

Summary and main findings of the workshop on Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning, UBC Annual Conference, Gdynia, 29.10.2015

1. The seminar was organised by Zarząd Drog i Zieloni w Gdyni (Road and Green Areas Authority in Gdynia), UBC Sustainable Cities Commission (Turku) and University of Gdansk.
 2. The seminar was officially opened by Esther Kreutz (UBC Sustainable Cities Commission) and dr Marcin Wolek (University of Gdansk).
 3. Marcin Wolek presented the main features of SUMP and stages of its preparation. He also presented the Competence Centre on SUMP for Baltic Sea Region within CIVITAS DYNAMO Project.
 4. Structure of the seminar included 2 main parts. The first one included presentations, namely „How to monitor sustainable transports and quality of life in Malmö?” presented by Peter Hakansson (City of Malmö) and „A city for its citizens - pedestrian and cycle friendly- Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan Bremen 2025” by Michael Glotz-Richter (City of Bremen).
 5. Both speakers showed a very similar modal split for their cities. Peter Hakansson presented current modal split for Malmö, where 40% of travels are being made by car (same as Bremen), 22% by bike (25% in Bremen), 21% by public transport (14% in Bremen) and 15% (Bremen 21%) are as pedestrians. Share of car in Malmö decreased significantly from 52% in 2003 to current 40%.
 6. Michael Glotz-Richter presented the ‘congestion index data for the Baltic Sea Region – as won by mobile phones and navigation systems. It shows clearly the low congestion level of cities being cycle-friendly and with good public transport. The aspects of space consumption of the various modes are a key for transport-efficient cities. Both Malmö as Bremen are low-congestion cities.
-
1. During the preparation of the SUMP for Malmö, 10 most common destinations were defined (nearest child care, nearest school, nearest care centre, nearest store, etc...) and 8 criteria (travel time by walking/cycling and public transport to 10 destinations, distance to nearest bus stop, nearest major node in public transport, etc...). The City was divided into particular areas for which accessibility was measured. Only 3% of areas scored „poor accessibility” mark and 59 % scored an acceptable level of accessibility. It is noteworthy that City of Malmö is developing a method to monitor and evaluate a perceived accessibility index as a supplement to the accessibility index mentioned above.
 - 2.
 3. Michael Glotz-Richter focused on social participation in preparation of SUMP. He underlined the role of new technology for social consultations that should start in the very early stage of SUMP preparation. An example of Bremen (online participation tool) was presented.
 4. In his opinion, the role of individual cars should be re-modelled. Even making all cars non-emission, electric vehicles would not solve the biggest challenges for modern, European cities – congestion and parking space.
 5. One of the possible solutions is to change a model of car ownership into a car-sharing system („use it – don’t own it). Every car from a car-sharing system in Bremen (Germany) replaces 15 individual cars. By September 2015, there are 10,700 users – who have reduced the number of cars by 3,700 cars – being taken off the road.

6. During next part of seminar, discussion was organised in circulating „world cafe” scheme. Three „discussion tables” were prepared, namely about: „Monitoring of SUMP process”, „Mobility for workplaces” and „How can UBC support your city?”.
7. The 1st table on „Monitoring of SUMP process” focused on integration of individual and collective mobility as there were different mobility patterns in central city area and in its suburbs. Research of mobility should include all stakeholders, also privately owned (i.e. taxi companies, important employers). Quality of life is the fundament of mobility planning, therefore spatial planning is a strategic element of planning sustainable mobility. SUMP’s are documents of different capacity, complexity and formal status. Therefore tailor-made monitoring system is needed for particular document. Main KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) should be clustered around environment, accessibility (i.e. Malmö, Sweden), social inclusion, spatial planning and economy.
8. Also, A growing level of cooperation is important (from city level to metropolitan level/regional level of SUMP, i.e. Malmoe, Sweden) which makes preapration of monitoring scheme more challenging issue.
9. The discussion at the 2nd Table „Mobility in workplaces” focused on the main challenges for organisations to start with workplace travel planning. City of Karlstad (Sweden) implemented already quite a lot measures as a city, also some companies in Karlstad did, as part of the TRIP project, where companies could earn a diploma for the efforts in workplace travel planning; but no follow-up was done, and it seemed that the effects were because of that partly temporary. When implementing measures, follow-up is important.
10. Another Swedish city, much smaller than Karlstad, hadn’t done much with workplace travel planning, because there was only minimal public transportation coverage in the city; in addition, remote working wasn’t really an option because of insufficient broad band coverage: an idea was to introduce e-bicycling, so commuters could travel to work up to 15 km; good infrastructure is a requirement for this, ideally bicycle highways are in place which are now being developed in Copenhagen and they were researched within 7th FP project TIDE (already finished).
11. Besides stimulating employees to use alternative modes of transportation than the car as part of their CSR strategy, an employer can also organize a shift from an „at the office” attitude” towards a „work-output” attitude.. This would allow more people to have flexible working times (not traveling during rush hours) and to work remotely a couple of days per week.
12. Also at the 2nd Table there was discussion about how a city (or a SUMP) could help in stimulating workplace travel planning. It was discussed that very effective action is “leading by example” (i.e. CEO’s of companies should showcase their own sustainable behaviour when travelling to work). Another option is that the public authority praises front-runner companies in public and in that way make other companies enthusiastic or at least more engaged.
13. A public authority could also make it obliatory for companies who are planning to start activities on a new location to first have them to submit a workplace travel planning document. This action plan would explain by which measures the employer is planning to limit the expected amount of travelling to the office so that it would suit with the parking norms for that specific location. For example in the UK this kind of legislation exists, besides for new developments also for companies that are already located on a specific location.

14. A barrier for the development of „mobility in workplaces” is a limited awareness of employers of the potential cost saving that can be gained from decreasing parking spaces at their premises. The best way to convince employers to start with workplace travel planning is to make a business case of the mobility situation and to really show how much costs can be saved by introducing different measures and in the meanwhile decreasing parking and office space.
15. Another practical action is to search allies, including healthcare business – i.e. health insurance company is a sponsor for a Cycle to Work campaign.
16. Tax incentives might be a suitable local/regional/ national solution according to general tax system of given country.
17. Another solution is the provision of incentives by companies in employee benefits (salary or e.g. extra holidays). A Polish branch of DNV (Det Norske Veritas) was brought as an example – the company pays extra salary based on mileage done by bike by its employees..
18. At the 3rd Table „How can UBC support your city?” the discussion was focused on how a network like UBC, together with the Competence Center on SUMP can support different cities (working in different legal environment) in preparing/improving their SUMP or related documents Following issues/ideas were discussed:
 - 18.1. to provide info on EU funding programmes for not advanced cities or with cities having limited resources;
 - 18.2. Provision of information about upcoming projects in time;
 - 18.3. Organisation of regular webinars on different topics (i.e. how to turn a mobility plan into a SUMP);
 - 18.4. spreading good examples;
 - 18.5. hands-on seminars (similar to the Planning Cities Commission) and cooperation with Planning Cities commission;
 - 18.6. preparation of project idea database on the website;
 - 18.7. providing access to expert contacts in cities / people with experience
 - 18.8. from inspiration to action – organization and support of small working groups;
 - 18.9. exchange of “real” experience through physical meetings/working meetings;
 - 18.10. contacting/matchmaking between potential partners being interested in informal exchange of knowledge, experience, etc. It could play an important role in the very early stage of project proposal preparation.
 - 18.11. Creation of list of implementers of particular solutions/measures with direct contact to them should be provided.