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LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

**AAU**  Assigned Amount Unit

**ACT**  Association of Commuter Transport (Liverpool)

**ATM**  Authority Transport Mobility (Barcelona)

**BMR**  Barcelona Metropolitan Region

**CCMS**  City Centre Movement Strategy (Liverpool)

**CPER**  Contrat de projets État-Région

**CTS**  Compagnie des Transports Strasbourgeois (Strasbourg Transport Company)

**CUS**  Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg (Urban Community of Strasbourg)

**DCLG**  Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)

**DfT**  Department for Transport (UK)

**DISC**  Dutch Initiative Subsustainable Cities

**ELTIS+**  European Local Transport Information Service PLUS

**ERDF**  European Regional Development Fund

**FQP**  Freight Quality Partnership

**GVA**  Gross Value Added

**HAVAG**  Hallesche Verkehrs AG (Local Transport Operator Halle)

**HOV**  High-Occupancy Vehicle

**ICT**  Information and Communication Technology

**IEOP**  Infrastructure and Environment Operational Programme (Krakow)

**JASPERS**  Joint Assistance to Support Projects in European Regions

**JESSICA**  Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas

**GDP**  Gross Domestic Product

**LSP**  Local Strategic Partnership (Liverpool)

**LSTF**  Local Sustainable Transport Fund (Liverpool)

**LTP**  3rd Local Transport Plan (Liverpool)

**MA**  Managing Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTP</td>
<td>Merseyside Transport Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIMOSA</td>
<td>Making Innovation in Mobility and Sustainable Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWDA</td>
<td>North West Regional Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Operational Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP MC</td>
<td>OP Monitoring Committee (Cluj Napoca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>Infrastructure Master Plan (Barcelona)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Mobility Masterplan of the Barcelona Metropolitan Region (Barcelona)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDU</td>
<td>Plan de Déplacements Urbains (Urban Mobility Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILOT</td>
<td>Planning Integrated Local Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Barcelona Urban Mobility Masterplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEST</td>
<td>Quality management tool for Urban Energy efficient Sustainable Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCE</td>
<td>Regional Competitiveness and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Regional Development Agency (Cluj Napoca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>Regional Economic Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>Regional Operational Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Strategic Development Plan (Cluj Napoca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium sized Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMILE</td>
<td>Towards Sustainable Mobility for People in Urban Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Sectoral Operational Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQP</td>
<td>Statutory Quality Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMP</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTP</td>
<td>Sustainable Urban Transport Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEG</td>
<td>Südwestdeutsche Verkehrs-Aktiengesellschaft (Southwest German Transport Company)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGO</td>
<td>Tarifverbund Ortenau (Tariff Association Ortenau)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEP</td>
<td>Verkehrsentwicklungsplan (Transport Development Plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE STUDY BARCELONA

CITY PROFILE

Country/region/objective
Spain/Catalonia
NUTS 3 - Barcelona (code ES 511)
RCE (ERDF)

Geographical factors

The Barcelona Metropolitan Region (BMR) comprises the regions of l'Alt Penedès, el Baix Llobregat, el Barcelonès, el Garraf, el Maresme, el Vallès Occidental and el Vallès Oriental with a total of 164 municipalities. It spans a surface area of 3,237.1 km² and has a population of 5,012,961 inhabitants (2010). Barcelona is located on the northeast coast of the Iberian Peninsula, facing the Mediterranean Sea, on a plain approximately 5 km wide limited by the mountain range of Collserola, the Llobregat river to the southwest and the Besòs river to the north. These topographic constraints have produced urban congestion and high residential densities.


Economic factors

The BMR is the largest demographic and economic concentration in Catalonia. The economical influence of the metropolitan area is large: it houses 51% of all the jobs in Catalonia. It concentrates, especially, the most dynamic economic sectors: 56% of all services and between 60 and 70% of services with the highest added value and high technological content such as research, information technologies and telecommunications. The unemployment rate (17%) is slightly below the overall Catalan level (19%).

Key economical figures:
- Annual GDP in the Region of Catalonia (2009): €221.4 million (18.6% of national GDP);
- Annual GDP in BMR (2009): €137.5 million;
- Annual GDP in the City of Barcelona (2010): €57 million;
- Primary Sectors in the Region of Catalonia (2010):
  - services (71.2%);
  - industry/energy (18.5%);
  - construction (9.1%);
  - agriculture (1.1%).
- Exports:
  - Region of Catalonia: 26% of Spanish exports;
  - BMR: 20% of Spanish exports;
- Level of Unemployment in the Region of Catalonia: 17%;
- Firm Size in City of Barcelona (2009): 99.7% are Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs).

Sources: Eurostat, National Institute of Statistics; Statistic Institute of Catalonia, Department of Statistics, Barcelona City Council, Ministry of Industry, Tourism and Trade.
Demographic factors

The BMR has a population of 5 million; in the central area, density is over 5,000 inhabitants per square kilometre and in the outskirts it is less than 1,000 inhabitants per square kilometre. In the last decade people and businesses have moved from central to external and lower-density zones, which are badly connected by roads and transport services. From 2000 to 2010, the population in the BMR grew from 4.3 million to 5 million, whereas that of Barcelona city remained static. In the central area, 30% of personal mobility takes place by private vehicle, while in the outskirts the figure surpasses 55%.

Key statistics for the Region of Catalonia, the Barcelona Metropolitan Area and the city of Barcelona:

- Population in the Region of Catalonia (2010): 7.5 million (16% of the Spanish population);
- Population in BMR (2009): 5.0 million (11% of the Spanish population);
- Population in the City of Barcelona (2010): 1.6 million.

The BMR has a high share of ageing population (127 elderly people for every 100 young persons, compared to 108 for Catalonia), and an income level of 5% above average.

Sources: Eurostat, National Institute of Statistics; Statistic Institute of Catalonia, Department of Statistics, Barcelona City Council, Ministry of Industry, Tourism and Trade; ATM (2008), The Mobility Master Plan of the Barcelona Metropolitan Region; http://www.waterloss-project.eu/?page_id=123.

Challenges faced by the city/city region

According to the prognosis, in 2018 there will be 2,946,000 private cars in the region. This implies 20.8 million vehicle km per day, of which 24.5% will take place with congestion levels higher than 90% (13% in 2004).

URBAN POLICIES

Urban mobility policy

Barcelona City Council committed itself to safe and sustainable mobility. Thus, it adopted a global vision and strategy for mobility management. Important measures are as follows:

- Establishing green zones for parking;
- Promoting cycling (through the ‘Bicing’ public bike programme);
- Developing the nighttime public transport network (metro and ‘Nit Bús’);
- Creating quiet traffic zones (with a maximum 30km/h speed limit);
- Awareness-raising, monitoring and enforcement;
- Traffic management;
- Immediate evaluation of accidents in order to enhance road safety.

Local public transport network

Source: Estrada, M., Case study: Mobility Planning at University Campus: UPC and UB, Presentation at the 4th International Seminar in Sustainable Technology Development, Vilanova i la Geltrú, June 2011.

Other related policies

The Barcelona Urban Mobility Masterplan (PMU) operates within the geographical scope of the Barcelona municipality. Related policies for the metropolitan area are:

- The Mobility Masterplan of the Barcelona Metropolitan Region (PDM): In Barcelona the Regional Government of Catalonia, after approving the National Mobility Directives issued following the Mobility Law of 2003, entrusted the Transport Authority (ATM) as Regional Mobility Authority with the new task of drawing up a Mobility Master Plan including targets for reducing pollution. The PDM was approved in September 2008.

- The Infrastructure Master Plan (PDI): This comprises all the activities in public transport infrastructure for a ten-year period in the Barcelona metropolitan region, regardless of the administration in charge and the operator running the service.
SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Official name/associated documents

Barcelona Urban Mobility Masterplan (PMU)

Responsible body

Municipality of Barcelona.

Other key stakeholders involved

- Barcelona city council;
- ATM (Transport Authority);
- Catalonian Government;
- Municipalities;
- Spanish government.

Aims and objectives

All criteria for a SUMP are fulfilled:
- Participatory approach. All kinds of stakeholders are involved in the process of implementing the urban mobility plan. They all have a role in the Mobility Council.
- Integrative approach. An integrative approach between policy sectors, authority levels and/or neighbouring authorities is applied to the implementation process.
- Overall sustainable mobility principles. Environmental targets are considered, but economic and social challenges are also taken into account. The SUMP aims at
  - Safe mobility: Reduction of number of accidents and diseases related to air quality (NOx, PM10, immissions, etc.);
  - Sustainable mobility: Reduction of environmental consequences related to mobility (CO2, energy, etc.);
  - Equal mobility: The right of access to mobility for 100% of the population;
  - Efficient mobility: Reduction of mobility as a necessity, optimising supply.
- Review of transport costs and benefits. External costs of transport are explicitly quantified and monitored.

Budget

Specific information regarding the total budget allocated to the development and implementation of the PMU could not be obtained.

Main measures

The main measures for sustainability are:
- Increase the number of public and official transport fleet vehicles that use cleaner fuels;
• Check vehicle emissions (sulphur oxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, COV, lead, PPS, fumes and ozone) annually. Ensure adherence to European rules;
• Apply ecological criteria to the municipal vehicles fleet renewals policy: emissions (g/km), efficiency and use of bio-fuels;
• Introduce reverse discrimination measures in favour of the cleanest vehicles with regard to: restricted circulation areas, access to some stops (public transport), parking, traffic restrictions in cases of elevated contaminant concentration;
• Consider the ‘environmental capacity’ concept on the city mobility planning;
• Preferred use of "sound reductor“ asphalt, especially on the main road network.

Status of implementation

The PMU was implemented in 2006. It is valid for the period 2006-2012 (although its strategic vision is based on the period 2006-2018).

Monitoring and evaluation

Important monitoring results of the evaluation in 2009 were:

• Objectives accomplished:
  – Vehicle occupation (1.21 people/veh.);
  – Motorization index (366 cars/1 000 inhabit.);
  – Percentage of population covered by railroad public transport (91%);
  – Share for public transport, private vehicle, bicycle and walking changed as intended.
• Objectives going well:
  – Number of serious accidents involving persons reduced;
  – Railroad stations in the outskirts: adaptation to increase the mobility of disabled people.
• Objectives in difficulties:
  – Global crisis: reduction of investment;
  – Public transport frequency;
  – Noise (55% people living with noise levels over 65 dbA).

RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)

Official name/associated documents

Operational Programme 'Catalonia' (2007ES162PO006)
EC Regional Policy weblink:

Managing authority (MA)

Ministerio de Economía y Hacienda - Madrid, España (Ministry of the Treasury, Spain)
Dirección General de Fondos Comunitarios (DGFC), Subdirección General de Administración del FEDER

Context

The OP is co-funded by the ERDF under the Regional Competitiveness and Employment objective.
Overall aims and objectives

The development strategy of the Autonomous Community of Catalonia focuses on achieving the objectives of the Lisbon Strategy, namely:

- Restoring the foundations for competitiveness;
- Boosting the potential for growth and productivity;
- Strengthening social cohesion through research, innovation and the upgrading of human capital.

Policy axes:
1. Knowledge-based economy, innovation and business development;
2. Environment and risk prevention;
3. Energy resources and access to transport services;
4. Sustainable local and urban development;
5. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €679 million

Source: EC Regional Policy weblink.

Transport-related aims and objectives

Priority axis 3 is related to transport. In order to meet the growing demand for transport services in a population essentially concentrated in the Barcelona region, this priority supports the construction of an intermodal railway station at Barcelona airport and the widening of motorways, reserving one lane for public transport.

Transport Projects and associated fundings

The transport projects and associated fundings are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Total costs (€ million)</th>
<th>EU contribution (€ million)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness on the fast track</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of the Port of Barcelona</td>
<td>523.0</td>
<td>277.2</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed railway line</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>3400</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Selva CIM (Integrated Goods Centre) – Airport and logistics park in Girona</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2 Motorway. Cervera – Santa Maria del Camí section</td>
<td>159.1</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovering the navigable channel of the River Ebro</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus-HOV lane for Barcelona</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New railway station – pivotal link for transport networks</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Postponed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priorities/measures and associated funding

See above, the most important measures are an intermodal railway station at Barcelona Airport and a Bus and HOV lane on the C-58 motorway. The financial allocation is discussed in the measures section.

Use of technical assistance budget

0.9% of the overall budget (ca. €12 million) is used for technical assistance.

Status of implementation

See section examples of projects.

Monitoring and evaluation

See section examples of projects.

Additional support for the city

Information was not available.

Other Operational Programmes

Besides the regional OPs (one of them is the OP ‘Catalonia’), two national Operational Programmes and two multiregional programmes exist in Spain. Since neither multiregional programme covers transport-related projects they are not of relevance for this study. One of the national OPs (Cohesion Fund – ERDF) does cover transport-related projects (TEN-T). There is no readily available information on whether Barcelona participates in this OP.

Spain is also involved in some trans-national OPs, one of them the Mediterranean Programme. This Programme also has transport-related objectives. However, there is again no readily available information on whether Barcelona participates in this OP.

EXAMPLES OF TRANSPORT PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE OP

Project: Bus-HOV lane on the C-58 motorway


Responsible body

Project is financed by the Catalanian government and the Operational Programme.

Other key stakeholders involved

The beneficiary and organisation responsible for the execution of the specific lane for buses and high-occupancy vehicles (HOVs) on the motorway C-58 is “TABASA Infraestructures i Serveis de Mobilitat SA”, a public company attached to Territory and Sustainability
Department of the Catalan Government, to whom the Catalan Government have commissioned the construction and management of some catalonian collective mobility infrastructures.

**Objectives**

Reduction of congestion, accidents and pollution.

**Budget**

See table under “Transport projects and associated funding”

**Main elements**

The Bus-HOV lane will connect the Ripollet junction (which provides access into Barcelona via the C-58) and Meridiana Avenue in the centre of Barcelona. This route is one of the most important access routes into the city. The Bus-HOV lane will run for a total length of 6.8 km, with two dual lanes for the exclusive use of buses and for private vehicles, such as cars, which must carry a minimum of at least three passengers. The lane itself will be placed in the middle of the C-58 road. To achieve this, an elevated section will be built above the central lane. A second section will run at ground level and the motorway will be widened.

**Status of implementation**

The Bus-HOV lane project is currently in progress (60% has been executed). The project started in 2008 and is expected to finish this year or at the beginning of 2013. The new railway station project has been postponed due to problems with the partners financing the project.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

After the project is finished, its impacts will be evaluated. Impacts considered are the reduction of congestion, accidents and pollution as well as changes in land use etc.

**LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECTS AND SUMP/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The only link that exists is between the Operational Programme 'Catalonia', and the Bus-HOV lane as a relevant project. The PMU, however, seems to play a minor role.

**Objectives and targets**

The PMU and the OP have comparable objectives, although the scope of the OP is much broader (both in terms of geographical coverage and objectives/targets considered). The relevant transport-related OP project (the Bus-HOV lane) is adopted in the Urban Mobility Plan.

**Measures/projects**

There is no evidence that the PMU was considered when drawing up the OP.
With respect to the Bus-HOV lane project the Catalanian government is the responsible authority. The Municipality of Barcelona (as the responsible body for the PMU) is involved in the design and implementation of the Bus HOV lane project. There is for example contact on implementation issues like the category of vehicles that are allowed to use the lane.

**Impacts**

The only linkages that have been found are between the OP and the Municipality of Barcelona on the monitoring of impacts of the relevant OP project (Bus-HOV lane). The impacts of this project are measured both by the Catalanian government and the Municipality of Barcelona. As the bus lane has a larger geographical scope than the municipality, the impacts are measured by Barcelona for the part of their territory. There are six stations on the route for Barcelona measuring the impacts of the Bus-HOV lane.

**Funding**

There are no linkages in funding between the PMU and the OP, with the exception of the BUS-HOV lane project which is co-funded by the OP and the Catalanian government.

**Management**

There is communication between the municipality and the Catalanian government on the Bus-HOV lane project. The lane is to be operated by a private company. Topics to be discussed are categories of vehicles that are allowed to use the lane, prices etc. There is no evidence of any other regular communication between the OP authority and the Municipality of Barcelona.
CASE STUDY CLUJ NAPOCA

CITY PROFILE

Country /region/ objective

Romania (Region 6 North West)

NUTS 3 - Cluj (code RO 113)

Convergence (ERDF)

Geographical factors

Cluj Napoca County is located in the North West of Romania. Cluj Napoca City is the main urban metropolitan area of the county. The County, historical capital of the Transylvania region, is spread over an area of 180km² and is located between the Apuseni Mountains, Somes Plateau, and Transylvania Plain. Cluj County includes 18 rural areas such as Apahida, Baciu, Bontida, Capusul Mare, Feleacu, Floresti, Gilau, Garbau, Jucu and Savadisla.

Economic factors

Cluj Napoca City is a dynamic urban centre of economic growth. It is the second largest financial centre in Romania (after Bucharest) with an estimated GDP of €8 700 per capita in 2011.


Cluj Napoca City presents potential for economic growth in various fields such as: education, the financial and insurance sector, building, health and social services, as well as transport, trade, manufacturing and housing.

An analysis of the business environment and commercial activities in Cluj County highlights that the majority of businesses registered in the metropolitan area are medium and small.

- 61% of all businesses operate in the hospitality services and the mining sector;
- 19% operate in the building sector;
- 5% operate in the agriculture sector.


The industrial sector plays a significant role in the economy of the Cluj County and Metropolitan area. 89% of all businesses operating in Cluj County are micro-businesses, 8% are small businesses, 2% are medium sized businesses and 1% are large businesses.

The most significant organisations operating in Cluj Napoca are:

- Nokia (ICT, 3 500 jobs);
- Emerson (Electric, 3 500 jobs).
Demographic factors

In 2008, Cluj Napoca City had a total of 309,338 residents, representing 81% of the total population in the Cluj Metropolitan Area. The demographic trends observed in Cluj Napoca show that the population is declining. In 2008, Cluj Napoca City had 309,338 inhabitants, 2% less than in 2002.


Challenges faced by the city/city region

Cluj Napoca City faces a number of challenges such as:

- Traffic and congestion generated by the lack of a peripheral ring road;
- Insufficient provision of public transport services and sustainable transport alternatives;
- Insufficient car parking provision;
- Pollution and CO₂ emissions;
- Excessive noise on the main roads and at the major junctions of the city;
- High number of car accidents;
- Outdated transport infrastructure;
- A lack of coherent urban policy which integrates both development of urban and rural transport infrastructure network.

URBAN POLICIES

Urban mobility policy

The existing public transport system in Cluj Metropolitan Area comprises 21 bus services served by 229 buses, 6 electric buses routes operated by 110 electric buses, and 3 tram routes served by 49 trams. In addition, 12 micro-buses fill the gaps left by the public transport system. RATUC Transport Commercial Business is responsible for maintaining and modernising the public transport routes. The public transport system operates on a public transport network of 321 km.


Both Cluj County and Cluj Napoca City are well connected to the national European rail infrastructure, with direct links to Bucharest, Oradea, Arad, Budapest and Vienna. Cluj Napoca City is well situated within the European road infrastructure and linked by the European road E60 to major European cities such as Vienna and Budapest. Cluj Napoca is also accessible by air; with Cluj Napoca International Airport situated 9 km away from Cluj Napoca City Centre and 12 km from the railway station.

The main document covering sustainable urban mobility is the Strategic Development Plan (SDP) for the Cluj Napoca Municipality (http://www.primariacj.ro/proiecte-dezbateri/ Dezvoltare%20urbana.pdf). This is considered in more detail in the next section on the sustainable urban mobility plan. Other relevant documents are referred to below.

The Cluj Napoca City Development Strategy outlined specific objectives such as:

- Development and modernisation of the transport infrastructure, including road and rail;
• Improved mobility and accessibility to Cluj Metropolitan Area;
• Improving the local air quality in Cluj Metropolitan area and protecting the environment;
• Development of an integrated interchange public transport hub;
• Development of passenger and freight terminals;
• Development of an cross docking and cargo consolidation facility;
• Extension of the Cluj Napoca Airport runway to allow larger aircraft and airlines to operate.


These specific objectives are in line with the Plan of Integrated Development for the Cluj Napoca Growth Pole – Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area, 2009–2015. Its objectives are to improve the public transport services through:

• Increased urban and rural mobility benefiting Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area’s residents without hindering the commercial activities of the local businesses;
• Development of a long lasting and high quality public transport system;
• Promoting sustainable modes of transport, including electric vehicles.

