УДК 330.342.44

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT POLICIES: GOOD PRACTICES

© **Khaykhadaeva O., 2020**
Buryat State University, Ulan-Ude

Many cities in the world are trying to implement transport policies to mitigate negative impacts of transportation on the environment. Existing problems in the area of transportation include mobility patterns, urban sprawling, congestion. Transport sector of the economy is generally viewed as less successful in reducing greenhouse gases in comparison with such sectors as energy or industrial production. But there are successful transport systems, and studying these success stories would help reach good results in other cities. Studying

good practices is very useful since it can give insights into policy tools utilized by successful cities. This paper is devoted to studying an experience of two cities, Seattle and Montreal, in implementation of sustainable transport systems by using different styles of regulation and policy tools.

Keywords: transport policies, congestion, government, governance, policy instrument.

Many cities in the world are trying to implement transport policies to mitigate negative impacts of transportation on the environment (Mayers, 2000). Existing problems in the area of transportation include mobility patterns, urban sprawling, congestion. Transport sector of the economy is generally viewed as less successful in reducing greenhouse gases (GHG) in comparison with such sectors as energy or industrial production (Monbiot, 2006). Moreover, transport related GHG emissions continue to increase (International Energy Agency, 2013).

Comparing different transport systems and determining successful ones is not an easy task. This is because of different geographical and socio-economic characteristics of each country. But despite it, studying good practices is very useful since it can give insights into policy tools utilized by successful cities. This paper is devoted to studying an experience of two cities, Seattle and Montreal, in implementation of sustainable transport systems by using different styles of regulation and policy tools. In scientific literature, cities of Seattle and Montreal have got a recognition for their sustainable transport system and implementation of active transport policies.

In the centre of Seattle, in 2014, 45 % of people got to work by transit, which is 2 % more than in 2012. In general, Seattle uses public transport ten times more than the US average.

In Montreal, the use of transit and non-motorized modes is about 33 % (City of Montreal, 2010). Bike-sharing system in Montreal was implemented in 2009: it has more than 5 000 bicycles and is one of the largest in the North America (Shaheen et al., 2010). Thus, in terms of transit, bike and pedestrian modal share these two cities reached considerable success. But despite it, these cities face challenges such as increase of motorization and metropolitanization (Tremblay-Racicot and Mercier, 2014).

Urban Transport

The literature on sustainable urban transport addresses mostly two main challenges, namely: 1) multi-level public policies; 2) large number of stakeholders wishing to participate in decision-making.

Institutional fragmentation and the diffuse nature of authority lead to the multi-level policy environment, and this is especially true for transportation (Mercier et al., 2016; Brown, 2012). The problem is partly defined by the fact that the main city may be at odds with smaller, but growing, cities within its metropolitan region.

The second challenge concerns a wide variety of state and non-state actors, NGOs, interest groups, private firms, voluntary organizations (Mayntz, 2006), who have aspirations to participate in decision-making. This array of stakeholders and combination of their interests «has weakened the ability of territorially based jurisdictions to control policy formulation and implementation in traditional ways (Howlett et al., 2009, p.384). Moreover, it challenges top-down regulations conducted by the centralized city government (Frey, 2012).

Responding to fragmentation of urban areas and growing demands for participation in decision-making, urban scholars use the concept of «multi-level governance» (Horak and Young, 2012).

The notion of governance (in contrast to «government»), firstly, «fits perfectly with the research agenda in urban politics (where) public-private partnerships and other forms of exchange between local authorities and their environment had long been in place» (Pierre, 2011, p.6). Secondly, governance requires different set of instruments for implementation (Howlett, 2014; Torting and Triantafillou, 2013; Torting et al., 2012). And governance instruments are less direct and more interactive (Jordan et al., 2003; Howlett, 2001; Kassim and Le Gales, 2010; Salamon, 2002).

This paper studies the mix of policy instruments (Howlett, 2011) and styles of intervention to reach sustainable urban transportation system.

Government instruments can be described as more «top-down» and «coercive». On the opposite, governance instruments are those that are more participative, interactive and flexible. In addition to government and governance instruments, in practice there can be self-regulative and informative instruments. In this paper, effort is made to clarify how government and governance instruments work.

Seattle

The city of Seattle and Washington State are leaders in sustainable transport. Washington State has been a leader in policy adoption concerning greenhouse gases emission reduction since 1990, a year of adoption of the Growth Management Act. The City of Seattle and King County have had long-term sustainability program for GHG decrease (Mercier et al., 2016).

