

Summary:

Market Oriented Public Transport

Background

In May 2001, the Swedish government decided to appoint a parliamentary public transport committee (*Kollektivtrafikkommittén*) whose purpose is to identify, analyse and describe the problems and opportunities within public transport, formulate objectives and visions and propose changes in organisation, legislation etc which are significant for the development of public transport, from both a consumer perspective and a unified perspective.

The Swedish public transport committee has given TØI the task of producing summaries and knowledge about the market, organisation and finance of public transport, based on available research records in Norway, Sweden and comparable countries in Europe. This work will form one of the essential background documents which will provide the basis for further work by the committee.

This summary of knowledge is in no way comprehensive, but is designed rather as an overview of the most important problems connected with this field. A great deal of knowledge exists in this field, both in Sweden and internationally. The literature list at the back of this document provides an overview of Swedish and international literature which can be read in order to obtain a deeper perspective of the theme of market-oriented public transport.

We would like to draw particular attention to some central summary documents which go in some of the problems dealt with in this report in greater depth:

- *Kollektivtrafikkforskningens Klara Resultat* (Börjesson and Eriksson: 2000)
- *Spårtrafikens Klara Resultat. En sammanfatning av forskning kring spårburen trafikk åren 1996-1999* (Ehrling and Johansson 2000)
- *Fakta om kollektivtransport. Erfaringer og løsninger for byområder* (Stangeby and Norheim 1995)
- *Attraktiv kollektivtrafikk i små städer. Förutsättningar och möjligheter för ett ökat resande. En förstudie* (Fredriksson et al. 2000)

- *Samlet evaluering av tiltakspakker for kollektivtransport i byområder – 1996/97* (Kjørstad et al. 2000)
- *Hva forsøksordningen har lært oss. Hovedkonklusjoner fra forsøk med kollektivtransport 1991-95* (Renolen 1998)

Huge potential amongst occasional public transport users

A number of studies show that a great number of people vary their choice of form of transport, both from one period to another and from one year to the next. Thus, there are many people who cannot be defined as pure "car users" or "public transport users". Thus, it is not a question of getting those who "always" drive their car to go over to using public transport permanently, but rather a question of getting the marginal public transport users to use their cars less often. This means that increasing the focus on passengers can also contribute to reducing car traffic.

Passengers' variations in their choice of form of transport imply that it is necessary to look more closely at the marginal public transport users, i.e. those who use public transport on an occasional basis.

Previous experiences in areas which have experienced positive passenger development have shown that the growth in public transport is largely due to marginal public transport users using public transport more often. The new journeys are made by those who previously used public transport on an occasional basis and who now use public transport somewhat more often. Those who never used public transport before still don't use public transport. It would take a great deal to get "persistent" car users to use public transport.

In order to get more passengers, the public transport companies need to concentrate their attention on the marginal public transport users, i.e. those who use public transport occasionally. The greatest potential for increasing the use of public transport lies within this group.

Many barriers against using public transport

Barriers, whether physical, psychological or of an informative nature, prevent the individual traveller from using public transport, no matter how well developed public transport provision may be.

- *Psychological barriers* may include feelings of a lack of security and fear of the form of transport, at the bus stop or on the route to or from the bus stop. Psychological barriers can also include feelings of insecurity regarding mastery of the public transport system, that is to say, a fear of not being able to find one's way around the system, or being unable to figure out the system, timetables etc.
- *Physical barriers*: A number of elderly and handicapped people have problems in getting to the bus stop and in getting on and off buses. Other road user groups may have difficulties in using public transport at different phases of their lives.
- *Informative barriers* are barriers which affect the majority of road users. This problem concerns both a *lack of* knowledge and *incorrect* knowledge.

Reducing feelings of insecurity

Feelings of insecurity when using public transport are a big- city problem. A survey amongst permanent public transport users in Oslo showed that half the women who did not use public transport during the evenings stated feelings of a lack of safety as the most important reason. Waiting at the bus stop or the route to /from the bus stop were connected with the greatest feelings of insecurity. This particularly applies to women.

A study from Gothenburg shows that 27 per cent of passengers are afraid of violent and threatening behaviour in connection with their journey. This study also showed that 4 per cent of the inhabitants of Gothenburg avoid using public transport at least once a week because of feelings of insecurity.