However, the above strategic document for the entire Cluj Metropolitan Area highlights a series of issues such as:

• Congestion to/from the entrance/exit to Cluj Napoca City due to inadequate carriage way capacity;
• Increased pedestrian and traffic flows in Cluj Napoca City Centre;
• Lack of dedicated pedestrian areas in Cluj Napoca City Centre. (However, the City Centre area is in the process of being re-designed);
• High transport operating costs;
• Inadequate public transport and road infrastructure to accommodate the evolution and the socio-economic growth of the area;
• Lack of a long lasting public transport system which undermines mobility and impacts negatively on local economic growth.

The Municipality of Cluj Napoca has signed the Covenant of Mayors.

Other related policies/activities in the European arena

The Dutch Initiative Sustainable Cities (DISC) aims to develop sustainable urban projects in the four major cities of Romania, including Cluj Napoca. DISC is a public-private co-operation programme between Dutch-Romanian companies, knowledge institutes and the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs. The focus point for the Municipality of Cluj Napoca is cultural development. Several other fields of action were identified for possible collaboration with the DISC team: urban programming, residential areas and mobility.

The Municipality of Cluj Napoca is also involved in the Quality management tool for Urban Energy efficient Sustainable Transport (QUEST), a project supported by the EC. This project receives funding from the Intelligent Energy Europe programme. Later in 2012 Cluj Napoca’s urban mobility policy will be evaluated using an audit tool developed by QUEST. The aim of the QUEST audit is to support cities in their efforts of developing more sustainable urban mobility systems. Based on the results of the QUEST audit a tailor made improvement programme will be recommended to Cluj Napoca.
**SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Official name/associated documents**

The Strategic Development Plan for Cluj Napoca Municipality (SDP). The municipality plans to use JASPERS as the financial instrument for the development of a Sustainable Mobility Plan for Cluj Napoca urban area, to be finalised in July 2013.

**Responsible body**

Municipality of Cluj Napoca

**Other key stakeholders involved**

- North West Regional Development Agency
- Growth Pole Co-ordinators

**Aims and objectives**


The SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality presents the existing local transport infrastructure in the light of its potential for contributing to the long term urban social and economic development of Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area. The Municipality of Cluj Napoca is also the local transport authority.

The strategic objective of the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality is: Development and urban modernisation of the Cluj Napoca area through sustained economic growth. The SDP ensures that mobility within and accessibility of the Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area are attained in a sustainable way whilst protecting the environment. The specific transport-related objectives of this SDP are:

- Development and modernisation of the road, rail and airport infrastructure;
- Ensuring mobility and access to the Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area;
- Protection of the environment ensuring sustainable development of the Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area;
- Increased urban mobility and rural mobility for the benefits of residents in the Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area, without hindering the commercial activities of local businesses;
- Development of a long lasting and high quality public transport system.

The SDP’s overall objectives are in line with the Romanian National Development Plan 2007–2013 ([http://www.fsenordest.ro/BIBLIOTECA/ndp0713_en.pdf](http://www.fsenordest.ro/BIBLIOTECA/ndp0713_en.pdf), the Strategic and Development Plan for the North West Region, North Transylvania Plan 2007-2013 and the Plan of Integrated Development for the Cluj Napoca Growth Pole – Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area, 2009-2015. These latter plans aim to reduce the economic and social disparities between Romania and other EU member countries by focusing on the urban growth poles. This is also the strategic objective outlined in the Regional Operational Programme 2007-2013.
The SDP is not a SUMP specifically, but a strategic framework for the Cluj Napoca Urban Area promoting social and economic development and growth. However it does identify potential areas for transport infrastructure development and upgrading in some detail.

Nevertheless, with the exception of the overall sustainable mobility principles, the SUMP criteria are not fulfilled.

**Budget**

Specific information regarding the total budget allocated to the development and implementation of the SDP in the Cluj Napoca Urban Metropolitan Area is not available.

**Main transport measures / opportunities**

The following transport measures / opportunities have been identified through the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality.

**Street infrastructure:**

- Lengthening and modernising the streets in the urban area;
- Combining street road works with works required for the upgrading of existing water, gas and electricity infrastructure;
- Implementing two roundabouts to ease congestion on main roads and traffic junctions;
- Identifying other measures for easing congestion by commissioning a traffic study.

**Car parking provision:**

- Increasing car parking infrastructure and the number of charging car parks in the vicinity of hospitals, schools and other public institutions.

**Pedestrians and public transport:**

- Increasing the pedestrian areas on central streets such as: Eroilor Boulevard, Unirii Plaza, Matei Corvin Street, Vasile Goldis Street, Musem Plaza, Bolyai and David Ferencz Streets;
- Implementing a GPS system on 20 bus routes to increase the punctuality and the frequency of bus services;
- Upgrading the existing tram network and some tram routes;
- Deploying trained and professional staff on public transport network;
- Efficient distribution of public transport tickets.

**Status of implementation**

The SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality has been developed according to the methodology and the requirements outlined in the Strategic Development Plan for the North West Region, North Transylvania 2007 – 2013. It includes a SWOT analysis of the existing transport infrastructure identifying opportunities, risks and potential costs and is aimed at identifying the potential for social, economic growth and transport development and modernisation in line with the strategic regional objectives.

Some of the urban and public transport measures / opportunities identified in the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality have been addressed by implementing public transport-related
projects such as the modernisation of the tram line Mănăștur - Rail Station Market funded via the RDA North West (OP project). However, no information could be obtained about timescales, implementation status and evaluation and monitoring of such projects. Nevertheless, general information about project objectives and the funding contributions from the RDA, the Romanian Government and the Municipality can be found online at: European Projects, http://www.primariaclujnapoca.ro/userfiles/files/proiecte_europene.pdf.

Monitoring and evaluation

There are no specific arrangements for monitoring and evaluating the efficiency of the public transport measures implemented through the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality. There are also no specific performance indicators or any baseline data indicating the situation before and after the projects have been implemented.

RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)

Official name/associated documents

Operational Programme 'Regional Operational Programme' (ROP) (2007RO161PO001)

EC Regional Policy weblink:

This covers the entire Romanian territory which is divided into 8 Development Regions. Region 6 is the North West including 6 counties: Bihor, Bistrita-Nasaud, Cluj, Maramures, Satu Mare and Salaj. Cluj Napoca is in Cluj County.

Managing authority (MA)

Ministry of Development, Public Works and Housing.

A number of Intermediate Bodies participate in the implementation and monitoring of ROP such as:

- The Romanian Government and its Ministries;
- Ministry for Small and Medium-Sized Companies, Trade, Tourism and Liberal Professions;
- Eight Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) e.g. the North West Regional Development Agency.

The North West Regional Development Agency liaises with beneficiaries and applicants for OP funding. It also launches calls for proposals, provides guidance to potential applicants in project preparation and ensures that projects are developed.

Context

North West Romania is a Convergence Region.

The Regional Operational Programme Implementation Framework 2007 -2013 outlines the overall aim and strategic objective as:
Integrated urban transport plans and cohesion policy

- Supporting a balanced territorial and long lasting economic and social development, in Romania’s regions, corresponding to specific territorial needs and resources;
- Focusing on urban growth poles, improving the business infrastructure and the business environment in order to create attractive areas to live, visit, invest and work in all Romanian’s regions (particularly in those lagging behind).

This objective will be achieved in close co-ordination with the actions implemented through:

- Other operational programmes such as the Sectoral Operational Programmes (SOP). The SOPs include a programme for transport;

The OP’s priority axis 1 is to support sustainable development of urban growth poles. The urban development activities envisaged are eligible only as integral parts of plans for the regeneration of deprived urban areas to sustain long term economic growth and employment, not as isolated individual measures. The actions supported under this priority axis complement activities included in other priority axes (see following section). They also complement some actions supported under SOPs.

Project applicants/beneficiaries submit applications for funding and carrying out projects. In our case study, Cluj Napoca Municipality is a beneficiary of the OP funds.

**Overall aims and objectives**

In order to accomplish the strategic objective of the OP, the following specific objectives have been established:

- To increase the economic and social role of urban centres, in order to stimulate a more balanced development of regions through a polycentric approach;
- To increase accessibility within regions and in particular the accessibility of urban centres and their connection to surrounding areas;
- To increase the quality of the social infrastructure of regions;
- To increase the competitiveness of regions as business locations;
- To increase the contribution of tourism to the development of regions.

The OP is supported by the ERDF. The balanced development of all of the country’s regions will be achieved through an integrated approach. This is based on a combination of public investments in local infrastructure, active policies to stimulate business activities and support for the upgrading of local resources.

**Priority axes:**

1. Support to sustainable development of urban growth poles (incl. sustainable urban mobility planning);
2. Improvement of regional and local transport infrastructure (focussing on large scale infrastructure projects);
3. Improvement of social infrastructure;
4. Strengthening the regional and local business environment;
5. Sustainable development and promotion of tourism;
6. Technical assistance

Total EU budget = approximately €3 726 million.

**Source:** EC Regional Policy weblink.
Transport-related aims and objectives

Priority Axis 1, i.e. ‘support to sustainable development of urban growth poles’, aims to increase quality of life and to create new jobs in cities, by rehabilitating the urban infrastructure and improving services. The axis also targets development of business support structures and entrepreneurship. To contribute to balanced territorial development of the country and avoid increasing internal disparities, investments will be concentrated in those cities which act as regional and/or local growth poles and spread development into surrounding areas. Priority will be given to growth poles located in regions and counties with lower levels of development in terms of GDP and unemployment. Cluj Napoca is defined as a growth pole.

