

★ **THE** **2008** ★

RUC

Heavyweight
Championship
of the
World

Illustration by Magictorch

Illustration by N/A

WAR OF WORDS

SPARKS FLY WHEN GRUSH TAKES ON ROBERTS IN THE ROAD PRICING RING

Welcome to this intellectual title bout, which pits road pricing's biggest advocate against one of its most staunch critics. Prepare yourselves – neither of these guys are pulling any punches...

Campaigner Peter Roberts is perhaps best known for his Downing Street anti-road pricing petition, which in a few weeks gathered almost two million signatures. Readers of this magazine will know of Canada-based road-pricing advocate Bern Grush through his *Grush Hour* column. These two men are poles apart when it comes to the subject of charging for road usage.

Road pricing has become *the* hot topic in towns and cities worldwide over recent years. Many drivers' sympathies currently lie with Roberts, because of privacy/security issues as well as impatience with traffic-control systems that they

believe involve empire building and revenue-generation before a desire to ease congestion and enhance people's lives. Supporters firmly believe that the way forward is to replace road duties and fuel taxes with road pricing that genuinely charges according to the distance we drive, with a reduction for more environmentally friendly vehicles.

One thing is certain however: today's congested roads are proof that *something* definitely needs to be done. But whose argument do you back? And can either opponent change your mind, or is this another avenue that will end in gridlock? Seconds out, round one...

ROAD PRICING IS AN UNDERHAND POLICY

➔ Road pricing is a stealth tax, and a tax too far – an underhand policy that the UK government is planning to turn into legislation against the wishes of the people.

Even if road pricing is 'revenue neutral' – unlikely – the technology and administration will increase driving costs. Its supporters claim the money raised will be invested in public transport. By definition, 'money raised' is in addition to current taxation.

There are serious privacy issues. A scheme that charges you for being in a given place at a given time must track your vehicle location.

policy. For the past 10 years, road building has stagnated. Existing roads have become crammed with speed cameras, traffic lights, width reductions, and inconsistent bus lanes. Where possible, drivers choose to join already crowded motorways, which become increasingly congested.

Rather than solving congestion, policy increases it. Lights at roundabouts, bus stop build-outs restricting traffic flow, stretches of dual carriageway cut to single lanes with miles of cross-hatching, speed limits reduced (lowering the limit from 40 to 30mph reduces road capacity by 25%).

"The only way road pricing will reduce car use is by pricing some of us off the roads. Those least able to pay will be the first"



Even with guarantees to the contrary, this information will be available to strangers, and possibly criminals who place high value on knowing when properties are empty. The dire implications are heightened by recent cases in the UK of personal data banks being lost.

Road pricing impinges on our freedom. The only way it can reduce car use is by pricing some of us off the roads. Who will be the first to be priced out? Those least able to pay.

The DfT's feasibility study predicted that over a 20-year period, a national scheme using satellite technology could cost £314 billion (US\$612.6 billion), or £537 (US\$1,048) a year for every driver. Even the tag-and-beacon system is expensive and complex.

Road pricing is promoted as the solution for congestion, but with these costs, why is it even being considered? And is it really designed to ease congestion? Many drivers see today's traffic jams as a consequence of defective

For the past 30 years, successive governments have underinvested in UK roads. What is their response to predicted demand for increased road space? Inaction.

We have fewer motorway miles than comparable countries in Europe, the fewest motorway miles per car, and the fewest per person. This isn't because we have more cars – our level of ownership is comparatively low.

We have been let down and don't have the infrastructure needed. When our roads are jammed, the best our government can come up with is to charge more to use them.

CONGESTION ROBS US OF FREEDOM

➔ 'Stealth tax' is a term used by British Conservatives to discredit tax policies of the Labour Party. It implies it is introduced in a secretive, underhand way – which can hardly be claimed of congestion charging, launched with a fanfare of publicity.