Measures to reduce insecurity include

- Lighting at bus-stops and along footpaths leading to bus-stops
- Manned underground stations
- Guards
- Installing emergency telephones

- At larger bus stops: personnel present
- Smaller bus stops: proximity to kiosks, cafés, shops etc.

Reducing problems in understanding the public transport system

Psychological barriers can also arise as a result of the uncertainty felt by individual passengers. There is reason to believe that many people feel that they have not mastered the public transport system and this aspect in itself can be a barrier to using public transport. Many doubt whether they have sufficient knowledge to plan and carry out the journey, or may be worried that the journey will not go as planned, that they might take the wrong bus etc.

The lack of information, or poor information, is a factor which can lead to great uncertainty in the journey situation. In a way, this is a combination of informative barriers and psychological barriers. This type of barrier can, however, be reduced through producing clear information for passengers and simple route systems.

Improving physical obstacles

Physical barriers are physical obstacles, differences in levels etc, for example at bus stops and on buses themselves. Health- related problems, particularly amongst the physically handicapped and the elderly, can also be defined as a physical barrier which prevents many from using the public transport system. Swedish data indicates that, in all, around 10 per cent of the population may have problems connected with transport. The group with serious handicaps in relation to transport, however, is much smaller. This means that a high proportion of those who have problems can have such problems reduced to such an extent that they actually can use public transport, providing that accessibility is good in all parts of the system.

- *The line system must be developed so that the great majority of inhabitants are only a short distance from public transport provision.* A public transport system with high priority network should be supplemented with service lines or "hail and ride" buses for those who have physical difficulty in travelling a long distance to the bus stop, but who could use public transport providing the conditions were improved.
- *Physical conditions which can create barriers for some road user groups must be documented and improved.* This may be a question of the steepness

of steps, steep ramps, heavy doors, unevenness in the road surface, and poor surfaces on roads and at bus stops. Another negative factor is inadequate lighting at bus stops and along roads and footpaths running to and from the bus stops, which increases the danger of falls and injuries. A further problem is that bus stops, and footpaths to and from bus stops, are often covered with snow and ice in the winter, and that they are not always swept or sanded immediately.

Problems in getting on and off buses are experienced by the physically handicapped and people pushing prams in particular. This barrier can lead to reduced use of public transport. The elderly and the physically handicapped often need help in getting on and off the bus, and many require a seat during the journey.

Better information and marketing

In order to reduce informative barriers, the public transport companies must take a conscious decision to offer the best possible information to their customers by profiling public transport, actively marketing public transport provision and offering easily accessible passenger information.

The main objective in designing information for passengers is that it should be simple to find, read and understand.

Information about public transport is a continuous process. Without updating in the event of changes in the system, timetables and other information are worthless and passengers will lose their faith in the public transport company. Wrong information can be worse than no information at all. With electronic information, the requirement for updating increases significantly. Electronic information gives an impression of always being up to date, and it needs to be so. This requires good follow up and maintenance.

User-friendly public transport provision

Public transport provision should be user-friendly and easy to understand. New users in particular need a public transport system which is simple to use. Ideally, public transport provision should be so simple to understand that all new passengers can use it without needing specific knowledge about fares, timetables or connecting routes. This is not simply a question of passenger information. The design of the route network also affects passengers' chances of getting to know what is available. Some measures which can make it easier to use public transport are:

- *Fixed departure times*, i.e. fixed departures every hour each day
- *Frequent departures*, so that passengers do not need to learn the timetables
- *Junctions* with direct transfers to connecting routes
- *Co-ordination of routes* in large public transport streets and at bus stops
- *Priority given to public transport*, so that the journey time is reduced and regularity improved
- *Simple, easy to understand route systems*, with quick routes and easily recognisable numbers and names.
- *Better passenger information*, before the passengers start their journeys, at the bus stop and during the journey itself.

Making the route structure more effective

Potentially, one of the greatest ways to obtain "more and better public transport for our money" will be by making the route structure more effective. In recent years, many cities have tidied up and simplified the route structure, largely in the form of a high priority network with supplementary small bus networks. Experiences from these cities show that this can result in better provision and more passengers, but it requires active support from local authorities.

Improved regularity and accessibility

Delays easily occur in rush hour traffic, both for car users and for public transport users. A study carried out in five medium-size Norwegian cities shows that one in six public transport users experienced a delay the last time he or she used public transport.