Transport Projects and associated fundings

During 2007 – 2011, a total of 292 of projects have been financed by OP under various key areas of intervention within priority axis 1. As explained above, the funding available under this axis was difficult to absorb by the Romanian regions. However, in 2012 it is known that six projects submitted to the North West RDA have received funding under axis 1, in the intervention area integrated urban development plans (see table below). The RDA North West Agency’s website contains a list of projects in the process of being implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority axis 1</th>
<th>Total costs (million Lei / € million/1)</th>
<th>EU contribution (million Lei/ € million/)</th>
<th>State Budget (million Lei/ € million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restauration of the historic complex Central Park Simon Barnutiu and Cazino of Cluj county</td>
<td>40.05/ 8.89</td>
<td>24.36/ 5.41</td>
<td>5.35/ 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation of the tram route from Rail Market to Municii Boulevard in Cluj county</td>
<td>86.21/ 19.14</td>
<td>53.71/ 11.92</td>
<td>11.8/ 2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation of the tram route from Mănăștur to Rail Market in Cluj Napoca</td>
<td>76.85/ 17.06</td>
<td>45.25/ 10.05</td>
<td>9.94/ 2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Social Housing on Street Albac</td>
<td>2.06/ 0.46</td>
<td>1.33/ 0.3</td>
<td>0.29/ 0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of hire and self service bicycle stations</td>
<td>17.65/ 3.92</td>
<td>11.0/ 2.44</td>
<td>2.42/ 0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District community centre complex of social services for children and adults</td>
<td>9.26/ 2.06</td>
<td>5.97/ 1.33</td>
<td>1.31/ 0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities/ measures and associated funding

The main area of intervention in priority axis 1 is integrated urban development plans. These are designed to also take into account projects implemented under the other SOPs, in urban action zones. Urban development plans focus on implementing projects that address the following issues:

1 Converted by the rate of Lei 100 = €22.2 as of September 2012.
• Rehabilitation of the urban infrastructure and improvement of urban services, including urban transport;
  – Building/ modernising existing bus, tram and electric bus stops
  – Building interchange / multi modal terminals
  – Extending/ modernising existing tram and electric buses network
  – Rehabilitating urban infrastructure and improving public transport and urban infrastructure
• Development of sustainable business environment;
• Rehabilitation of social infrastructure, including social housing and improvement of social services.

30% of the priority axis 1 funds were allocated to the development of sustainable urban development plans for urban growth poles. However, it was acknowledged that the total funding allocated for this axis (including co-financing) will not cover the implementation of complex projects, particularly in the area of urban regeneration.

The September 2008 OP Annual Evaluation Report illustrated that for priority axis 2 a total of 215 projects were submitted for funding to the eight RDAs from all eight Romanian development regions. However, no similar information regarding the number of projects funded via priority axis 1 could be obtained. The same report reflected the difficulties encountered by the Romanian regions in absorbing and prioritising the funding available under priority axis 1.

Use of technical assistance budget

The rationale for the technical assistance priority axis 6 is as follows: financing the preparatory, management, monitoring, evaluation, and information and control activities of OPs together with activities to reinforce the administrative capacity for implementing the funds. The technical assistance budget may be used for:

• Support of the publicity and information activities of the OP;
• Development of information system of OP content for all interested parties;
• Preparation and dissemination of information and publicity materials;
• Organising conferences, forums, road shows, workshops, training for potential beneficiaries.

Status of implementation

During the implementation phase of priority axis 1 in 2008, Romania did not have a national strategy for sustainable urban development and the lack of a coherent policy made the process of implementation and the absorption of funds under axis 1 slow and patchy. At a later stage, it was established that the criteria used to prioritise funding depends on the:

• Importance and size of the local or regional urban growth pole;
• Quality, maturity and sustainability of the integrated urban development plan;
• Projects’ contribution to the integrated urban development plan’s objectives.

Once teething problems were overcome, the OP Evaluation Report 2010, the latest document available online, indicated that, in 2010, 35 projects received funding under priority axis 1, including projects contributing to the development of integrated urban development plans. The projects’ total value amounted to RON 313 million. The same report identified a series of factors contributing to the slow development and implementation of integrated urban
development plans and their urban transport associated projects such as:

- The ongoing requirement of a significant co-funding budget;
- Municipalities lack of initiative and understanding of axis 1 projects.


Regarding the Cluj Napoca urban growth pole, it was established that six projects in Region 6 North West have received financing under priority axis 1 (see table in section of OP project examples).

Monitoring and evaluation

Three main types of evaluations apply to the ROP: Ex-ante, ongoing and ex-post evaluation.

A national institutional framework for evaluation was developed, comprising two levels:

- An overall co-ordination level, ensured by a so-called Evaluation Central Unit established within the Ministry of Economy and Finance;
- A functional level composed of Evaluation Units established within each MA.

In line with EC requirements, an OP Monitoring Committee (OP MC) was established in 2007. The OP MC’s main responsibility is to monitor the progress of the OP and to evaluate how it evolves in terms of financial efficiency and effectiveness. The monitoring process comprises regular progress review meetings and reports. The purpose of the reports is to provide updates on achievements against indicators and milestones. The reports need to be written in a standard format allowing for comparison between reports over time. The monitoring system takes into account the needs of different user groups and different levels of management structures.

Specific monitoring indicators for the implementation of priority axis 1 have been established in the OP Evaluation Framework:

- Indicator 1 - Number of Integrated Urban Development Plans;
- Indicator 2 - % of projects which contribute to improvements to the urban transport infrastructure and their sustainability in the Integrated Urban Development Plans;
- Indicator 3 - % of projects which contribute to the development of business and entrepreneurial environment and how these account to the Integrated Urban Development Plans’ total allocated budget;
- Indicator 4 - % of projects which promote gender equality and social inclusion and their contribution to the Integrated Urban Development Plans’ total allocated budget;
- Indicator 5 - Number of inhabitants benefiting from the Implementation of the Integrated Urban Development Plans;
- Indicator 6 - Number of businesses settled in the urban areas of action;
- Indicator 7 - Number of jobs created or kept in the in the urban areas of action.


Other environmental indicators established for the entire OP and stipulated in the Evaluation Framework are:

- NO\textsubscript{x} emissions;
- SO\textsubscript{2} emissions;
• $CO_V$ emissions;
• $PM_{10}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ particulate emissions;
• $CO_2$ tonnes emissions;
• Green areas affected by pollution.

Although adapted to the specific feature of the OP, the indicator system pursues the uniformity of core data, allowing them to be aggregated at different levels of interventions.

The MA submits an Annual Implementation Report to the EC by 30th June in each year. The report is examined and approved by the OP MC beforehand. A Final Report will be submitted to the Commission by 31 March 2017. This will cover all information of the entire implementation period from 2007 to 2013.

**Additional support for the city**

The OP recommends that the rehabilitation of the urban infrastructure and improvements to urban services, including improvements to urban transport systems and urban mobility plans, may also involve different types of financial engineering instruments such as JESSICA. JASPERS special support instrument and URBACT II programme will be used as financial instruments for the development of the Cluj Napoca Integrated Urban Development Plan.

**Other Operational Programmes**

The Regional OP is one of seven OPs with the objective of convergence for Romania. These include SOPs, one of which relates to transport. (The transport SOP is not within the list of the 60 largest OPs with expenditure on transport.) Romania is also involved in three European Territorial Co-operation OPs. There is no readily available information on whether Cluj Napoca participates in any of these OPs.

**EXAMPLES OF TRANSPORT PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE OP**

**Project 1: Network of hire and self service bicycle stations**


**Responsible body**

Municipality of Cluj Napoca

**Other key stakeholders involved**

• The general public;
• Private organisations;
• Non profit organisations.

The organisations’ contribution was to develop the cycling route network, and support and promote cycling as an alternative and sustainable mode of transport to the public.
Objectives

General objectives:
- Reduce car traffic;
- Encourage the uptake of sustainable modes of transport;
- Integrate cycling with other sustainable modes of transport including public transport;
- Increase urban mobility.

Budget

- OP: €3.1 million (Priority axis 1, intervention area integrated urban development plans);
- Other funding sources and associated budgets: €1.06 million mainly from the Romanian Government, but with small contribution from the Municipality of Cluj Napoca.

Main elements

The project aims to provide the required provision of bicycles and the cycling infrastructure needed to increase urban mobility in the Cluj Napoca Metropolitan area. Specific elements include:
- Providing 50 new cycle hiring and self-service stations;
- Developing a cycling route network;
- Providing 500 bicycles to encourage cycling;
- Organising one campaign to promote cycling as a sustainable mode of transport.

Status of implementation

Ongoing.

Monitoring and evaluation

It is expected that the project will increase the number of bike users, contributing to the modal shift from car travel to sustainable modes of transport.

The project is evaluated against the following indicators:
- Length of cycle routes;
- Number of cycle hiring stations;
- Number of campaigns promoting sustainable travel and cycling;
- Number of promotional materials developed;
- Number of bike users;
- Number of transport users shifting from car travel to cycling.

Project 2: Modernisation of the tram route Mănăștur – Rail Market

Information about the project’s objectives and budget is available on the Municipality of Cluj Napoca’s website at http://www.primariaclujnapoca.ro/userfiles/files/proiecte_europene.pdf
**Responsible body**

Municipality of Cluj Napoca

**Other key stakeholders involved**

Tram operating company

**Objectives**

General objectives:

- Reduce car traffic;
- Encourage the uptake of sustainable modes of transport;
- Integrate existing tram routes with other sustainable modes of transport;
- Increase urban mobility;
- Increase public transport accessibility to users with disabilities;
- Reduce journey time by 50%.

**Budget**

- OP: €12,987,438. (Priority axis 1, intervention area integrated urban development plans);
- Other funding sources and associated budgets: €5.1 million mainly from the Romanian Government, but with a small contribution from the Municipality of Cluj Napoca.

**Main elements**

The project aims to modernise one of the existing tram routes and associated passenger infrastructure to increase urban mobility in the Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area. Specific elements include:

- Re-surfacing carriageway;
- Refurbishing 12 tram stations and waiting areas;
- Providing 3,200 m² of green areas.

**Status of implementation**

Ongoing.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

It is expected that the project will increase the number of public transport users, contributing to the modal shift from car travel to public transport.

The project is evaluated against the following indicators:

- Length of tram route modernised;
- Total carriageway area re-surfaced;
- Number of tram stops and waiting area refurbished;
• Increased number of public transport users;
• Reduction in journey time by 50%.

LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECTS AND SUMP/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

There is a clear link between the OP and its two urban transport projects discussed above, the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality, and the Strategic Development Plan for the North West Region.

