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' – unlike 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.

“...will be the first to be priced out? Those least able to pay will be the first”

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 more 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.

For the past 10 years, road building has stagnated. Existing roads have become clogged 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%).

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, 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 the 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 ($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 introduce a public vote about a fundamental change in city life? The council showed 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 – ‘a tax levied in such a way that is largely unnoticed, or not recognized as a tax’.

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 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 of funding 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.
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 sorrier 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 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.
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, comfortable, personal, enjoyable, and sometimes more reliable than transit. Congestion robs the car of its value.

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.

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 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 or deploying these systems.

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 designated 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 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.
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 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 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 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 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 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.
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.

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

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.

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

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.

"If you drew a political line between Mayor Livingstone and myself, we would find you sitting closer to him than me. Ironic, that“
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, 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 taxes 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 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 crashed repeatedly under the pressure. It was global news and sparked debate in Parliament. For the first time in history, the general public reacted in record numbers to register their opposition to this unfair proposal.

Road-user charging is a tax too far. It has been exposed as intrusive, expensive, inefficient and authoritarian. We do not want it and no amount of propaganda or heavy-handed persuasion will change our minds.

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

FEBRUARY/MARCH 2008 RUCCHAMPIONSHIP