Democracy is exemplified by the polling booth rather than the cowardly Edinburgh referendum, or London's tabloid press. If you were right about the democratic wishes of the people – and include Londoners in that statement – then Mayor Livingstone would not have been re-elected for a second term.

and everything else living on the planet. My fuel taxes pay less than half the real costs, based on where and when I drive and what is included in the calculation. 'Revenue neutral' would continue this subsidy, and is therefore unfair to the majority of humans (i.e. all people who drive less than



"I agree that any politician who says that 'revenue neutral' and 'money raised goes to transit' has made a mathematical error"

I agree that road pricing is unlikely to be revenue neutral. The assertion (since withdrawn) by Alistair Darling (former Secretary of Transport) that road pricing might be neutral was based on the fact that you can move around the same absolute taxes and still have an impact on congestion. But car use is subsidized. When I drive on a public road, I don't pay my share of congestion, emissions, risk, road-wear, and land-use. These 'externalities' are shared by us all: drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, children, asthma sufferers, public transport users, your grandchildren,

average). This imbalance must be corrected. Over-dependence on the car harms quality of life. Congestion and pollution rob us of 'freedom' far more than market pricing will. But this is little understood by the public, or by politicians.

I agree politicians who say 'revenue neutral' and 'money raised goes to transit' have made a mathematical error. This comes from the need to attract votes rather than intellectual weakness. The fact that Tony Blair backed away from road pricing in the face of your petition shows most politicians are reluctant to threaten our entitlement to free road access.

You are also right that technology and administration currently cost more in terms of tax – up to 35% more as borne out in current schemes. These costs will be driven below 4%, but such technology will not be available nor challenge your point until 2009. Road pricing systems currently deployed are expensive, and £537 (US\$1,048) per vehicle per year is egregious. In Canada, annual cost is already well under £100 (US\$196) and falling toward £50 (US\$98).

The rest of your argument suggests we can build our way out of congestion – a theory that went out with the 1960s.



TO ARGUE ROAD USE IS SUBSIDIZED IS OTIOSE

➔ Look up 'stealth tax' – 'a tax levied in such a way that is largely unnoticed, or not recognized as a tax'. Road pricing is secretive and underhand as governments increase local taxes without sufficient awareness or informed consent. A 20p (US\$0.39) per mile increase on the A404 is a local issue, which would never receive national coverage in the way an increase in fuel duty does.

You say the Edinburgh referendum on the congestion charge was "cowardly". In what way is it cowardly to invite a public vote about a fundamental change in city life? The council showed

Afghanistan, the countries of Eastern Europe – would you deny them their road-building programs, which are central to their economic development? The UK road network is plagued with bottlenecks that cause catastrophic congestion. A program of road building to eliminate them would cost a fraction of road pricing and be money far better spent.

You say that the idea of building roads to satisfy demand is long gone. By extension, presumably you oppose new hospitals? Why not introduce health pricing and charge people more for falling ill at busy times as a way to manage NHS demand?

"Livingstone was indeed voted in – on a ticket to introduce a low-cost congestion charge. But the cost has nearly doubled"

courage in hearing and acting on the wishes of the people. To impose the charge without a vote, as London did, is the mark of dictatorship.

Livingstone was indeed voted in – on a ticket to introduce a low-cost congestion charge. But the cost has nearly doubled, the system is intrusive, the penalties punitive, and the Western Extension was imposed against the people's wishes. We know this not because he held a vote, but from protest groups whose grievances were ignored. Elections for London mayor take place later this year. Perhaps this time a representative majority of Londoners will vote.

Your claims about externalities and the 'true' cost of motoring don't wash. The UK has some of the highest motoring taxes in the world. Domestic fuel is taxed at 5%; petrol/diesel at 73%. It is a penalty tax with VAT on top – we pay tax on a tax! To argue that car use is subsidized is otiose. Drivers contribute £50 billion (US\$97.5 billion) a year to the Treasury, which spends less than a fifth on roads.

You say dependence on the car damages quality of life. But without cars, we would not have social mobility or economic success. China,

Comparisons between city congestion charging and national road pricing are specious. Where population density supports adequate public transport, seeking public support for congestion charging is fair. If people really are in favor, that's fine. But imposing charging and forcing people out of cars against their wishes is plain wrong.