Objectives and targets

The Municipality of Cluj Napoca is the local transport authority. It is responsible for the SDP and is the beneficiary for a number of OP projects, including the two examples studied. These projects are formally part of the SDP and correlate with the drafting of the sustainable mobility plan for Cluj Napoca Urban Area (to be finalised in July 2013). The MA is aware of the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality and the plans for the forthcoming SUMP which are supported. The need to increase urban mobility was taken into account when planning and approving OP projects. The projects are related to the modernisation of tram stops and routes, integration of cycling with public transport and increase of urban mobility to ensure long lasting sustainable growth in Cluj Napoca. It was explicitly checked that the SDP’s objectives were in line with the OP and that the objectives of the OP project examples were aligned with the SDP. The Plan of Integrated Development for the Cluj Napoca Growth Pole – Cluj Napoca Metropolitan Area, 2009–2015, was also considered when developing these and other OP projects. According to the MA the objectives of the forthcoming SUMP would also be linked to OP objectives and targets.

The strategic and specific objectives of the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality as well as the projects’ strategic and specific objectives contribute to the sustainable development and growth of Cluj Napoca as an urban growth pole within the OP priority axis 1.

Measures/projects

The development of the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality took into account the OP’s SWOT analysis for the North West Region but tailored the identified strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats to the existing local situation. The SDP implements at a local level the projects prescribed at a strategic level by the OP priority axis 1 and its key areas of intervention.

The SDP for Cluj Napoca is an umbrella under which urban mobility, transport-related, social infrastructure and business related projects co-exist. The SDP is an important strategic document which complements other policy documents such as the North West Regional Development Plan, National Plan for Rural Development, Plan for the Human Resources Development, and other Sectoral OPs.

Impacts

Information about the overall progress of OP projects against the indicators in the OP Evaluation Framework could not be obtained. All projects funded via OP priority axis 1 are monitored against strategic and specific indicators by the corresponding RDAs. In Cluj Napoca’s case, the projects contribute to the targets and the indicators 2 and 5 of axis 1 (see monitoring and evaluation arrangements in the section on the OP).
The two OP project examples play a role in improving local transport infrastructure and access to public transport and in increasing urban mobility. They also contribute to the sustainable, long term growth of Cluj Napoca and improve the quality of life of its inhabitants. As such, they contribute to the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality and inform the development of the sustainable urban mobility plan to be finalised in July 2013.

**Funding**

OP funds were considered as a co-financing source when planning projects for the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality and subsequently used as a co-financing source for SDP projects and included in its budget.

It is clear that, at the local level, OP priority axis 1 is a necessary means of funding for urban transport and mobility projects. These projects would not be implemented and completed without OP financing. This is mainly due to the municipalities’ lack of financial resources; Cluj Napoca Municipality’s contribution to local project funding amounts to around 2% of total budget. The municipality staff stated that another substantial source for co-financing projects is the Romanian Government. Other co-funding sources were Cluj County Council and credit loans.

Therefore, OP and SDP projects have similar co-funding sources. Transport-related OP projects are intended to be included in the budget of the future SUMP.

**Management**

It appeared that the municipality manages OP project implementation, while project monitoring and evaluation is carried out by the North West RDA.

The North West RDA provided support and guidance to the municipality’s representatives particularly during the process of application for project funding. This is a collaborative process during which the project managers (municipality representatives) and the North West RDA’s (Growth Pole Co-ordinators) work together on proposed projects. They also have regular meetings to discuss project implementation and how to overcome related obstacles.

Overall, the municipality staff was happy with the North West RDA’s Pole Co-ordinators’ input and assistance on various projects. It was clear that a continuous communication process exists between them, during which the North West RDA’s Pole Co-ordinators provide suggestions and clarifications when these are required. The MA is also generally satisfied with the level of co-operation between the North West RDA and OP project staff. However, they would like to work more closely with local authorities in the region on procurement and contracting processes.

The local transport authority interviewee indicated that:

- OP project staff were involved in the design and implementation of the SDP for Cluj Napoca Municipality;
- Cluj Napoca Municipality, as the local transport authority, was involved in the design and implementation of transport-related OP projects.
The same urban development policy staff at the municipality was involved in the SDP and the network of hire and self service bicycle stations OP project. This facilitated effective co-operation regarding management of the SDP and the project. The Municipality officer who was interviewed regarding the Modernisation of tram route Mănăștur - Rail Market project stated that he liaised regularly and effectively with SDP managers regarding project development and implementation.
CASE STUDY HALLE (SAALE)

CITY PROFILE

Country /region/ objective
Germany (Saxony-Anhalt)
NUTS 3 - Halle (Saale) (code DE 21)
Convergence (ERDF)

Geographical factors
Halle is one of three major cities located in the southern part of Saxony-Anhalt (as well as Magdeburg and Dessau).

Economic factors
Halle lies to the northwest of Leipzig and is therefore part of the Halle-Leipzig agglomeration, which is an important economic centre of the new eastern states of Germany, the new ‘Bundesländer’.

Demographic factors
In 2012, the registered population of Halle was 232,500, which is around 25% less than 1990 (almost 310 000).

Source: [http://www.halle.de/de/Rathaus-Stadtrat/Statistik-Wahlen/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsentwick-06050/](http://www.halle.de/de/Rathaus-Stadtrat/Statistik-Wahlen/Bevoelkerung/Bevoelkerungsentwick-06050/)

Challenges faced by the city/city region
The specific problem of Halle is the shrinking and ageing population which leads to problems of funding and utilisation of existing and planned (transport) infrastructure.

URBAN POLICIES

Urban mobility policy
Halle is connected to Leipzig by local train service (S-Bahn), which was opened in 1969. Public transport is operated by the local transport operator HAVAG (Hallesche Verkehrs AG). It operates 15 tram lines and 23 bus services. The tram-network was the first to be commercially operated in Germany and it was preserved after World War II. In terms of road network, Halle is encircled by a motorway ring. Because Halle only suffered minor damage during WW II the inner city is still characterised by a narrow road grid.

The basic goals of the city are to provide attractive economic and housing conditions, a functioning ecosystem and a diverse landscape. Therefore the aim is to extend the share of green modes of transport and achieve corresponding savings in relation to car travel.

Source: [http://www.halle.de/de/Leben-Gesellschaft/Verkehr/Planung/Nahverkehrsplan](http://www.halle.de/de/Leben-Gesellschaft/Verkehr/Planung/Nahverkehrsplan)
Overview of the construction standard of the tram lines in Halle

Other related policies/ activities in the European arena

The Municipality of Halle (Saale) recently joined the ‘Quality management tool for Urban Energy efficient Sustainable Transport’ (QUEST), a project supported by the EC. This project receives funding from the Intelligent Energy Europe programme. Later in 2012 Halle’s urban mobility policy will be evaluated using an audit tool developed by QUEST. The aim of the QUEST audit is to support cities in their efforts of developing more sustainable urban mobility systems. Based on the results of the QUEST audit a tailor-made improvement programme will be recommended to Halle City Council.

Source: [http://www.halle.de/de/Leben-Gesellschaft/Verkehr/Planung/Nahverkehrsplan](http://www.halle.de/de/Leben-Gesellschaft/Verkehr/Planung/Nahverkehrsplan)
SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Official name/associated documents

- Transport Policy Vision ("Verkehrspolitisches Leitbild") (1997);

Responsible body

Halle City Council

Other key stakeholders involved

Comprehensive citizens participation for the new VEP

Aims and objectives

The goals of the current document (Transport Policy Vision) are summarised above in the urban mobility section

Although the plan preparation process is still ongoing, the new VEP in Halle seems to fulfil the following criteria of a SUMP.

- Participatory and integrative approach;
  The content of the new plan is currently being discussed and drawn up in workshops involving all stakeholder groups. All associations, organisation and initiatives dealing with urban transport are involved. Its aims and objectives will be based on the results of this process.
- Overall sustainable mobility principles;
  The transport policy vision from 1998 highlights measures to promote sustainable transport.

The criteria of a SUMP which are not fulfilled are:

- Short term objectives and strategic vision;
  The VEP will contain a Strategic Vision for 2025 but no short term objectives are included. The City Council intends to avoid a commitment to implementing certain infrastructural measures due to the declining options of co-funding by federal and national government.
- Review of transport costs and benefits;
  The cost benefit analysis is seen as a further step to be taken on a project level.

Budget

There is no budget directly allocated to the plans.

Main measures

The current document (Transport Policy Vision) contains several measures to reach the goals. They are divided into:

- Public transport (network improvement and extension, organisational measures, transport association);
Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies

- Pedestrians;
- Bicycles;
- Car traffic;
- Business traffic;
- Parking;
- Accompanying measures (carsharing, carpooling, carfree housing, mobility management).

Status of implementation

Transport Policy Vision implemented, new VEP in the preparation phase.

RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)

Official name/associated documents

Operational Programme 'Saxony-Anhalt' (2007DE161PO007)


Managing authority (MA)

Ministry of Finance of Saxony-Anhalt

Context

The OP is co-funded by the ERDF under the Convergence objective.

Overall aims and objectives

Rather than funding projects in major cities, the OP focuses on smaller towns and rural areas, mainly to adjust the standard of road construction throughout the federal state of Saxony-Anhalt. This goes along with the regional planning objective to adjust living conditions even in rural areas. However, due to the local differences in the demographic processes (i.e. increasing and decreasing numbers of population in adjacent areas), this goal is currently under discussion.

The main objective of the OP is to strengthen research, development and businesses’ capacity for innovation. Urban projects aim at contributing to enhancing the potential for economic development and combating social and ecological degradation.

Priority axes:

1. Innovation, research and development;
2. Increasing the competitiveness of the economy;
3. Economic infrastructure;
4. Sustainable urban development, including educational infrastructures;
5. Environmental protection and risk prevention;
6. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €1 931 million

Source: EC Regional Policy weblink.
Transport-related aims and objectives

There are no explicit transport-related aims and objectives.

Transport projects and associated funding

Even though the OP states that “clean urban transport projects will be carried out”, hardly any examples could be found. As for Halle, only one transport infrastructure also contains a measure related to tram extension. However, only a minor measure of this project is co-funded by the OP.

Transport projects and associated funding are presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Axis</th>
<th>Total costs (€ million)</th>
<th>EU contribution (€ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority Axis 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State road construction</td>
<td>36,3</td>
<td>36,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local road construction</td>
<td>26,7</td>
<td>17,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure for rail freight transport</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Axis 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram infrastructure</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle route network</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Research</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities/ measures and associated funding

Priority Axis 3 of the OP states that selected investment in economic infrastructure should be undertaken in order to remove key bottlenecks in the transport infrastructure and to improve certain areas’ links to national transport networks. Priority Axis 5 envisages clean urban transport projects.