Passengers value regularity highly. The road authorities must therefore implement measures which prioritise public transport over and above the car. Improved accessibility for buses and trams is also amongst the most profitable measures within the transport system. Frequency along the routes can be increased and make possible a better utilisation of the vehicle fleet. At the same time, passengers will reach their destination more quickly and delays will be reduced.

High priority network results in better journey standards for majority, but must be supplemented.

The majority of passengers prioritise departure density more highly than shorter distances between bus stops. Over all, passengers have a better standard of journey with a coarse- meshed high priority network with more than 500 metres between each bus stop, frequent departures, separate bus lanes, active prioritisation at intersections and well- equipped bus stops.

Long walking distances to bus stops and speedy mounting and dismounting are problematic for some public transport users. The high priority networks must therefore be supplemented with mini-bus routes, service lines or "hail and ride" buses with short walking distances, lower frequency and/or extra help with mounting or dismounting according to need. It is important that this concentrated, more surface-covering provision is seen as a unified system, with good opportunities for changing from one bus to another, and suitable bus times.

There are several reasons for integrating the different line networks. One important reason is that none of these systems covers the journey requirements alone. It has also proved to be more economically profitable to have lines which work together than lines which run in parallel. Another reason is that new legislation sets requirements for handicapped people using public transport. This means that the existing traffic solutions must work in co-operation to deal with the requirements of different passenger groups.

Differentiated fares

General fare reductions have proved to have little effect on car traffic. At the same time, studies have shown that a number of passengers are willing to pay for improved public transport provision. By differentiating fares, price sensitive passenger groups can have lower fares, while at the same time the level of provision can be maintained because a number of passengers are willing to pay more.

The "right" level of fares depends on what has the greatest effect on demand: lower fares or better provision. For some groups, the basis for increasing fares in order to subsidise better public transport provision is found within today's level of subsidies. Other public transport users prioritise lower prices and simpler standards. Differentiated fare systems need to be developed which deal with the needs of a number of groups.

Public transport subsidies have been reduced

It costs money to prioritise public transport. The size of the subsidies from the public authorities plays a decisive role for the level of public transport provision in urban areas. A number of public transport companies have had their public subsidies reduced in recent years.

Public transport fares are both a tool for obtaining more passengers and a source of finance for maintaining a good level of provision.

Passengers are willing to pay for improved public transport provision

The level of fares is significant as a source of finance for the provision which is being developed. There are a number of analyses which show that passengers are willing to pay a higher price for improved services. A fare - financed improvement in public transport provision will thus provide both better services and more passengers within today's level of subsidies. Even though there may be other reasons for maintaining a low level of fares, it is important to emphasise that there are clear challenges in the level of service which is being developed.

Targeted fare experiments have the best effect

Public transport in Norway and Sweden has largely used fare rebates in the form of monthly bus passes, rebates for pensioners and distance rebates (zones, kilometres). These are rebates which can be found in the majority of areas in society and which are seen as fair by users. They are also simple to use, which is important both for bus and tram personnel and for new users.

The disadvantage with such rebates is that they are seldom based on cost. Rebates are given to the least price-sensitive users, workers in rush hour periods, while passengers travelling outside rush hour subsidise rush hour passengers. There are major variations in passengers' price sensitivity, between different groups and between different journeys. Some important differences are:

- Rush hour traffic is least price sensitive
- Leisure passengers are more price sensitive than workers
- Children and young people are more price sensitive than adult passengers
- Owning a car increases price sensitivity

- Low income groups have few alternatives and are therefore not very price sensitive
- Good public transport provision increases price sensitivity
- Price sensitivity is greater on shorter than on longer journeys.

A targeted fare system, adapted to the market, should utilise this knowledge about variations in price sensitivity. Rebates should be given to the most price-sensitive and least costly passengers.

Long term prioritisation

The framework conditions for the public transport companies make it difficult to prioritise in the long term, even though experience shows that it can take time before changes in the level of provision have an effect on passenger development. More stable framework conditions would create greater opportunities for the long-term development of public transport provision.

It takes time to implement new public transport services. If public transport has long term, stable framework conditions, it is easier to design and implement new provision. Area usage and urban structures create long term challenges for development opportunities for public transport. It is important to take this into account in area planning.