YES, WE NEED TO BUILD MORE ROADS

➔ You derogate road pricing to garner votes. I call it a road-user charge because, as a transportation professional, I want the fuel tax replaced with usage charges, as fuel tax is insensitive to congestion. Cards on the table: I've invented a technology that could enable that over the next 6-15 years.

No group of motoring citizens would return a 'yes' to a congestion charge in a referendum. If the politicians in Edinburgh had Livingstone's courage, they would have just decided yes or no. The referendum was a money-wasting, newspaper-filling mechanism to let the motorists make the wrong decision for

among travel modalities. Reforming the tax system is at the core of that. Yes, we need to build more roads, but they will be charged. But charging some and not others is elitist; it double-dips as long as the fuel tax remains, and it moves toll-dodgers to free roads instead of another time or modality, so dulling its effectiveness.

You avoid recognizing the full set of externalities that extend far beyond road wear. The bit my personal vehicle causes is well covered by fuel taxes that are then re-allocated to the general fund and often used for other purposes. Join the European Road Federation. They argue for ways to ensure

"You insult your road-laden country by comparing it with the decaying infrastructure of Eastern Europe or Afghanistan"

them. Now *that's* otiose, as well as absolute cowardice.

Transport bureaucrats in congested jurisdictions know that pricing is a critical tool to combat congestion. Its immediate purpose is to move 10-15% of motorists away from peak hours, or to other modalities. Its further purpose is to rescue our cities from the car. In between, we need to change the balance



that money collected for roads is fairly spent on roads.

You insult your road-laden country by comparing it with the infrastructure of Eastern Europe or Afghanistan. When you build a new road to relieve jams and you do not price it, commuters from other roads, travel times, and modalities will congest it. We call this triple-convergence. You might call it 'not enough lanes'.

To your hospital point, I suspect we shall have to build more. A 2005 study by the Ontario College of Family Physicians list some of congestion's consequences in the Greater Toronto Area, including absenteeism, arthritis, asthma, back pain, blood pressure, CV disease, frequency of illness, frustration tolerance, headaches, job satisfaction, mood, overall life satisfaction, personal effect on home life, psychological adjustment, road rage, and stress. These are just some of the externalities you ignore.



WE ARE NOT DEBATING INANIMATE OBJECTS

➔ Bern, we are clearly looking at road-user charging or road pricing in a completely different way. I do not avoid the externalities, I just disagree with your view. In your calculation you fail to include the massive economic benefit from transport. If we took all traffic off the roads, there would be no external costs, but society would cease to function and economic activity would stop.

I said we are building roads in Eastern Europe and Afghanistan to generate economic activity and was not comparing our decaying roads to theirs. But UK roads are in a sorer state than I have ever

seen them. You also assert we are living in a 'road-laden country'. Roads cover less than 1% of the country and road provision has fallen way below forecast demand.

Tracking movements and charging per mile is logical, but we are not debating inanimate objects here; we're talking about people who want to go about their lives without intrusive manipulation by government. Road pricing will inevitably be intrusive and cost far more than fuel tax. The admin alone will cost billions, while fuel duty collection costs are negligible. Extensive enforcement will be needed and any challenge to a charge would need a huge database with everyone's travel history and the resource to cope.

You continue to suggest that elected representatives who listen to people's wishes are cowards when they do not do as you wish. This sounds like a subtle form of dictatorship. Educate and inform first – yes! But impose policies without consultation – no!

Road pricing was not mentioned at all during the last general election; it was hidden

away in the back pages of Labour's manifesto. Nor was it mentioned in their campaign, which challenges your assertion that government should impose unseen and unwanted laws provided they get elected.

Labour would have seen a massive swing against them if road pricing had been aired during the campaign. You



"Road pricing was not mentioned at all during the last election, it was hidden away in the back pages of Labour's manifesto"

say motorists make wrong decisions, but most people drive or use cars. Are all these people wrong and you right? In a free country, the views of the people are paramount – no government should force through legislation against the wishes of the clear majority.