Status of implementation

The OP is currently in year 5 of an implementation period running from 2007-2013. Accordingly, many projects have already been implemented.

EXAMPLE OF TRANSPORT PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE OP

Project: Major road Reconstruction Delitzscher Strasse/ tram track renewal and line extension

The road reconstruction “Delitzscher Straße” in combination of the 3rd Main Section of Tram line Halle-Neustadt – Central Station – Büschdorf (tram line 7) is currently one of the biggest transport infrastructure projects in Halle.

Responsible bodies

Halle City Council/ HAVAG
**Other key stakeholders involved**

HAVAG has appointed a project coordinator, who is responsible for communicating with the MA on matters concerning OP co-funding.

**Objectives**

The road surface, tramway tracks and secondary structure of the Delitzscher Strasse, which has an important function as a ‘town entry gate’, needs to be restored. At the same time the existing tram line 7 will be extended to the eastern district of Büschdorf by 1.3 km, in accordance with local population growth changes and a rise in transport demand.

**Budget**

The total road reconstruction including the tram line extension cost €31.2 million. Of this amount, the extension of the tram line by 1.3 km accounts for approximately € 4 million. The tram-line extension is basically financed by federal funds. In addition two specific measures were co-financed by the OP:

- Tram track construction at the road junction “Grenzstrasse”;
- Construction of a new transformer station.

**Status of implementation**

The tram extension of tram line 7 was opened in July 2012.

**LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECT AND SUMP/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

There is only little linkage between the OP and sustainable urban transport projects due to the fact that only a minor part of the tram line expansion associated with the renewal of Delitzscher Strasse is funded through the OP.

The Transport Policy Vision of the city plays a minor role. The new VEP, however, is now being developed in an integrative and participative way and aims to contain many sustainable transport measures. It also addresses the tram network of Halle City, but its focus will be on measures to adapt to the trend of shrinking population. Thus, the focus will be on strategies and concepts on how to manage to keep the high level of tram service and how to finance necessary maintenance and repair work in future.

**Objectives and targets**

The project is mainly carried out to improve the road traffic situation. Therefore it fits within the OP’s priority axis 3.

**Measures/projects**

The interviews showed that the transport planners and developers of the new VEP know little about cohesion policy and vice versa, there is no evidence that the VEP is considered when drawing up the OP programme.

However, the construction measure ‘Delitzscher Strasse’ including the tram expansion is part of the current Transport Policy Vision of the city of Halle.
Impacts

The impact of the new plan (VEP) and the OP projects are not known, because they are ongoing. The measures of the current plan, however, have all been implemented.

Funding

The tram extension part of the project is mainly funded by sources from national and federal government. Only one part of the tram tracks as well as one transformer station is partially co-funded by the OP.

Management

The beneficiary complained about a large number of obstacles put in place by the MA during the ongoing project. The MA provides little help for applicants and beneficiaries and is regarded as rather a bureaucratic institution.
CASE STUDY KRAKOW

CITY PROFILE

Country /region/ objective

Poland (Region Lesser Poland/Małopolska)

NUTS 3 - Miasto Kraków (PL 213)

Convergence (Cohesion Fund, ERDF)

Geographical factors

Malopolska region is situated in the south of Poland which is a mountainous area. Half of the region lies at or above 500 m above sea level. Poland’s highest peak is situated in this region (Rysy, 2499 m). Krakow, which for many centuries used to be the capital of Poland, is the capital of the region. Located in the region of Malopolska are some of Poland’s prime tourist destinations such as the old city of Krakow, Auschwitz, Wieliczka salt mine and the Tatra mountains. In addition, six national parks are situated within the borders of the region.


Economic factors

GDP per capita Region Lesser Poland: 30 220 PLN in 2010 (approx. €7 335)\(^2\)
GDP per capita Krakow: approx. 40 000 PLN (approx. €9 700)

In spite of the economic crisis in most European countries, Poland managed to avoid major economic crises in the last few years. Over the last few year in the whole country including Malopolska, the GDP was still growing slightly both in general and per capita terms. The rate of unemployment has been continually decreasing during the years 2003-2008, however in 2010 this trend was reversed: the unemployment rate in 2010 was 9.1% as compared to 8% in 2009.

Source: Statistical Office of Krakow.

Demographic factors

- Population of the region: 3.3 million (slightly more than 50% urban population);
- Population of Krakow: 750 000 inhabitants.

Population density in Malopolska equals 218 people per km\(^2\), which makes it one of the most densely populated regions in Poland (the national average being 122). In the last few years the number of people of pre-productive age has been decreasing while the number of people of post-productive age has been increasing. This trend is characteristic for the whole of Poland and according to forecasts until 2030 it is set to continue. Between 2000 and 2010 the total population number in Malopolska increased by 2.7%, which was partly due to a positive migration saldo observed in recent years. The population from urban areas was decreasing in net terms (minus 1 900 in 2010), while in rural areas it was increasing (plus 6

\(^2\) Converted by the rate of PLN 100 = €24.272 as of September 2012.
300 people in 2010). This is mostly due to the trend of people moving out of the city to the suburbs in order to live there while continuing to work in the city.

More than 20 higher education establishments are situated in Krakow, which is also known as ‘the city of students’. The number of students fluctuates at around 200 thousand.

**Sources:** Statistical Office of Krakow; www.krakow.pl.

**Challenges faced by the city/city region**

The density of the public transport network in Krakow is not sufficient, especially in new residential districts situated far from the old city centre. The city especially needs new tram lines which would improve mobility during peak hours. A negative phenomenon of creating secluded mini-structures with apartment buildings and shops has been observed. More and more people are moving from the city centre to live in the suburbs, while the city centre increasingly accommodates service providers, office space and retailers. This creates a bigger need for longer-distance transport (often by car) and less social cohesion within the city.

**Source:** Integrated Plan of Development of Public Transport for Krakow.

**URBAN POLICIES**

**Urban mobility policy**

The following are the main modes of public transport in Krakow:

- Trams (27 lines);
- City buses (86 daily routes plus 8 night buses);
- Agglomeration buses (67 daily routes and 3 night buses);
- Mini-buses (there are many private companies operating mostly between the city centre and the suburbs);
- Tele-bus service available in selected areas (anyone can call and order transport for a certain route, regular monthly bus tickets apply).

**Source:** website of the municipal transport company; http://www.mpk.krakow.pl.

During recent years older buses were systematically replaced with newer models so that the quality of the bus stock became relatively good. The situation is less positive with regard to trams, in that both the tram lines and the tram stock need modernising. The train network is well developed, however it is not used for urban transport.

**Source:** Integrated Plan of Development of Public Transport for Krakow.

Currently, at certain points the urban mobility network is not very well integrated with the wider regional and national network. Public transport is often not convenient to use and this results in the creation of a preference for using the car. The railway network is not very well integrated with urban transport. This is because the area around the main railway station is densely developed, which precludes easy integration with the urban transport system. For instance, one of the most important roads leading to Zakopane (the chief holiday destination for Polish winter recreation) is poorly served by urban public transport and there is no railway connection.
The general goal of urban mobility policy is to create an effective transport system for the city, to support its role as a regional centre for living, services, education and industry. The Integrated Plan lists the following, more specific aims:

- Integrating Krakow’s transport system, both regarding internal connections and regarding connections with external (regional, national and European) transport systems;
- Developing areas with relevant technical infrastructure to attract investors into the Krakow area;
- Improving transport safety and the state of the natural and cultural environment;
- General improvement of the role and quality of urban transport;
- Making public transport more competitive compared to car transport;
- Preventing congestion in city transport;
- Saving energy.


Other related policies/ activities in the European arena

Transport policy is closely related to other strategies and policies of the city, including:

2. Transport policy for the City of Krakow for the years 2007-2015, adopted in 2007;
3. A study of conditions and directions of spatial management, adopted in 2003;
4. Strategy of development of the Malopolska region for the years 2007-2013, adopted in 2006;
5. Spatial management plan for the Malopolska voivodship;

Krakow is a demonstration city of CIVITAS II (2005 – 2009) in the CARAVEL project.

SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Official name/associated documents

(Integrated Plan of Development of Public Transport for Krakow)


Responsible body

The president of the City of Krakow.

Other key stakeholders involved

- Self-government of the Malopolska region (manager of the road network in the region and responsible for the regional railway lines);
- PKP SA (main railway company; its role is to make sure that urban public transport is integrated with the railway system);
- Main Directorate for State Roads and Highways (manager of the state roads; its role
is to make sure that public transport is well integrated with the system of state roads);
- Administrators of local communities and provinces around Krakow, especially the ones situated within the Krakow Metropolitan Area (to make sure that areas around Krakow can be reached by public transport);
- Public transport companies which implement the planned investments;
- Non-governmental organisations dealing with transport and environment (their role is to formulate opinions about and proposals of changes and revisions).

**Aims and objectives**

The main goal of the Plan is to create conditions for the efficient and safe transport of people by optimal division of transport tasks among the different modes – collective transport, cars, pedestrian and cycling. At the same time, it aims at limiting the burden of transport on the environment. Once the plan has been implemented, public transport accessibility of the city and its metropolitan area is expected to be improved.

The following criteria for a SUMP are fulfilled:

- Integrated approach.
  The Plan stresses the need of cooperation with adjacent areas and with other modes of transport.
- Overall sustainable mobility principle.
  Balancing economic development, social equity and environmental quality. The Plan in a few places repeatedly stresses the role of transport in boosting economic development in the region, while at the same time emphasising that environmental and cultural quality have to be maintained and promoted. The Plan promotes more social cohesion and prevention of the suburbanisation trend, where many secluded residential areas are created outside the city centre.
- Short-term objectives and strategic vision.
  Short-term objectives should be set in line with a vision for transport and embedded in an overall sustainable development strategy. The Plan itself mentions measurable targets and refers to other strategic documents adopted for the region.

The criteria of a SUMP which are not fulfilled are:

- Participatory approach.
  While citizens and stakeholders are involved in taking decisions about major investments, they were not involved in the process of formulating the plan;
- Review of transport costs and benefits.
  Only the costs are estimated while a quantitative evaluation of the benefits is lacking.

**Budget**

Total amount of investment outlays covered by the Transport Development Plan equals 1 686.42 million PLN of 2011 (approx. €410 million).