Seattle is considered as a city where «cultures of deep ecology and high technology merge» (Jarvis, 2001, p.243). In Seattle, sustainability became a key subject in policy making since 1991 (Atkisson, 1996; Mercier et al., 2016). Public transport promotion became one of the main political issue. In Seattle, the construction of major road infrastructure was reduced and replaced with unprecedented development of public transit projects. City's policies include creation of a wide choice of quality mobility infrastructure, reduced travel time, rational economic development.

No doubt, sustainable transport policies imply imposition of some constraints on citizens. But despite it, Seattle authorities see their duty in offering more and better mobility choices.

Montreal

In Montreal, there are many institutional players with competing mandates: the Province, the regional government, the regional transit agency and the City of Montreal (Mercier et al., 2016). The provincial government responsibilities include provincial capital plan for road infrastructure and public transit, transport plan for Montreal. The City of Montreal controls Agglomeration (which includes all municipalities on the Island of Montreal). The Government of Canada owns main transport infrastructure (ex., bridges, ports). The metropolitan government comprised of the region mayors (the CMM) controls transport and land use planning. In addition, there is the AMT (Agency Metropolitaine de Transport) that operates the commuter rail service and coordinates transit operators around and to Montreal. In general, Montreal has good results in terms of promoting sustainable transport. However, according to expert opinions, Montreal could have better results if transport governance was improved (Mercier et al., 2016).

Historically, Montreal has developed more compactly because of its island configuration. Compact development, in turn, was more favourable for public transport. However, recent trends show that growth has taken place far from the city center in low density areas, even outside island itself. This pattern of development has caused big problems related with its aging infrastructure which has led to congestion problems.

At the same time, there are significant positive changes such as transit use growth among different cohorts of population, especially among young people, as well as transit-friendly municipal policies (ex., transit-oriented development around subway and railway stations) (Grimsrud and El-Geneidy, 2013). But despite these positive trends, there are, according to expert opinions, problems with public transport such as schedule complexities, duration of trips, crowding, lack of comfort, etc. (Mercier et al., 2016).

Policy instruments

What policy instruments these cities have chosen to implement their transport policies? Both cities rely on government instruments at some point to implement their policies. These types of instruments can take many forms, but all of them are forceful and coercive. As for governance instruments, they are more complex. This kind of instruments implies interaction that requires a response, but this response is not imposed coercively. Governance/Interactive instruments can take two forms: an economic response and a political response.

An economic response means that stakeholders modify their behavior in response to financial incentives and disincentives used by public authorities. For example, public authorities can use financial disincentives to use private car by charging a congestion fee.

As for political response, if public authorities wish to consult stakeholders on the elaboration and implementation of transportation plan. Doing this, public authorities hope for public participation and support.

Sustainable urban transport is socially and technically challenging issue. Cities need time in studying traffic patterns, public and expert opinions. In general, the City of Seattle actively uses interactive instruments as political as economic ones. For example, public authorities actively use extended consultations with citizens. As for Montreal, it uses a hybrid form of regulation (mix of government and governance instruments).

Conclusion

Two cities are different, but despite this fact, there are some emerging patterns. First of all, there is the challenge of metropolitanization and fragmentation.

As for promotion of sustainable urban transport, these cities have used such policies as greenhouse gases reduction policies, land use policies, transit/transport policies. The study of two cities showed that the difference between government and governance instruments are not so much clear as it might appear at first glance. Moreover, these instruments complement each other. In contemporary world, government instruments have become more flexible and interactive. On the other hand, governance instruments, at some points, especially economic instruments, can be more coercive (Wurzel et al., 2013).

In future, probably, trends of convergence towards comparable policy mixes will strengthen. However, this move may take quite long time (Williamson, 2000; Carey and Low, 2012).

The use of governance instruments does not exclude the use of government instruments. Moreover, in the face of externalities and interdependence, which are characteristic elements for urban transport, the presence of government instruments is, actually, absolutely necessary. The use of governance instruments is particularly helpful in metropolitan regions that are fragmented. But, it should be noted that some level of centralization is necessary to achieve sustainable urban transport in the region. ■

10. Atkisson, A., 1996. Developing indicators of sustainable community: lessons from Sustainable Seattle. Environ. Impact Assess.Rev.16(4),337–350.