It takes time to establish new provision

Passengers are slow to adapt to new provision, due to both a lack of knowledge and because many stick to their previous travel habits. People who are used to travelling a lot by public transport continued to travel more in this way than others, and people who travel little by public transport also continue in this way, even though important factors which are significant for the choice of transport are changing.

An old Norwegian saying runs thus: "Old habits are hard to change!". If this is the case with people's choice of transport, public transport planners need to take this into account. New services must be marketed both at the start and through long term follow-up over a number of years. Passengers must be "trained" to use public transport. This can prove profitable in the long term, particularly with regard to children and young people.

Experiences from *Forsøksordningen* have shown that the introduction of new public transport services has an effect both in the long term and the short term.

Even though the greatest increase in number of users normally comes in the first year after the measure is implemented, it takes some time before potential users know about the service and start using it.

Long-term targeted emphasis is an important key factor.

Public transport faces new and demanding challenges if it is going to play a role as an attractive, competitive alternative to the car in urban areas. For Norway's part, TØI has calculated that if public transport "stagnates", i.e. if routes, vehicle fleet and fares are maintained at current levels this will mean that for the 10 largest urban areas there will be an annual decrease in the number of public transport passengers of 1.6 per cent. This means that a continuous, targeted product development must be implemented to maintain, and preferably increase, the public transport share.

Results from the Norwegian *Forsøksordningen* indicate that dissatisfied passengers have a greater tendency to stop using public transport than satisfied passengers have to increase their use of buses. This underlines the need to safeguard current passengers, which requires a *long-term, continuous development of public transport provision*.

Combined measures

Improved public transport provision results in more passengers – but has little effect on car traffic if the measure is not combined with measures which make using the car less attractive.

A better, cheaper public transport system is not sufficient in itself to reduce car traffic. Restrictions in the form of traffic regulation, parking regulations or financial instruments are necessary in order to achieve an evening-out or reduction in car traffic. However, such tools have little effect unless there is a well-developed alternative for car users.

Competitive interfaces between public transport and other forms of transport

The *Forsøksordning* shows that 12 – 30 per cent of people who use public transport have a car as their most important alternative. This does not mean that they have a car standing at home ready to use. As a rule, it is usually somebody else in the household who uses the car. Who uses the family car or who uses public transport is often a question of negotiation,

depending on public transport provision, errands to be undertaken on the way, parking opportunities etc.

Greatest potential to increase public transport traffic on longer local journeys

In contrast to the car, walking and cycling, public transport has fixed departure times. The frequency of departures is therefore very significant for passengers' choice of transport.

For local traffic, public transport competes best with the car on long journeys, such as in and out of the major urban areas. The difference between journey times by public transport and journeys by car is smaller the longer the length of the journey. On short journeys, the waiting time comprises a relatively large proportion of the total time than on longer journeys.

For short journeys, walking and bicycles are often a good alternative to public transport. With an hour between departures, one can walk or cycle a relatively long way before public transport becomes competitive.

Public transport must be integrated in area planning

The standards and costs of developing public transport are decided to a large extent by area usage and the road network. Public transport planning must therefore be integrated in the overall area and road plan.

Planning and development based on the public transport system create the opportunity to improve public transport at a lower cost than adapting the public transport system to existing developments. In several countries, such as the Netherlands, public transport coverage in an area is the basis for the utilisation of the building plots. Plots where there is good access to public transport are granted higher usage than areas with poor coverage.

Combined measures are necessary to reduce car traffic

It is difficult to encourage car users to use public transport where public transport provision is poor. Buses with hourly departures are seldom an alternative to the car in the garage. If there is really going to be competition between cars and public transport, the total journey time by public transport should not be more than double the length of the journey time by car.

Better and cheaper public transport services are, however, not sufficient to reduce car traffic. Experiences from Switzerland showed that it is only possible to reduce the growth in car traffic through strong development of public transport. Restrictions in the form of traffic restrictions, parking regulations etc

or financial instruments are necessary in order to obtain an evening-out or reduction in car traffic. However, such tools have little effect if a well developed alternative for car users does not exist. It is therefore necessary to combine the development of public transport provision with restrictions on car traffic in order to limit or reduce the use of the car.

Socially effective public transport

Public transport should be organised and financed in a way which takes greater account of the socio-economic effects, such as improvements for existing passengers and gains in the form of reduced car traffic.