Funding source(s):
- The city own resources amount to 601.29 million PLN (approx. €146 million)
- The city transport company resources amount to 390.65 million PLN (approx. €95 million)
- The planned EU funds contribution amounts to 694.49 million PLN (approx. €170 million)
Integrated urban transport plans and cohesion policy

Main measures

1. Integrated public transport in Krakow agglomeration – stage II;
   a. Construction of tram line Grzegórzeckie Roundabout – Kotlarski Bridge – Lipska street together with construction of Kuklinski street;
   b. Extension of the tram lines at the stretch of Dluga-Kamienna streets together with a node of Basztowa-Dluga streets up to the cargo terminal;
   c. Purchase of 24 new tram vehicles.
2. Construction of the tram line connecting Brozka Street and the campus of the university together with a system of traffic management;
3. Extension of the node ‘Mistrzejowice’ together with the tram line KST Stella Sawicki;
4. Modernisation of 29 Listopada Alley with arrangement of separate lanes for public transport;
5. Modernisation of Konopnicka Street with arrangement of separate lanes for public transport;
6. Extension of the Krakow City Card system to the whole area of the agglomeration;
7. Construction of Fast Agglomeration Train;
8. Construction of an overpass along the streets Nowohucka and Powstanców Wielkopolskich;
9. Renovation of the node Dietla-Starowislna together with a tram line at the sections: Sebastiana street – Blich street and the node Main Post Office – Dietla street;
10. Purchase of environmentally-friendly buses (150 buses in the years 2009-2015);
11. Construction of a tunnel beneath the roundabout Ofiar Katynia;
12. Renovation of the streets Dominikaska – Franciszkanska together with a tram line;
13. Renovation of a tram line at the stretch Rondo Mogilskie – al. Jana Pawla II – Plac Centralny together with the system of traffic management.

Status of implementation

The plan is in the process of being implemented. It was adopted in 2008 and since then a few updates have taken place (e.g. new investments have been added to the list). The city authorities plan to formulate a new Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan in 2013.

Monitoring and evaluation

The document discusses obligatory monitoring of the transport system in order to be able to analyse the dynamics of various phenomena and implement rational solutions to the problems which might be brought to light by the analysis. The system of monitoring contains the following elements:

- Investigating transport needs (mobility goals, distribution of mobility in time and space);
- Investigating the increase of motorisation;
- The number and status of firms in the specific branches, their size and transport potential, employment and remuneration;
- The state of transport infrastructure;
- Measuring traffic intensity;
- Measuring congestion and insufficient supply of collective transport;
- Expenditures on transport infrastructure made by various stakeholders;
- Tax burden on transport companies and on transport users;
- Emissions of exhaust fumes and noise;
- Registration of traffic accidents and places where they occur;
The level of accessibility of the transport modes and related devices for people with disabilities;
Conditions surrounding the transport system (including population density and labour market);
Measuring operational quality of public transport;
Evaluations by citizens obtained through various forms of surveys, focusing on functioning of public transport and proposals of new solutions.

Comprehensive traffic surveys are carried out by the city every 8-10 years. Smaller surveys needed for updating traffic models are carried out every 2 years and surveys aimed at evaluation of the main parameters of mobility every 5 years.

The SUMP as a whole is not a subject of periodical evaluation. However the status of urban public transport is monitored. Every two years a small survey of the population is conducted where the relevant indicators of the usage of public transport are measured. Every 7-8 years a more comprehensive survey is conducted on a larger sample.

**RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)**

**Official name/associated documents**

Infrastructure and Environment Operational Programme (IEOP) (2007PL161PO002)


**Managing authority (MA)**

Ministry of Regional Development,
Department for the Management Coordination of Infrastructural Programmes

**Context**

The general objective of the cohesion policy is to reduce the gap between different regions, more precisely between less-favoured regions and affluent ones. It is an instrument of financial solidarity and a powerful force for economic integration.

Development difficulties in Poland are caused, to a great extent, by degradation or by the lack of infrastructure. In order to increase the country's competitiveness and to attract investors, these obstacles have to be overcome. The Infrastructure and Environment Operational Programme serves this objective by supporting the development of technical infrastructure and by simultaneously protecting and improving the condition of the natural environment and health, as well as preserving cultural identity and developing territorial cohesion. This programme is complementary to other regional programmes.

The Infrastructure and Environment Programme is also an important instrument for implementation of the renewed Lisbon Strategy (Lisbon-related expenditure constitutes over 66% of the EU spending).

The goals of the IEOP in relation to transport have been identified on the basis of the strategic development directions of the transport sector described in the National Strategic
Integrated urban transport plans and cohesion policy

Reference Framework 2007-2013 and draft Strategy of Transport Development for the years 2007-2013. This Strategy indicated four main goals:

1. Creating a transport network appropriate for the transport needs of the country,
2. Development of market mechanisms in transport,
3. Integration of transport both regarding the territory an the modes,
4. Increasing traffic safety.

Many of the priority goals of the IEOP have been based on the more detailed goals of the Polish Strategy of Transport Development. These include construction of highways and motorways, pilot projects in the area of Intelligent Transport Systems and modernisation of railway lines within the trans-European network TEN-T.

More detailed development plans for individual transport branches are described in strategic documents relating to the specific sectors, such as the “Strategy for the Railway sector until 2013” and the “Programme of development of the network of airports and land-based navigation”.

For the Polish authorities investments located along the TEN-T network are priority investments. The roads and railway networks as well as airports located along TEN-T will have to comply with the parameters set for these networks.

This OP does not specifically relate to regional and urban strategies. Regional transport strategies however refer to the same national strategic documents on which IEOP goals are based.

Sources: „Program Operacyjny Infrastruktura i Środowisko. Narodowe Strategiczne Ramy Odniesienia 2007-2013“
http://www.pois.gov.pl/Dokumenty/Lists/Dokumenty%20programowe/Attachments/122/POIiS_wersja_3_0.pdf

The City of Krakow implements its development strategy, in which one of the main goals is to increase the competitiveness of Krakow and the whole region while having regard to the natural and cultural environment. The city also aims at creating better connections with the nation-wide transport system. The goal of improving urban transport is in accordance with the strategic goals of the IEOP. The city, together with other beneficiaries such as the city transport company, helps to achieve the goals of IEOP through implementing specific investment projects.

**Overall aims and objectives**

Six main objectives can be distinguished:

1. Building infrastructure to ensure that the economic development of Poland will be supported, at the same time as preserving and improving the state of the natural environment;
2. Improving access to the main economic centres of Poland by connecting them with a network of highways and motorways and other transport modes offering an alternative to roads;
3. Ensuring a stable long-term energy supply for Poland by diversifying supplies, lowering energy intensity of the economy and supporting renewable sources of energy;
4. Using Poland’s cultural heritage sites with worldwide and European significance to increase the attractiveness of Poland;
5. Maintaining a high level of public health which contributes to good quality labour forces;
6. Developing modern academic centres, including centres for education in the field of new technologies.

Priority axes:
1. Water and sewage management - Cohesion Fund;
2. Waste management and the protection of the earth - Cohesion Fund;
3. Resource management and counteracting environmental risks - Cohesion Fund;
4. Initiatives aimed at adjusting enterprises to the requirements of environmental protection – ERDF;
5. Environmental protection and the promotion of ecological habits – ERDF;
6. TEN-T road and air transport network - Cohesion Fund;
7. Environment-friendly transport - Cohesion Fund;
8. Transport safety and national transport networks – ERDF;
9. Environment-friendly energy infrastructure and energy efficiency - Cohesion Fund;
10. Energy security, including the diversification of energy sources – ERDF;
11. Culture and cultural heritage – ERDF;
12. Health, safety and improvement of health protection system – ERDF;
13. Higher education infrastructure – ERDF;
14. Technical assistance – ERDF;
15. Technical assistance – Cohesion Fund.

Total EU budget = approximately €27,91 million

Source: EC Regional Policy weblink.

Transport-related aims and objectives

In the area of transport it is expected that 636 km of motorways and over 2219 km of dual carriageways will be constructed, 1566 km of railway lines will be modernised and 8 main airports will be expanded. The following priorities are distinguished in the area of transport (general):

- TEN-T road and air transport network;
- Environment-friendly transport;
- Transport safety and national transport network.

Urban transport is included in the priority axis 7 “Environment-friendly transport”.
### Transport projects and associated funding

On the most recently updated list of IEOP from December 2011 there are 350 transport projects and the following urban transport projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Total costs (million PLN/ € million)</th>
<th>EU contribution (million PLN/ € million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated public transport in the Krakow agglomeration – stage II</td>
<td>430.4/ 104.5</td>
<td>184.2/ 44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation of tram route Wilenski stadion – National Stadium – Washington Roundabout together with purchase of 30 tram carriages</td>
<td>366.4/ 88.8</td>
<td>175.0/ 42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the tram line connecting Brozka Street and the university campus together with the traffic management system and supervision in Krakow</td>
<td>182.9/ 44.4</td>
<td>52.4/ 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd metro Line in Warsaw – preparation and construction of the central interval together with purchase of rolling stock</td>
<td>5924.3/ 1437.9</td>
<td>2771.8/ 672.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of modern, low-floor tram rolling stock</td>
<td>386.9/ 93.9</td>
<td>185.7/ 45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of fast urban railway in Tricity</td>
<td>117.0/ 28.4</td>
<td>55.9/ 13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of dynamic passenger information in the area of KZK GOP</td>
<td>0.81/ 0.19</td>
<td>0.56/ 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System ITS Poznan</td>
<td>103.1/ 25.0</td>
<td>79.8/ 19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the Integrated System of Traffic Management TRISTAR in Gdańsk, Gdynia and Sopot</td>
<td>184.3/ 44.7</td>
<td>156.2/ 37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of an Intelligent Transport System in Koszalin</td>
<td>13.5/ 3.3</td>
<td>11.4/ 2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of the system of detection in the city of Gliwice together with modernisation of the selected traffic lights, stage I</td>
<td>29.0/ 7.0</td>
<td>24.1/ 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent transport system &quot;ITS Wrocław&quot;</td>
<td>72.9/ 17.7</td>
<td>58.7/ 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of system of public transport management in Krakow</td>
<td>47.0/ 11.4</td>
<td>32.6/ 7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of an intelligent system of road transport in the city of Rzeszów</td>
<td>16.0/ 3.9</td>
<td>11.7/ 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent transport system in Bydgoszcz</td>
<td>69.6/ 16.9</td>
<td>56.3/ 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of an integrated system of road traffic management in Kalisz – stage I</td>
<td>22.4/ 5.4</td>
<td>19.1/ 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of functioning of public transport in Szczecin agglomeration using telematic systems</td>
<td>54.3/ 13.2</td>
<td>29.3/ 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL in million PLN (million €)</td>
<td>8002.9 (1924.5)</td>
<td>3895.2 (945.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities/ measures and associated funding

The transport-related priority axes and the associated financial allocations, commitments and expenditure are as follows:

- **Priority 6: TEN-T road and air transport network – Cohesion Fund;**
  Increasing Poland’s transport accessibility and improving interregional connections by developing the road and air TEN-T network; improving transport connections between the main cities of eastern Poland and other parts of the country by developing the road network in the eastern regions. Construction of sections of motorways and dual carriageways connecting the biggest agglomerations, the construction of bypasses and the reconstruction of sections of other national roads included in the TEN-T network.
  - Allocation from the EU funds: €8 802 million;
  - Commitment: 95.7% of the allocation;
  - Expenditure to date: 47.5% of the allocation.

