



Wednesday 30th June 2010

Rome 2010

Once more the IMPACTS annual conference was a well attended event with lively debate and thought provoking presentations around the theme of Urban Sustainable Mobility. We are grateful to Rome as host city for providing such a great venue and welcoming hospitality that has come to be the hallmark of IMPACTS gatherings.

Welcome Address

Welcome from Cllr. Sergio Marchi, IMPACTS President

Sergio extended a warm welcome to delegates on behalf of the Mayor of Rome. He expressed his appreciation that the concept and objectives of the association answered a need for high level strategic co-operation in the field of mobility amongst European Capitals and a chance to compare International experience.

At a time when governments find themselves in deficit and are forced to cut expenditure on services - including transport, there still remains a need to invest in sustainable transport to keep cities moving forward. The presentations from Rome demonstrate how the project aims to build a sustainable city. The conditions for sustainable development are inspired by longer term policies based on climate change mitigation, economic recovery, social integration and employment in Rome. They are also represented in sustainable energy master plan, recently presented by the Mayor.

Sustainability is the inspiration for each program and action plan. The City of Rome in the specific area of mobility has anticipated the issue of sustainability by making it the central theme inspiring the Strategic Plan of Sustainable Mobility (PSMS).

Keynote presentation Stefano Giovenali, Coordinator of the technical secretariat of Rome's Sustainable Mobility Master plan

Stefano set the scene for the conference with an overview of the Strategic Plan for Sustainable Mobility for Rome. He described the context of mobility within the city and the wider region identifying rings of mobility management radiating out from the city. He noted that although car use dominates in the metropolitan area (50% car, 30% PT, 20% PTW) it is the reverse in the historic city centre due to various mobility initiatives.

Stefano highlighted Rome's strategies for sustainable mobility, including:

- Definition of a functional architecture for Rome and the necessary transport infrastructure reflecting the new Land use Plan;
- Identifying necessary short term work to create low-impact infrastructures that can rationalise the city; and
- Guarantees for sustainability in the newly urbanised areas to ensure provision of infrastructure and mobility services.

Railway enhancements form a backbone for the mobility system with high frequency services integrated with intra and extra urban services. The aim is to make every station an interchange node to attract commuters and to tailor the system so it meets regional needs. Amongst the goals are: completing the rail ring around the city, doubling the regional rail capacity, and strengthening the metropolitan railway to Latina and increasing capacity and frequency of services.

The city underground will develop to four lines to provide geographic coverage. New extensions will utilise advanced technologies and lighter systems. Automation of the existing lines will enhance services, reduce disruptions and improve safety.

The plan also identifies mobility corridors and a new tramway network creating connected bypasses and investigating innovative solutions for sharing railway infrastructures.

Road users are not forgotten with initiatives to improve capacity and conditions outside and around the city. Complementing the broader initiative are local traffic plans. Together these plans will deliver considerable journey time savings with reductions in vehicle numbers and PM emissions. A three year road safety plan also aims to deliver a 30% reduction in social costs from accidents with particular attention to PTW based on the eSUM project recommendations. Technology innovations underpin the initiatives with increased diffusion of information to mobile devices and the internet.

Session 1

Session One, containing presentations from the city of Rome was chaired by Maria Krautzberger.

An overview of the reorganisation of mobility services in Rome was given by Fabio Nussio, on behalf of the Mobility Agency President, Mr. Tabacchiera explaining why the new agency "Roma Servizi per la Mobilità" was founded in January 2010 through the partial division of ATAC S.p.A. A vision emerged of design work to create a city that is "more livable and more enjoyable" and an experience which Rome believes is important to share with IMPACT members to activate synergies towards a common goal.

Federico Bortoli, CEO - Roma Metropolitane gave delegates a detailed insight into the on-going activities for the implementation of major mobility infrastructures in Rome; in particular the Metro Line C extensions with driverless trains. Delegates were later able to visit construction sites to see for themselves the impressive progress in a city where archaeology is everywhere you dig.

Public Transport in Rome is critical to sustainable mobility. Marco Coletti, Executive Industrial Director, ATAC shared his thoughts on the activities and goals of the new mobility plan from the perspective of public transport provision under its new administrative structure. Rome and its hinterland require the transportation of around 1.5 billion passengers per year. Achieving this takes 118,350,000 veh/km of surface transport (bus, tram, trolley) and 10,700,000 train km on lines A and B. The PT fleet contains 400 natural gas and 51 electric powered buses marking a move towards sustainable transport. Metro Lines B1 and Line C will extend coverage in 2012 introducing driverless trains on the later services. He explained that much is being done to upgrade control systems and to automate systems, for example, routing for park and ride services and to control parking facilities.