ROUND THREE

Introducing the Fourth-Generation Radar Sensor from EIS... the **G4**

Powered by **ISAC**

Less Power Consumption

- Multiple communications ports
- Multiple built-in communications options
- RTCP 120S option
- Fully compatible with all EIS Solutions

Integrated Radar & CCTV Camera

- High resolution for even higher accuracy
- Improved detection around barriers
- Enhanced per-vehicle data
- Wireless & IP-based

Less Install Effort

- Re-introducing 12-lane detection
- Industry's shortest setback distance
- Backward-compatible



All-in-One Concept

- Plug & play installation
- Cabinet-free, heats-free
- Customized built-in package
- Protected by multiple patents



TRAFFIC SOLUTIONS
ELECTRONIC INTEGRATED SYSTEMS INC.
Tel: 1.800.668.5385 www.cabletraffic.com

SATELLITES ARE JUST SIGNAL BEACONS

➔ We look at it differently, Peter, but we want the same things: access to mobility, fairness to *all* travelers, privacy, and government transparency. I want that via free-market mechanisms; you want the status quo, the tragedy of the commons – which is what flat taxes give us, and is your guarantee of permanent congestion.

You and I both prefer to use a car.

Innovation, wealth and urban planning have made the car more convenient, independent, private,

Choice? Anyone who pays annual insurance, registration and other flat taxes, and has a tank full of tax-paid fuel has been robbed of choice by tax and premium structures. The marginal cost of using your car to commute is quite small. If the bus takes 20 minutes longer (it's stuck in traffic, too), if you have to wait 15 minutes in a grotty bus shelter, and pay five times more for transit than for a liter of gas, you'd be an idiot to take the bus. I take my car because I have no viable choice. I thought about moving to the suburbs and taking a train, but there was only one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Because



"Most people who describe track and toll write for tabloids. None work for companies building or deploying these systems"

comfortable, personal, enjoyable, and sometimes more reliable than transit. Congestion robs the car of that.

I do not suggest taking all traffic off the road. I advocate pay-as-you-go rather than the current flat tax structures.

We need a larger fraction of peak-hour commuters to use another travel mode or time. We need this to protect the "massive economic benefit" and the "functioning society" you champion. We need to preserve room for commerce, goods movement, taking kids to school, and picking something up on the way home. We need room for buses, bikes, ambulances, service vehicles, car-poolers, and pedestrians. There are thousands of reasons a car is needed, but there are millions who drive alone, carrying only their newspaper to a job that could, or should, be serviced by transit. If more of those had a *choice* they would leave their car home more often.



of the way everything has been planned, zoned, developed, and preferred, I am essentially forced to use a car.

There is no excuse for privacy infringement. Satellites are merely signal beacons. They cannot track cars. The only way to track is with an in-car device that reports its position to a central system (your mobile is tracked this way). It is unnecessary and ineffective to build a track-and-toll system. Most people who describe track and toll write for tabloids. None work for companies building these systems, or for governments deploying them. If your government is considering that, you should demand anonymous methods such as those used for pre-paid mobiles. In Canada and the USA, we can get anonymous tolling tags for our toll roads.

Non-secure databases are older and badly designed. If your government proposes to use these, fight those too.

CONGESTION CHARGING IS FLAWED

➔ Bern, we both want equal treatment for all travelers, especially motorists, but I'm not convinced that free-market mechanisms are the best approach to public service provision. Take public transport. We have heavily regulated private companies competing for routes and passengers. This does not promote efficiency and requires taxpayer subsidies of £2.5 billion (US\$4.87 billion) for buses and £4 billion (US\$4.79 billion) for trains. But these companies still make big profits from ever-increasing fares. Why should the taxpayer subsidize private companies? Public services should be

designed congestion zone. Employees who live outside the zone are forced to pay, say, £5 (US\$9.70) a day. That's £100 (US\$195) a month, and, allowing for holidays, £1,000 (US\$1,950) a year. This additional cost per employee is a direct loss, which the employee cannot avoid, so they demand a salary increase to cover their loss, meaning £500,000 off the employer's bottom line. The company loses its competitive edge in a bid to keep its workforce intact. Or the employees leave. Is that a constructive or desirable consequence of the charge?