11. Brown, D.M., 2012. Comparative climate change policy and federalism: an overview. Rev. Policy Res.29(3),322–333.

12. Carey, C., Low, N., 2012. Institutional Barriers to Sustainable Transport. Ashgate, Farnham.

13. Frey, K., 2012. Abordagens de governance em areas metropolitanas da América Latina: avançoseentraves. Urbe 4(1), 87–102.

14. Grimsrud, M., El-Geneidy, A., 2013. Driving transit retention to renaissance: trends in Montreal commute public transport mode share and factors by age group and birth cohort. Public Transp. 5(3),219–241.

15. Horak, Martin, Young, Robert, 2012. Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities. Mcgill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, Kingston.

16. Howlett, M., 2011. Designing Public Policies: Principles and Instruments. Routledge, London, New York.

17. Howlett,M., 2014. From the ‘old’ to the ‘new’ policy design: design thinking beyond markets and collaborative governance. PolicySci. 47(3),187–207. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11077-014-9199-0.

18. Howlett, M., Rayner, J., Jollefson, C.,2009. From government to governance in forest planning? Lessons from the case of the British Columbia Great Bear Rainforest initiative. For.PolicyEcon.11,383–391.

19. Jarvis, H., 2001. Urban sustainability as a function of compromises households make deciding where and how to live: Portland and Seattle compared. Local Environ.6(3),239–256.

20. Jordan, A., Wurzel,R., Zito,A., 2003. Comparative Conclusions – ‘New’ Environmental policy instruments: an evolution or a revolution in environmental policy? Environ.Polit.12(1),201–224.

21. Kassim, H., Galès, P., 2010. Exploring governance in a multilevel polity: a policy instruments approach. WestEur.Polit. 33(1),1–21.

22. Mayeres, I., 2000.The efficiency effects of transport policies in the presence of externalities and distortionary taxes. J.Transp. Econ. Policy 34(2), 233–259.

23. Mayntz, R., 2006.From government to governance: political steering in modern societies. In: Scheer, D., Rubik, F. (Eds.), Governance of Integrated Product Policy: In Search of Sustainable Production and Consumption. Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield, pp.18–25.

24. Mercier, J., Carrier, M., Duarte, F., Tremblay-Racicot, F., 2016. Policy tools for sustainable transport of the Americas: Seattle, Montreal and Curitiba. Transport Policy 50, 95-105.

25. Monbiot, George,2006.Heat:How to Stop the Planet from Burning. Penguins Books, New York.

26. Pierre, Jon, 2011.The Politics of Urban Governance. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

27. Pierre, Jon, Peters,B.Guy,2000. Governance, Politics and the State. Macmillan Press, London.

28. Salamon, L. M., 2002. The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance. Oxford University Press, New York.

29. Shaheen, Susan, Guzman,Stacey, Zhang,Hua,2010. Bike sharing in Europe, the Americas, and Asia: past, present, and future. Transp.Res.Rec.2143(1), 159–167.

30. Torfing, J., Triantafillou, P., 2013. What's in a name? Grasping new public governance as a political-administrative system. Int.Rev.PublicAdm.18(2), 9–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2013.10805250.

31. Torfing, J., Peters, G, Pierre,J., Sorensen,E., 2012. Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm. Oxford University Press

32. Tremblay-Racicot, F., Mercier, J., 2014. Integrating transportation and land use planning at the metropolitan level in North America: multilevel governance in Toronto and Chicago. Urbe 6(2),184–200.

33. Williamson, O., 2000. The new institutional economics: taking stock, looking ahead. J.Econ. Lit. 38(3), 597–598.

34. Wurzel, R., Anthony R., Zito, Andrew J., Jordan, 2013. Environmental Governance in Europe. A comparative Analysis of New Environmental Policy Instruments. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited and Northampton USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.

REFERENCES

Atkisson, A., 1996. Developing indicators of sustainable community: lessons from Sustainable Seattle. Environ. Impact Assess.Rev.16(4),337–350.

Brown, D.M., 2012. Comparative climate change policy and federalism: an overview. Rev. Policy Res.29(3),322–333.

Carey, C., Low, N., 2012. Institutional Barriers to Sustainable Transport. Ashgate, Farnham.

Frey, K., 2012. Abordagens de governance em areas metropolitanas da América Latina: avançoseentraves. Urbe 4(1), 87–102.