Finally, Fabio Casiroli, from Milan Polytechnic & Systematica gave a fascinating presentation on the "mobility renaissance", demonstrating how cities can be planned to integrate all transport modes and how within a city like Rome you can introduce new technologies. An example given was based on the micro mobility concept where vehicles

could be hired from ecostations, with the possibility to build a network of 1,000 ecostations at a cost no greater than building 2km of metro line.

Session 2

Session two chaired by Claude Dargent broadened the mobility debate by introducing experiences from Barcelona and Vienna.

Findings from a mid-term evaluation of the Barcelona Mobility Urban Master Plan were presented by Julio Garcia Ramon. Set against the background of Kyoto, European, National, Regional and Municipal objectives the action plan considers alternative mobility scenarios as a way of achieving ambitious environmental and economic targets. It tests future strategies that are environmentally sustainable, economically viable and good for the city. Julio examined flexible measures that can be adapted to changing circumstances and reflected on monitoring indicators.

Urban traffic levels and patterns of flow have grown dramatically in the last 40 years. In 2006 trips within the city were 47% on foot 23% private vehicles and 29% public transport (PT). External (commuter) trips were 52% private and 46% PT. Projecting growth forward to 2018 has shown this mobility pattern is not sustainable and has very high congestion. Maintaining congestion levels with greater PT usage will not deliver on Kyoto or EU air quality agreements. Just trying to satisfy Kyoto goals would need public transport investments to guarantee the necessary modal split (46% public transport). These would be triple those anticipated on the masterplan, so are not an option!

The compromise adopted in the masterplan sets out to maintain 2006 traffic congestion levels in the network and address Kyoto Protocol performance. This means using flexible measures including: increasing vehicle occupancy, decreasing vehicle km, and increasing PT trips. A greater use of bio-fuel vehicles and encouragement of electric vehicles are a key part of this policy as is the extension of the PT network infrastructure.

So far the city has seen success in improving vehicle occupancy, extending the PT network, and achieving desired mode splits. What needs more work are measures to reduce accident rates and improve accessibility at stations. The least successful aspects (PT frequency and noise levels) have all been impacted by the global economic crisis that has reduced capacity to invest.

Nicole Prikoszovits, of ITS Vienna put into context the motivation behind traffic services for new routes in the wider Vienna region that serves 3.5m inhabitants and 40% of all Austrians. The aim is to provide free public access to traffic info that is permanently updated for road, rail and public transport that also supports the cities development and environmental policies. In delivering these services Vienna has been fortunate to have support from the federal states and municipalities, e-Government initiatives and research projects. Cooperative traffic management is in place across the region integrated with the public transport association (VOR).

Nicole explained application of the graph integration platform (GIP) accessibly from <http://AnachB.at> that takes individual traffic detection from the police, ORF, loop detectors and taxis to provide detection of 94% of all car trips in Vienna. The system also utilises real time feeds from the ÖBB and control centres of metro and surface transport to support messages. The service goes beyond public transport to provide information on parking availability, journey planners and citybike Vienna. As a versatile GIS based system GIP offers users a powerful tool that will be extended further in 2010 with mobile (iPhone) applications.

Keith Gardner's presentation covered the New London Mayor's Transport Strategy. Up until 2031, Transport for London faces funding challenges in the region of 20-25% cut in funding. 50% of their income comes from fares and charges. London is the powerhouse of the UK's

economy with 12.5% of the UK Population. 80% of travel is outside the central area. The population is expected to increase by a further 1m up to 2013.

The Mayor, Boris Johnson wants London to be “the best big city on earth”. Since 2000, they have achieved a 5% mode shift and aim to achieve a further 6% shift from private to public transport. This will be achieved by focussing on smarter travel methods of walking, cycling and electric vehicles. Pedestrians will benefit from improved journey planning and wayfinding as well as pedestrian countdown for crossings, cyclists can use the new Barclays hire scheme and the 12 cycle superhighways. For those who still want to drive, electric vehicles are the way to go with 25,000 charging points by 2015 and exemption from the congestion charge.

Rene Meijer gave us an insight into the development projects in Amsterdam, followed by Lisette Moeskops on the Air Quality Monitoring Tool.

The Western area is the most heavily developed, with many new towns being constructed along the railways.