But "we would improve public transport", you say. Even

"Restricting demand through ability to pay is the wrong approach because apart from anything else, it does not work"

returned to public ownership and run for the benefit of passengers, not corporations. One example is publicly owned TfL, which provides a good, if expensive service.

To digress, the same can be seen in privatized energy and water industries. These now work for the benefit of shareholders, not the people they serve. Prices and profits have increased massively since privatization, and service levels have not improved.

Restricting demand through ability to pay is the wrong approach because, apart from anything else, it does not work. The evidence is clear – on trains, the subway, and buses in and around London, fares are high at peak demand and low at other times. The fact that the system is diabolically congested during both rush hours challenges the claim that people have easy travel choices. A minority might, but they already change their travel arrangements to avoid congested trains and buses without fare hikes to encourage them.

Congestion charging is flawed. Take a company with 500 employees just inside a newly

if the service is good, fares are still £4 or £5 (US\$7.80-9.70) a day. So where is the choice? The money is gone whichever transport method is used, with the same result: business closures or relocation, and loss to the local economy.

This is why there is majority opposition to PAYD and why most councils are walking away. This is why you should listen – to the voice of reason.



THE LONDON CHARGE IS A CRUDE FLAT TAX

➔ Sorry, Peter, I want equal treatment for all travelers *including* motorists, not *especially* motorists. Your bias is complete automotive apartheid. I suspect that cyclists annoy you when you have to drive around them. After all, the road is for cars.

I once discussed inequities between trucks and cars with a representative of a large Canadian trucking interest. Trucks cause more road damage than cars, but do not carry a commensurate tax burden in North America. The disparity is huge – yes, we subsidize trucks even more than cars. A debate ensued and I was told the motorways were

one contract; I doubt UK firms are as fragile as you'd imply.

Motorists in North America are *entitled* to a car, entitled to drive when, where, what and how they please, with little consideration to the wider view. In Toronto, councilors voted down cycle paths, because they would lose motorist votes. Like the male first-born, the motorist is a privileged being. And the non-car traveler gets more and more marginalized.

Congestion charging as it is deployed in London *is* deeply flawed, but not in Stockholm. You may recall that the people in Stockholm voted against congestion trials (and

"When asked prior to congestion charging, populations reject pricing at about 70%, but after pricing, rejection slips to about 30%"

designed and built for trucks (actually for the military, in the USA!) and that the problem was that cars congested them. So just as the bus, bike, and tax-stealthy government are the motorists' enemy, so too the car is the enemy of the lorry. 'Functioning society' at work, I suppose.

Here's another hidden bias. Many employers – like your imagined employer of 500 who might go belly up at a £500,000 loss – provide a paid-up parking space to at least some employees. So Mr A, who can afford a car, drives to work (usually alone) – and why not, parking is free. But Miss B, who cannot afford a car, takes the bus. Does the employer pay her bus ticket? Not usually. And what about Mrs C, who uses her bike? Anything towards her mode of transport?

By the way, I once had a six-person company that survived a US\$250,000 (£128,300) loss on

it went ahead against their wishes). When the trials ended, congestion returned the very next day. In the ensuing referendum, these same people asked for the return of charging. So it worked there.

I call this 'Opiola's 70-30 rule'. When asked prior to congestion charging, populations reject pricing at about 70%, but after congestion pricing, rejection slips to about 30%. I know you had something closer to 60-40 in London.

The problem in London is that the charge is a crude flat tax: now £12 (US\$23.60) whether for one mile or a hundred. It favors the motorist who comes in and out several times, and penalizes the one who comes in for lunch. As a free-market mechanism, the London Congestion Charge is lousy. That's why TfL wants to make it distance-based. Your government is not all bad.