Customer demands and requirements must be given a more central place in the contracts

There are a number of different "quality contracts" for public transport, even though these may be very different in character. Some clarification of the type of quality contracts which are to be found may be necessary:

- **Result contracts:** where the authorities pay subsidies in relation to the number of passengers and the service being provided
- **Customer guarantees /journey guarantees,** where the customers are given a guarantee that public transport services will be of a specific quality, and where they are given compensation if the guarantee is not fulfilled
- **Bonus/ malus- systems,** where bonus systems or fines are introduced if the provision deviates from the plans in either a positive or negative direction (for example delays)
- **Customer satisfaction measurements,** where bonus systems are introduced if customer satisfaction increases and where contracts can be rescinded if the measurements fall below a given level

The development of quality contracts within public transport is primarily connected with the target conflict which exists between the authorities' targets and the operators' targets. This is a target conflict which is not due to a lack of knowledge or to different definitions of the main objective of public transport, but to the financial frameworks and assumptions within which the participants have to operate. It is not primarily a question of budget frameworks but largely the financial incentives and degrees of freedom which the

participants have and which control planning and public development. This target conflict is more noticeable when there are tight financial frameworks for subsidies for public transport.

Alternative quality contracts

It is possible to correct for the target conflict through different forms of financial incentives or measurements of quality which control the development of public transport in the "desired" direction. In the discussion on different quality contracts, we want to distinguish between three different levels of decisions: strategic, tactical and operational levels.

- *Strategic levels* concern the main targets within public transport with regard to public transport's share of the market, transport and environmental conditions etc.
- *Tactical levels* concern the concrete development of route provision and fares in relation to specified objectives in public transport provision.
- *Operational levels* concern the daily running and actual delivered quality of public transport provision

Quality contract at tactical levels

Quality contracts at tactical levels mean that the operators have a relatively high degree of freedom to set up route provision and fares. Such contracts can be exposed to competition in the form of competitive tenders, or in that the existing contracts can be altered to become quality contracts at a tactical level. This must not be confused with a subsidy contract, where the operator has the opportunity to propose changes which form the object of discussion with regard to financial compensation. A quality contract at tactical level must have clearly defined incentives and division of responsibility for planning and product development contained within the clauses.

Quality contracts at tactical levels primarily cover result- dependent subsidy contracts which are connected with the strategic objectives which the authorities set for public transport. The result - dependent subsidy contracts which TØI has developed in Norway are an example of these. Here, socio- economic objectives within public transport have a central position in the development of incentives. There can also be other, simpler, tactical quality contracts connected with one or more concrete objectives for transport policies, such as the number of passengers, passenger development for specific

groups, environment objectives, accessibility, co-operation etc.

The main point of these tactical quality contracts that they focus on the results which are achieved in relation to strategic objectives. The operators are responsible for them at the tactical level, i.e. for choosing solutions which mean that these results can be achieved. Here, the challenge will be to find good measurement methods to measure this type of functional quality. In a number of contexts, one may well choose to focus on technical and operative qualities which are derived from the strategic objectives.

Quality contracts at operational level

Where the authorities are responsible for the tactical level and /or the operators do not have responsibility for income, it will be necessary to produce quality contracts at the operational level. These are contracts which are primarily designed to ensure that the authorities get what they pay for, i.e. contracts which focus on deviations between the planned quality and the actual delivered quality. These are contracts which are much simpler than a quality contract at the tactical level and which are primary developed in connection with tender contracts where the authorities are responsible for income (gross contracts).

The majority of quality contracts concern the operative level in relation to regularity, reliability and customer satisfaction, based on levels agreed in the contract. The financial incentives may be on different levels. With regard to:

- *Punctuality*: incentives will often be in the form of bonus/malus-systems depending on the level achieved above or below a boundary value.
- *Regularity*: often in the form of fines for cancelled departure.
- *Customer satisfaction*: often the in the form of a bonus which is shared between the operators who achieve over and above a previously defined level or those with the highest "score."

Within railway contracts, the great majority of the quality contracts are at the operation level. We will look at these in greater detail later on in this document.