Travel, measured by km/working day has decreased in the city, but increased regionally. Commuter trips have grown 50% in the rush hour from 1988 to 2008. The bicycle has increased mode share from 33% to 47% over the same period. There are plans to build 165,000 new homes in the next 20 years. New developments will be 50% housing and 50% workplaces with 1 parking space per 10 workers.

Lisette informed us that Amsterdam were struggling to conform to the EU pollution limits in the time given, so they applied for an extension, to support this application, they developed the air quality monitoring tool and an air quality plan. They instigated a national cooperation programme (NSL) which promoted the following measures:

- increasing parking tariffs
- encouraging car sharing
- a scrappage scheme for polluting cars
- Park and ride
- low emission zone for freight
- priority parking permits for electric vehicles
- promoting electric vehicles

The monitoring tool shows that new developments do not have to have a negative effect on pollution levels. The data from the tool provided enough evidence for the extension and the predictions are that the NO₂ limit of 40µg will be achieved on all routes in the city by 2020.

Session 3

At the close of day one a round table of elected representatives came together to consider whether the goal of sustainable urban mobility is achievable. Rene Meijer chaired the debate and initiated discussion by posing the question what motivates cities to strive for sustainability? Responses varied according to individual city circumstances.

Claude Dargent gave a perspective from Paris where he reported one motivation is a perception of unacceptable noise levels as a concern that is rising up the agenda for citizens. Another consideration is ecology issues which are increasingly becoming important. For Rome achieving a high quality of life is the first priority alongside improving health. Coupled to these is a desire to be a competitive city. In Gothenburg the motivation is focussed on creating more public transport with a target of moving from 20% to 40% mode share.

Rene Meijer pondered whether cities can afford to sacrifice the car to realise a sustainable city. Based on experience in Rome it appears this is not an issue. Car ownership there continues to rise to almost one car per inhabitant, yet kilometres travelled by car are falling as are CO2 emissions. Rene wondered if making car use more expensive in Rome would have an impact. Again the experience of Rome suggests running costs are not a limiting factor on car ownership and would only start to have an effective impact on usage if there was an extreme change in cost. If you own a car it will be used. Julio Garcia Ramon observed that the variable costs of car use are not paramount when ownership is considered. He suggested one way forward might be to sell the greater journey time reliability of public transport over that of a car to encourage mode shift.

Cities need to create policies to reduce car use as most residents could become pedestrians, but a goal of a totally car free zone is unrealistic. Rome provides evidence that powered two wheelers are a realistic alternative as they deliver quicker journey times than the car. Moves to test other options have included experiments in Rome with free public transport.

The Amsterdam experience is noticeably different. The introduction of parking fees has been effective, especially when linked to clamping, encouraging people to leave the car at home. Maria Krautzberger observed that, as this experience does not always hold true, cities need to look for other solutions and public transport provision therefore becomes critical. Cities need to create greater flexibility in public transport and extend route networks and capacity. Rome acknowledged this was particularly true in the outer suburbs where sufficient public transport is not always present, though Park and Ride services are well supported.

From the perspective of Gothenburg car ownership is not seen as a problem, it is rather the use of the car, particularly during weekdays. The city has therefore set an objective of reducing weekday car use. The experience of Stockholm with its successful congestion charging scheme was flagged as a potential way forward, since it delivered a 25% reduction in traffic and public acceptance in a referendum.

Experience with parking charges and fines differ across member cities. Paris observed around 10% of car users pay for on street parking, but as enforcement needs strengthening and fines are low people are inclined to ignore the charges. Amsterdam has addressed this issue by making penalty charges a tax; with the added benefit that the revenue goes to the city. Maria Krautzberger perceived the issue as one of cultural differences. In Berlin less than 50% of residents own a car and those that do use it infrequently with demographic change increasing its use by the older population for comfort and convenience. To address this public transport has to become even more flexible with bicycles encouraged for local trips.

Discussion turned to the question of whether financial resources are available to work towards building sustainable cities. Taking Barcelona and Rome as an example it is evident that the infrastructure cost of building new metro lines is high, especially when archaeology constraints are included. However, much can be done within available resources to improve existing rail lines and integrate them with territorial use across the city. Moves are in place to adjust the transport system to reflect changing patterns of demand.