Kria
KODIMEDIO RESEARCH IN INNOVATIVE APPLICATIONS

T-REDSPEED



T-REDSPEED first worldwide speed detector based on vision technologies
Parallel and queued vehicle speed measure and documentation
Accurate speed measure (error < 0,3%)

- Self-diagnostic imaging function guarantees the system calibration
- Mega-sensor cameras and Infrared lighting for night vision
- No radar, laser, inductive loops required
- Certified by the Italian Ministry of Transport
- Local and section speed measure, red light and U-turn violation detection
- ALPR Automatic Licence Plate Reader included



See Kria at Intertraffic
Amsterdam 1st - 4th April
Booth 01.219

KRIA S.r.l.
www.kria.biz
sales@kria.biz
tel. +39 0362.328178
fax. +39 0362.235088
Via dei Lavoratori Autobianchi,
1 - PTB Edificio 23/G
20033 Desio (MI) Italia

ROAD USERS SHOULD BE TREATED EQUALLY

➔ I have no bias towards one category of road user. All road users should be treated equally; indeed I'd go so far as to say that vulnerable cyclists and pedestrians should be more equal than others!

If we are free of prejudice towards one road-user group, it follows we should not subsidize public transport. Let's remove bus-priority lanes: why should bus passengers enjoy special treatment?

I believe cycle paths should be extended nationally. It is far safer for cyclists to use these than mix with trucks, buses and cars on roads. But, for equality, cyclists should also pay minimal usage tax and insurance.

to people inside the charging zone. As they are exempt from the charge, they voted (very) narrowly to keep it. If the vote had included people working outside but using the zone, would it have been voted in?

Returning to privacy, I would be interested to know how PAYD can be anonymous. It works by tracking location,



"In Stockholm they did hold a referendum but, cynically, it was limited to people inside the zone, who are exempt from the charge"

It's a shame your truck discussion took the direction it did. Maybe your contact was playing devil's advocate?

I take issue with your views on parking. Employers provide parking to attract good employees. They also provide cycle sheds and motorcycle spaces. They do not pay vehicle costs of getting to work so they shouldn't have to stump up for transport fares either. If Miss B works hard and does well, she can buy a car. Mrs C can put her bike in a dry cycle shed provided by her employer.

What benefit is there to charging people to park at work? Where will this money go and what gives anyone the right to dictate that private parking on private land should be charged? It is madness to keep increasing business costs and penalizing companies for providing employment and generating wealth.

In Stockholm they did indeed hold a referendum but, cynically, it was limited

time, and distance. GNSS cannot work without a record of users' journeys. Even if the OBU serial number is kept remote from the user details, any challenge to a bill will require matching up both pieces of information. The information needed to watch every journey is available with road pricing, which isn't acceptable – no matter how 'secure' the database.



FUEL TAXES ARE THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM

➔ Peter, let's establish some common ground and then see where we diverge. We agree on the importance of mobility. We can agree that walking and biking ought to be easy and encouraged. We could agree that humans increasingly need to go further and carry more, so there is a constantly growing fleet of motorized vehicles. These vehicles require an enormous infrastructure to carry them. Transportation, all in, accounts for about one-third of the world's GDP. So governments are involved. They tax what they can to spend what they must. And government is not perfect. We depart about here.

they are assessed and levied. People like me want to see the removal of inefficient taxes, replaced with what we think is a fairer approach based on usage, involving time, distance and place. (And not a London scheme as that, too, is an economically inefficient tax – the Mayor of New York wants to copy your system at the same time that TfL is struggling to rectify its inefficiencies...)

Externalities aside, I am not proposing you *should* pay more, although you may do due to the larger mess made by pooling tax revenues. I am saying that you should pay *differently*. That boils down to whether you are a free-market

"If you drew a political line between Mayor Livingstone and myself, we would find you sitting closer to him than me. Ironic, that"

I expect you'd say that government taxes too much then spends it badly. No doubt that happens. But it is more useful to criticize government for taxing the wrong things.

The root cause of congestion (besides wealth, preferences and myopic urban planning) is that the wrong things are being taxed. Vehicle excise duty and fuel taxes are the root cause, because of how



capitalist or a socialist. If you drew a political-economics line between Livingstone (a man I greatly admire) and myself, we would find you sitting closer to him than to me. Ironic, that.

If "Miss B works hard and does well, she can buy a car", reminds me of an apocryphal story I heard a while ago. A senior manager in a large city transport department was quoted as saying: "Show me a man waiting for the bus, and I will show you a failed career." Apparently, he was fired.