Travel guarantees with customer commitments

In addition to quality contracts, in recent years a number of passenger guarantee systems have been developed which can be regarded as alternative quality

contracts, but in this case between operators and passengers. There are several forms of passenger guarantees or similar agreements which can contribute to an improved service provision. The main point with these passenger guarantees is twofold:

1. firstly they provide important feedback from customers when something is wrong and which should be corrected
2. secondly, they give a signal to the customers about the standard that they should expect from the public transport company and, in some cases, provide compensation if this is not delivered

A passenger guarantee is one way of defining obligations in relation to the customers with regard to levels of service and the compensation which customers should be given if the service fails. As long as there is always something which goes wrong, this guarantee must primarily be regarded as a continuous improvement process, where the guarantee acts as a thermometer indicating when something is wrong. This means that passenger guarantees can be regarded as a form of quality contract, between public transport companies and the customers.

We can learn a lot from others

There are a number of good examples of cities and smaller towns which have prioritise customer- oriented public transport in various ways, both in Sweden and other countries in Europe. Even though few experiences are directly transferable, there are plenty of towns and cities which have prioritised customer oriented public transport, and much can be learnt from these. In this report, we present three good examples: Zurich and Schaffhausen (Switzerland) and Freiburg (Germany).

In the **Zürich** canton, the population has a legal right to public transport through the “Cantonal Traffic Law”. The law stipulates a minimum level of service (base service level) which must be offered to all inhabitants. There is also a minimum requirement for the level of public transport provision, depending on the density of population. People living in sparsely populated areas must have public transport provision at least once an hour; those living in densely populated areas are entitled to public transport provision every half hour, while those living in cities are entitled to departure frequency of at least 15 minutes.

Little **Schaffhausen** (45 000 inhabitants in the traffic area) lies far above all other comparable cities

with regard to the use of public transport, with 278 journeys by public transport per inhabitant per year.

Prioritising public transport has only been possible with the help of a long term, stable, good financing system. Financing public transport is done according to the following principles:

1. The on-going expenses are financed through five per cent (1990 levels) of the municipality’s total income taxes. This percentage rate is fixed and can only be changed by public vote. The outstanding amount is financed through ticket income, where the public transport company has the authority to set the fares.
2. Re-investments in the vehicle fleet and infrastructure etc are financed by a ”parking fund” where all parking fees in the city are set aside for public transport (adopted 1973).
3. New investments are financed from the canton’s other resources and are agreed by public vote.

Since the 1970s, the City of **Freiburg** in Germany has worked consciously, and with a long term perspective, towards a unified transport plan. Freiburg has a traffic plan where traffic is seen as a single, unified system. The plan contains a clearly differentiated, but integrated policy for all forms of transport: walking, cycling, local public transport and motorised vehicles. With the help of a comprehensive development of the public transport and cycle path system, in addition to restrictions on the use of cars in the city centre, *a very positive development for public transport and bicycle usage* has been achieved. From 1976 to 1999, the number of bicycle trips has increased by a total of 67 per cent, while the numbers using public transport have increased by 38 per cent. At the same time, the number of car journeys has gone down by a total of 12 per cent.

Norwegian experiments with public transport

Norway is seldom hailed as a country with plenty of good examples of prioritising public transport. Nonetheless, the Norwegian Ministry of Transport and Communications has financed a *Forsøksordning* for public transport, where different types of measures and packages of measures are tested and are evaluated over a ten-year period.

Even though the project, with its NOK 539 million over a ten year period, was limited in size, it has contributed to reversing a negative trend in public transport in recent years. All the experiments which

have received support from the project are evaluated in accordance with common criteria. Thus, experiences from a number of different measures have provided plenty of useful information about what is necessary in order to increase public transport usage.

The most important effect of the experiment is that trial and error with different types of individual measures and packages of measures have provided a good base of knowledge for further developing public transport. Since the evaluation project had an overall objective, it has been possible to compare effects of measures in a way which is unique in a transport research context.

Experiences from the experiment show that there are no simple solutions with regard to reversing the negative trend in public transport. Heavy factors, such as access to cars and the location of work places and

homes can contribute to reducing the proportion using public transport more than the gains which are achieved through the positive measures which are being implemented in the test cities. If the goals which have been set are to be achieved with regard to increasing the share of public transport in urban areas, it is necessary to create a unified transport policy, where better public transport is combined with restrictive measures and a targeted area policy.

The public transport contribution must be to develop the best possible service for those who use public transport at present. This is both good social economy and the best way to retain current passengers. Results from the experimental project form an important contribution towards developing such provision.