The current global economic crisis means cities are facing a challenge of doing things better with the limited resources they have at their disposal. Claude Dargent suggested this required development of a long term vision for cities. Maria Krautzberger believed change would require giving incentives. Financial constraints will be a fact of life for many years to come. Each city will need to have efficiency as a motivator and turn to "soft measures" to achieve sustainability (e.g. traffic management and reallocation of public space in streets). However, cities cannot forget the need to maintain the existing infrastructure. Roland Rydin

supported this view and cautioned that delaying investments may create problems. In the meantime building better quality public transport may offer a way forward.

Cristina Pou offered further reflections on the use of financial resources for infrastructure projects. In Barcelona around 65% of the budget has gone towards building Metro Line 9, although in itself it will not resolve the regions mobility issues. She encouraged cities to consider other innovative solutions and in particular not to forget the Bus, which is too often the "poor relation". From Vienna, Alexandra Vogl added that the difference between Tram and Metro costs should be remembered. She cautioned that politicians tend to see Metro schemes as high profile; focusing on questions of image and comfort at the expense of cost considerations. Once more members had different reactions to the alternative modes; Berlin expressing a preference for the tram, whilst Rome notes its two metro lines account for 50% of the traffic and are appreciated. The choice is therefore not just a political one.

Session 4

Day two of the conference saw the debate widen under with presentations on the New Berlin Transport Strategy: Process and Expectations by Friedemann Kunst and the French position on the ITS Action Plan from Claude Dargent.

Friedemann elaborated on the challenges facing Berlin and its response through the updated Integrated Urban Transport Plan (StEP-Verkehr) to provide sustainable transport planning. He noted the slight decrease on car use, stable public transport patronage and the notable increase in bicycle use. Overall projected trends suggest a decrease in transport volumes coupled with an increase in multimodal mobility. Although Berlin has a high quality transport infrastructure it sees the key mobility challenges as maintaining mobility whilst reducing its negative effects and enhancing the quality of the city as a place to live. It therefore seeks ways to move towards a carbon free city.

Key challenges include the stabilisation of its demographic makeup, tightening environmental requirements from EU directives and the uncertainty of financial resources to satisfy all its possible objectives.

The StEP-Verkehr has many ambitions which it addresses through an integrated approach linking transport with urban policies that couple long-term visions with short-term and medium-term measures. Actions are based on a consultative planning process involving all stakeholders that has led to a clear structure based on a guiding vision, clear aims, a strategy to move forward and measures to deliver the plan. All of which is assessed to evaluate its impact.

Given the existing quantity and quality of infrastructures in Berlin, non-infrastructure measures play a more important role than additional public transport infrastructure.

Switching to a French perspective Claude Dargent delivered a presentation that considered a response to ITS from an authority that makes both political and technical contributions at national and international levels. He noted the diversity of actors actively engaged in the deployment of ITS within cities, departments, regions and the role of private sector and semi-public bodies (eg ATEC-ITS France).

Elaborating on the work of ATEC-ITS Claude observed the importance of its memorandum on the EU Directive on ITS as a guide for stakeholders in France. The strategic plans embodied cover the development of sustainable mobility, limiting the emissions of green house gasses and creating real interoperability of transport systems within the EU.

He flagged up the need to make optimal use of traffic and travel data, but recognised the need to consider quality controls and development of an economic model for new

information systems that take into account both the costs of data collection and the payments from beneficiaries of new added value services. Action plans need to be based on user needs not technology requirements. In addition they must be intermodal and coherent with the EU Directive.

Whilst generally supporting the ITS Directive Claude stressed the need for effective implementation to remember development of new systems must be compatible with existing ones. That priority has to be given to involvement of all stakeholders from the start and emphasised that quality requirements need to be respected by all parties.

Session 5

The ever present issue of how to finance urban mobility projects, provides focus for a session that drew inspiration from contributions by representatives from Zagreb, Gothenburg and Vienna.

Visnja Bedenko looked at alternate sources for financing urban transport infrastructure, noting the motivations to seek private finance as cities strive to respond to rapid urbanisation, inadequate infrastructures or those that need rehabilitation. Reporting on discussions at a recent EBRD meeting in Zagreb she identified an expectation for developments in Croatian ports, rail infrastructure and airports. All of these will draw upon finance from bodies such as the EBRD, EIB, World Bank, or use tools such as PPP instruments.

Visnja concluded that conventional financing of schemes by the Public Sector tend to have a history of significant cost overruns, and delays, which leads to bad maintenance and reduced life expectancy for infrastructure. She suggested the many forms of Public Private Partnership (PPP) agreements might be a better approach. Comments from other delegates however indicated that experience with PPP was not always the best way forward and should be considered carefully.