I have no doubt Miss B would buy a car. Where she lives everything works better with one. Public transit is lousy as too few people use it to make it worth government investment. Luckily, she'll be comfortable with autonomous and anonymous tolling technology, as she has been using anonymous mobiles for years now. When she challenges her toll, she just brings her private location data with her to court services.

ROUND FIVE



EVERYONE HAS A RIGHT TO MOBILITY

➔ Bern, you and I are no different from the 'average' motorist. Everyone has a right to personal mobility. Certainly governments overtax and misspend – it's a result of political 'mission creep' and ever-increasing administration. Road pricing should not be added to the mix.

According to UITP, the percentage of global GDP spent on transport is 20%. Passenger transport accounts for 8.3% of GDP in Europe and 12.5% in the USA. Where did 33% come from?

In heavily populated cities, public transport is clearly preferable – we agree! But I believe that an elitist, intrusive,

your interest in selling the technology involve bias?

Proliferating bus lanes and traffic lights, reduction in parking provision, road narrowing, speed bumps, speed cameras, bus stop build-outs – all contribute to congestion. Until recently, if there was an accident on the motorway, police would push damaged vehicles to the side. Now they close it for hours.

My petition last year calling for road pricing to be dropped remains by far the largest online petition ever. A total of 1.81 million signatures in 12 weeks also made it the fastest-growing petition of all time. The Downing Street website

"My petition last year calling for road pricing to be dropped remains by far the largest online petition ever"

regressive, high-cost tax is not an option. Road pricing might represent technological progress, but social progress it is not. Roads are not a commodity for sale to private companies for profit. They are the arteries that carry a nation's lifeblood.

In the sense that fuel duty taxes usage and engine efficiency, it is fair, cheap to collect, and encourages choice. The more efficient your car, the less you pay. The system is not broken and does not need road pricing to fix it.

It is naive to think fuel duty would give way to a road usage tax and remain even remotely revenue neutral. Hard as I try, I see no benefit in road pricing. It will not work without high administration, collection and enforcement costs, and big profits for the companies involved. And that's *in addition* to current taxes. For every supporter, there is a financial incentive in the background. Could



MISTAKES WILL BE MADE ALONG THE WAY

➔ But 1.81 million signatures represents just 3% of your population, or 6.8% of adult UK internet users. Nintendo makes 1.8 million Wiis a month. December 2008 will see 1.8 million cars added to the world's car fleet. That's in *one month*, Peter. What's remarkable about your achievement is that Blair stood down from an internet poll.

Our debate will not be settled until the world of surface transportation finance has moved away from fuel taxes onto a usage-fee basis. There are a few ways to get there, and mistakes will be made along the way. But there

be as cheap as collecting fuel tax, but will be far cheaper than anything to date. And it will be far more equitable and economically efficient than fuel taxes. Plus, the privacy problem has been solved – and operates in Singapore, the USA, and Canada for those who elect it.

The primary social concern is that usage-based charges be



"There will be no choice if we want to have viable surface transport, for people, goods, jobs, families and recreation"

will be no choice if we want to have viable surface transport for people, goods, jobs, families, and recreation.

On the subject of cost, the cost of computing and telecommunications has been driven into the ground over the past 20 years. We will do the same to location-based billing systems in three to four more years. The technology has been developed; it's waiting to be deployed. It won't

equitable – that they do not harm the less fortunate. The worse-off *generally* commute via public transport. The worst-off don't even have that. These statistics speak volumes about the transportation 'apartheid' that gives half the middle class and upper crust congested roads and gives the lower class and the rest of the middle class lousy transit. Usage fees in lieu of fuel and vehicle taxes can save money for motorists by reducing urban and peak travel. Credits can be provided for not moving your car during peak hours. That is more efficient and equitable.

When properly coupled with transit investment, pricing helps rather than harms the poor. It's also good for remaining motorists who can get to work and home on time, without polluting the air.

In free societies, the purpose of pricing is not only to reduce demand, but also to increase supply. Of course you court failure if pricing is enacted without commensurate and thoughtful improvements in roads.

To fix funding, congestion and emissions, a) remove registration and fuel taxes, b) charge for road use by time, place, and distance, c) provide better roads, and d) provide better public transport.