Grimsrud, M., El-Geneidy, A., 2013. Driving transit retention to renaissance: trends in Montreal commute public transport mode share and factors by age group and birth cohort. Public Transp. 5(3),219–241.

Horak, Martin, Young, Robert, 2012. Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities. Mcgill-Queen's University Press, Montreal, Kingston.

Howlett, M., 2011. Designing Public Policies: Principles and Instruments. Routledge, London, New York.

Howlett,M., 2014. From the ‘old’ to the ‘new’ policy design: design thinking beyond markets and collaborative governance. PolicySci. 47(3),187–207. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11077-014-9199-0.

Howlett, M., Rayner, J., Jollefson, C.,2009. From government to governance in forest planning? Lessons from the case of the British Columbia Great Bear Rainforest initiative. For.PolicyEcon.11,383–391.

Jarvis, H., 2001. Urban sustainability as a function of compromises households make deciding where and how to live: Portland and Seattle compared. Local Environ.6(3),239–256.

Jordan, A., Wurzel,R., Zito,A., 2003. Comparative Conclusions – ‘New’ Environmental policy instruments: an evolution or a revolution in environmental policy? Environ.Polit.12(1),201–224.

Kassim, H., Galès, P., 2010. Exploring governance in a multilevel polity: a policy instruments approach. WestEur.Polit. 33(1),1–21.

Mayeres, I., 2000.The efficiency effects of transport policies in the presence of externalities and distortionary taxes. J.Transp. Econ. Policy 34(2), 233–259.

Mayntz, R., 2006.From government to governance: political steering in modern societies. In: Scheer, D., Rubik, F. (Eds.), Governance of Integrated Product Policy: In Search of Sustainable Production and Consumption. Greenleaf Publishing, Sheffield, pp.18–25.

Mercier, J., Carrier, M., Duarte, F., Tremblay-Racicot, F., 2016. Policy tools for sustainable transport of the Americas: Seattle, Montreal and Curitiba. Transport Policy 50, 95-105.

Monbiot, George,2006.Heat:How to Stop the Planet from Burning. Penguins Books, New York.

Pierre, Jon, 2011.The Politics of Urban Governance. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Pierre, Jon, Peters,B.Guy,2000. Governance, Politics and the State. Macmillan Press, London.

Salamon, L. M., 2002. The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance. Oxford University Press, New York.

Shaheen, Susan, Guzman,Stacey, Zhang,Hua,2010. Bike sharing in Europe, the Americas, and Asia: past, present, and future. Transp.Res.Rec.2143(1), 159–167.

Torfing, J., Triantafillou, P., 2013. What's in a name? Grasping new public governance as a political-administrative system. Int.Rev.PublicAdm.18(2), 9–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2013.10805250.

Torfing, J., Peters, G, Pierre,J., Sorensen,E., 2012. Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm. Oxford University Press

Tremblay-Racicot, F., Mercier, J., 2014. Integrating transportation and land use planning at the metropolitan level in North America: multilevel governance in Toronto and Chicago. Urbe 6(2),184–200.

Williamson, O., 2000. The new institutional economics: taking stock, looking ahead. J.Econ. Lit. 38(3), 597–598.

Wurzel, R., Anthony R., Zito, Andrew J., Jordan, 2013. Environmental Governance in Europe. A comparative Analysis of New Environmental Policy Instruments. Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited and Northampton USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.

Политика устойчивого транспорта: примеры успешного опыта

© Хайхадаева О. Д., 2020

Многие города мира пытаются внедрить транспортную политику, чтобы смягчить негативное воздействие транспорта на окружающую среду. Существующие проблемы в области транспорта включают модели мобильности, разрастание городов, пробки. Транспортный сектор экономики, как правило, считается менее успешным в сокращении выбросов парниковых газов по сравнению с такими секторами, как энергетика или промышленное производство. Но существуют успешные транспортные системы, и изучение этих историй успеха поможет достичь хороших результатов в других городах. Изучение передового опыта очень полезно, поскольку оно может дать представление об инструментах политики, используемых успешными городами. Эта статья посвящена изучению опыта двух городов, Сиэтла и Монреаля, по внедрению устойчивых транспортных систем с использованием различных стилей регулирования и инструментов политики.

Ключевые слова: транспортная политика, пробки, инструменты политики, правление