Nevertheless, there are benefits of public bodies working with private partners when common interests exist and joint efforts can realise objectives if funding from the private sector can be tapped into; identifying development initiatives in Munich as an example.

Jan Rinman extended the debate on funding options with a perspective from Gothenburg on its intentions for congestion charges and financing infrastructure investments. He commented that the strategy in the city is to deploy an urban transport policy that provides efficient, safe, sustainable mobility for everyone. This requires reduced demand for transport, shifts towards sustainable modes, making transport more efficient, promoting new vehicle technologies and reaching synergy through collaboration.

K2020 provides a background for city initiatives with, in particular, a push for greater use of public transport (rising from 400k to 1m PT trips per day in 20 years). The infrastructure package for the Gothenburg region is integrated with the National transport Plan 2010-2021 with investments of €3.8m. Of this €1.6m is derived from Congestion charges as a new way to finance infrastructure whilst decreasing traffic congestion and improving air quality. He noted the successful experiences of other cities and suggesting the benefits appear to outweigh its problems which can often be overcome by good local implementation to gain acceptance. Gothenburg will therefore provide more trains, trams and BRT prior to implementation.

The Gothenburg scheme will probably use a zone base tax that is time differentiated with a cap on the charge in a day (€6) and a general rule of only one toll charge in a 30-60 minute period (typically €0.8 - €1.8).

A final perspective in the session came from Vienna where Rainer Mueller discussed the provision of parking spaces and parking space management. In a city the size of Vienna parking is a major issue with car ownership rising steadily.

One of the key principles of the cities transport policy is that costs should be covered by prices. Parking management is being used not only to reduce car use, but also to improve conditions for those who drive as well as reducing traffic violations. Revenues generated are going into promoting more off street parking lots and improving public transport. The city has a long history of parking management and has adopted new technology (eg mobile payment) to improve convenience along with prepaid parking vouchers. Other advances include dynamic parking guidance signs, routing information and park and ride sites. All these actions have done much to enable the city to fund attractive local landscaping schemes that reclaim public space for pedestrian use.

Session 6

Large and sport event management in cities.

Stadium Project and the South Africa and Delhi demonstrators - Maurizio Tomassini, Rome

STADIUM (Smart Transport Applications Designed for large events with Impacts on Urban Mobility) is an EU funded project to enhance international cooperation and to share ITS know how.

It is challenging enough maintaining sustainable urban mobility on a day to day basis, but hosting a large event such as the World Cup, Commonwealth Games or Olympic games puts substantial extra pressures on the transport system. STADIUM aims to improve the performance of transport services and systems for large events hosted by big cities, by sharing experiences (demonstration projects) and ITS technology. The project is Co financed by DG RTD with 3,6 M€ it started on 1 May 2009, and will last 48 months until the end of the London 2012 Olympics.

The transport system can be viewed in 3 layers, the existing system, the enhanced system, where transport connections are improved in anticipation of the large event, and the temporary dedicated transport system in place during the event.

During the event, there can be up to half a million extra people needing to use the transport system. These include residents who attend the event, spectators, sponsors, Olympic family, broadcasters and press, workforce and contractors, athletes, team officials and International Federations.

STADIUM aims to support the host city by suggesting ITS management systems and integration of these systems via the management centre to ensure optimisation solutions to support management with demand requirements.

The project outcomes will be a handbook of decision support systems for managing the transport system. Drawing on inputs from ITS Providers ERTICO, PLUSERVICE and THETIS, The handbook will cover:

- Dynamic traffic management systems & realtime traffic information
- Public transport: tracking, fleet management/demand-responsive transport/ etc
- Tools to optimize operational transport plans according to historic and real-time demand data

This handbook will draw on the experiences of three demonstrator ITS applications at three major events:

- the South Africa World Cup (2010) in Cape town,
- the India Commonwealth Games (2010) in Delhi,
- and the London Olympics (2012)

In Cape town, the existing services were not based on technology and the systems in place were not sophisticated.

The main goals were to Improve the long term performance of minibus taxi public transport services through the use of ITS and to implement an ITS Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) application on collective taxis that could be used effectively during the 2010 SWC and beyond.

STADIUM funded a control centre with a call centre for booking, monitoring real-time information, giving speed and location. This was also important for security reasons.

