco-friendliness (48 percent) and the good accessibility of bus stops and train stations (54 percent). At the same time, more than half of users say that reliability of information and journey scheduling has improved considerably.

5 Basis for Strategic Recommendations

The approach used by the USEmobility project was clearly innovative. None of the previous research into personal mobility has focussed on swing users with the aim of better understand their motivation and gaining useful insights from this perspective for developing future mobility. Although the modal split has hardly changed for years, the USEmobility survey has shown that behind the apparent lack of movement there is considerable dynamism, with fluctuations both towards and away from public transport. The second important insight is that people are afforded a multitude of opportunities for rethinking their choices, and that these often go hand-in-hand with changes in their life circumstances. Above all, changing place of work leads to people questioning their usual behavioural mobility patterns.
Since it can be assumed that there is a general desire for mobility to become increasingly eco-friendly in the future, there is now an opportunity to take more notice of users' needs. For the stakeholders who are involved in this project, USEmobility will develop strategic recommendations. These are developed, on the one hand, for politicians who set on a national and local level the policy framework for sustainable transport. They also include the European Commission, the contracting authority for this project, which wants to further develop European transport policy ensuring that citizens' mobility is both, environmentally friendly and sustainable in the future. The recommendations are also directed at providers of transport services, who can attract new customers with made-to-measure offers. Particularly in metropolitan regions, there is considerable potential for public transport, which can benefit from a user-oriented approach incorporating decisive hard and soft factors to attract and retain customers.

We will pay particular attention in our recommendations to civil society organisations that consolidate and represent the interests of passengers. As part of the process of improving the policy framework and the offered services, as well as customer service, these passenger groups play an important role that will have to be strengthened in the future. Only then can it be guaranteed that the needs of the individual (customer, passenger) will be at the centre of this development.