Develop, implement, test and execute the Demonstration during the Commonwealth Games 2010, testing the ITS applications of Public Transport:

- planning,
- real time fleet management,
- infomobility on mobile devices.
-

The handbook will be available for future users, it will collect information from past and current events, cataloguing ITS Applications. It will supply user guidelines on What to do and a toolbox of how to do it.

Going forward, the STADIUM handbook will be offered to

- Glasgow (Commonwealth Games 2014),
- Warsaw, Krakow, Poznan, Kiev, Kharkov (Euro 2012)
- Sochi (Winter Olympic Games 2014)
- Milan (World Expo 2015) and Madrid.
- Rio de Janeiro (Summer Olympic Games)

The second presentation of this session was entitled Organisation of London 2012 Olympic games, Ed Thompson, Transport for London

Ed told us that the vision for the 2012 games is 'to host an inspirational, safe and inclusive Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, and leave a sustainable legacy for London and the UK.'

Transport is crucial to a successful games, it needs to be reported in the back pages of the newspapers, not the front pages.

The Olympic Delivery authority are responsible for delivering the games with a sustainable legacy. The games will take place over 3 weekends with two full weeks which are during the school holidays. A major factor of the bid was the regeneration of East London.

The venues for the games include the Olympic park in Stratford where the athletics and swimming events will take place, Wimbledon for the tennis, Greenwich and Woolwich for shooting and horse riding, Wembley for Football, rowing and water events will take place outside London on the South Coast. There will also be some events taking place in central London - Archery at Lords Cricket ground, Triathlon at Hyde Park, Volleyball at Earls Court and Beach Volleyball at Horseguards Parade.

Measures introduced by TfL to improve the transport infrastructure include:

- Increasing train capacity on the Jubilee line
- Step free access for Green Park and Southfields underground stations
- Increasing capacity on the Central and District lines
- Docklands Light Railway -in the last few years, new extensions have been opened to City Airport and Woolwich Arsenal. Future extension to Stratford International.

A transport coordination centre will be set up in time for the games, East London Transit will provide faster connections between Ilford and Barking.

On the river, piers will be enhanced and £10m has been spent on improving cycle and walking routes.

The Olympic route network is a network of roads linking venues with accommodation areas. It will comprise of a series of traffic management measures which will need to be tested beforehand and removed after the games. Project Clearway will minimise utilities' street works and roadworks before and during London 2012 as needed. This network will not be exclusive to Olympic traffic, although there will be some special games lanes. Alternative routes will be provided in case of emergency such as a burst water main.

In parallel to the games, there is a need for good transport (and access) for residents, businesses, freight, commuters and non games tourists. Transport providers will need to perform at their very best - they will need all their staff, so no holidays over the period of the games. All agencies involved need to talk to each other and work collaboratively.

The road network is already congested, so the way to deal with increased demand is to suppress it by providing very limited parking at venues and encouraging travel by public transport. Normal travel can be reduced by encouraging individuals to work from home during the games or volunteer to help at the games.

Measures can be tested at other shorter events such as the London marathon and triathlon.

Freight deliveries can be encouraged out of hours, but some essential services such as refuse collection and meals on wheels (hot meals delivered to elderly and infirm) will need to continue regardless.

The overall aim is to show London in a good light, many events are routed past national landmarks.

The plan is that Monday to Friday it will be business as usual, but the weekends will see road closures. It will be flexible, with a plan B if things don't work out.

Advice to Rome is to start planning now!

Rome 2020 Olympic Games candidature - Alessandro Fuschiotto, Head of Planning Mobility in the Rome Mobility Agency

Alessandro began the final presentation of the conference by telling us that Rome were originally in competition with Venice for the candidacy for 2020 Olympic games, their bid was strongest because of their transport proposals.

In Rome, their long term planning is sufficient to support the games. The infrastructural network of Rome in 2020 will be "naturally" suitable and ready to sustain this great event.

One of the goals is to ensure that there is a maximum 30 minute travel time by road between venues. Events taking place in other cities, such as Milan, are accessible by high speed rail in this time.

€6m will be spent on improving infrastructure. A large part of this is being spent on the new Line C metro. This will be extended to the Olympic village in time for the games.

The public transport network will be supported by private car transport. The road network has also been upgraded to dual carriageways and a 3 lane ring road. The capacity of the motorway connecting Fumicino Airport has been doubled.

ITS technology is already in place and future planning will be outlined by 2013 when the final decision about the location of the games will be made if Rome are chosen, they will accelerate developments and plug any gaps. They see the games as an opportunity to improve the transport system in Rome for the future and not just for the games.