- **Priority 7: Environment-friendly transport – Cohesion Fund;**
  Increasing the ratio of alternatives to road transport in the overall passenger and cargo transport (railway transport, sea transport, public transport in metropolitan areas, multimodal transport, inland waterways). This will result in a better balance of the transport system, decrease the negative effects of transport on the environment and limit traffic congestion.
  - Allocation from the EU funds: €7 676 million;
  - Commitment: 40% of the allocation;
  - Expenditure to date: 2.6%.

- **Priority 8: Transport safety and national transport networks – ERDF;**
  Improving the safety level of roads includes, on the one hand, modernising the infrastructure of national roads (increasing capacity) or providing equipment to improve road safety and, on the other hand, changing the attitude and behaviour of all persons involved in road traffic. Intelligent Transport Systems will be developed. Construction and modernisation of sea and river canals along with an extension of the existing infrastructure of inland waterways.
  - Allocation from the EU funds: €2 945 million;
  - Commitment: 56% of the allocation;
  - Expenditure to date: 25%.

Use of technical assistance budget

- Technical assistance budget from the ERDF: €187.8 million;
- Technical assistance budget from the CF: €393.5 million;
- So far (until the end of February 2012) 23% of technical assistance has been used and 34% has been contracted.


Status of implementation

The IEOP is under implementation.

Relevant indicators as evaluated in December 2010, half-way through the implementation of this OP (selected indicators):
- Highways: the length of newly-built highways within the TEN-T network was 344 km as compared to the goal of 477 km for 2013;
- Motorways: the length of newly-built motorways within the TEN-T network was equal to 249 km as compared to the goal of 1132 km for 2013;
- Railway lines: the length of the modernised railway lines was 120 km as compared to the goal of 1248 km in 2013;
- Airports: the number of renovated airports was 1 as compared to the goal of 8 for 2013;
- Urban public transport:
  - The length of tram and trolleybus lines was 4.2 km as compared to 550 km planned by 2013;
  - The length of modernised tram and trolleybus lines was 1.2 km as compared to 550 km planned by 2013;
  - The additional number of passengers carried by urban municipal transport was 470,000 as compared to 31.5 million planned by 2013.


**Monitoring and evaluation**

Short monitoring reports showing progress in terms of contracts and spending are prepared monthly. In addition, biannual and annual reports are produced. The last summary of spending available on the website of the Ministry of Regional Development shows that, until the end of December 2012, about 41% of the whole allocation of funds had been used (amounting to claims for payment in the amount of approx. €11.76 billion); taking the agreed amounts in signed agreements into consideration this percentage would rise up to about 84% (approx. €23.26 billion). In the transport sector these percentages are more or less the same as for the whole programme. However, regarding priorities 7 and 8 which are relevant for public transport, the execution of the programme is progressing slower than all priorities on average. In priority 7 (Environment-friendly Transport), only 12.6% of allocated funds has been used to date (approx. €968.28 million) and about 61% (approx. €4.7 billion) has been contracted; in priority 8 these percentages amount to 50% and 88%, respectively (approx. €1.5 billion and approx. €2.7 billion, respectively).


**Additional support for the city**

During the implementation of the IEOP JASPERS has been used as a support instrument. Several projects within the IEOP received support from the JASPERS programme. A full list of projects receiving support from JASPERS in Poland can be accessed at: [http://www.jaspers-europa-info.org/index.php/poland.html](http://www.jaspers-europa-info.org/index.php/poland.html)

In contrast to Krakow several cities in Poland implement projects with assistance of JESSICA or URBACT II programmes. These projects are implemented by the specific cities and if there is any link to the operational programmes, it is with the regional OPs and not with the IEOP. Within JESSICA, five regions in Poland implement various projects (Wielkopolskie, Zachodniopomorskie, Slaskie, Pomorskie and Mazowieckie).

The list of Polish cities involved in URBACT II can be accessed at: 

**Other Operational Programmes**

The City of Krakow is also involved in the Regional OP for Malopolska:

Operational Programme 'Lesser Poland' (2007PL161PO010) 
EC Regional Policy weblink: 

**EXAMPLES OF TRANSPORT PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE OP**

**Project 1: Development of a urban traffic management system in Krakow (IEOP)**


**Responsible body/bodies**

The City of Krakow

**Other key stakeholders involved**

- ZIKIT – administration of municipal infrastructure and transport, implementation unit to the City Mayor headed by the city subordinate; involved in preparing the documentation and supervising the project;
- CUPT – Centre for the transport projects receiving support from the EU funds - intermediary;
- Ministry of Regional Development – Managing Authority;
- Municipal police which is involved in some aspects, mostly related to more effective measures for keeping cars outside the old city centre;
- Municipal transport company – computers and information devices will be installed in the transport company’s equipment;
- Krakow Technical University which provides methodology for monitoring.

**Objectives**

The main objective of this project is to create better conditions of urban traffic for pedestrians, cyclists, users of public transport, and to protect the old city of Krakow from the consequences of air pollution, noise and general degradation of public spaces.

**Budget**

47 million PLN (approx. €11.4 million) including 32.6 million PLN (approx. €7.9 million) in EU funds contribution (ERDF).
Main elements

The main elements are:

1. Extension of the system of public transport management: purchase of software and hardware to be installed in trams, development of the system for statistical analyses, purchase of dynamic information boards;
2. Extension of the system of traffic management, renovation of traffic lights and steering devices;
3. Development of a system of control of access to the restricted traffic zone and supervision of the lanes for public traffic.

Status of implementation

Under implementation, completion planned for the end of 2013.

Monitoring and evaluation

No evaluation has been undertaken to date because only a small amount of the budget has been spent so far.

Project 2: Construction of the tram node Dietla-Starowiślna Street together with the tram line Sebastiana-Blich Street and Post Office node (from the Regional OP)


Responsible body

The City of Krakow.

Other key stakeholders involved

ZIKIT – administration of municipal infrastructure and transport, implementation unit to the City Mayor headed by the City subordinate, preparing the documentation and supervising the project.

The office of Regional Self-government (Marshal) being the Managing Authority for the Regional OP.

Objectives

The Project has increased capacity of the main public transport corridors in Krakow and improved comfort of public transport.

Budget

34.7 million PLN (approx. €8.4 million) including 19.9 million PLN (approx. €4.8 million) of EU funds. Initially, the project was fully financed by the city, later a partial refund was obtained from the ERDF.
Main elements

The main elements of the project were:

1. Renovation of the Dietla-Starowińska crossroad and tram line;
2. Renovation of the Main Post Office crossroad;
3. Renovation of the road and tram line situated along Starowińska and Dietla streets.

These works included construction of tram and bus lanes, construction of bike lanes, extension of the pavements and parking places, construction of shelters for passengers waiting at the stops, small architecture, renovation of traction network, drainage systems and rails, gas and electric networks, traffic lights.

Status of implementation

The project was implemented in the period September 2008-December 2009.

Monitoring and evaluation

The results of the project have been verified against the objectives. These were stated in terms of shorter time of transport along this road interval. The objectives have been accomplished.

LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECTS AND SUMP/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The SUMP was developed as a condition to receive OP funding. The project on improving traffic management is consistent with both the Integrated Plan and the OP (IEOP).

Objectives and targets

The objectives of the Integrated Plan are generally consistent with the objectives of the OP programme, although the Integrated Plan is interrelated with the Regional OP to a greater extent. The Integrated Plan was in fact developed because the consistency of projects with the Integrated Plan was a condition of the Regional OP for Małopolska. The project aims at the improvement of the transport system in Krakow by enhancing the system of traffic management. These activities contribute to the goals of creating a transport network which better fulfils the needs of country and region (in this case, the city of Kraków), as set out in the Integrated Plan. The project application and the feasibility study refer to the Integrated Plan (among other strategic documents). At the same time the project is consistent with priority axis 8.3 of the IEOP (Development of Intelligent Transport Systems).

Measures/projects

The Integrated Plan for Krakow has not specifically been used while drawing up the OP analysis because the OP relates to the whole country while the Integrated Plan relates only to the City of Krakow.

In parts, the Integrated Plan and the OP consider the same kind of measures because both documents deal with the development of transport. In case of the IEOP, more measures are taken into account because this OP also deals with non-transport projects such as wastewater treatment plants or waste management infrastructure. The Integrated Plan focuses on Krakow while the OP focuses on the whole country, which also implies some differences in scale. For instance, the transport measures proposed in the IEOP also cover
motorways and inter-regional railways while the transport measures covered by the Integrated Plan relate to urban transport only.

The IEOP is aligned with other economic and social plans and strategies mostly and explicitly at national level. The priorities and targets of various regions are also taken into account while drafting the OPs but usually no direct relation can be found. According to the city administration specific consultations were not required while drafting the IEOP. Urban plans such as the Integrated Plan combine nationwide objectives and strategies including those covered by OPs, with the specific needs of the regions and cities. Thus the IEOP is aligned with urban plans and vice versa. However, establishing whether an individual urban plan has had an impact on the IEOP is difficult; generally it is more likely for there to be references to OPs in urban plans (the Integrated Plan for Krakow contains such a reference). The manager of the project financed by the IEOP says that his institution (ZIKIT) pays particular attention to Integrated Plan and transport policy of Krakow. The manager of the other project financed by the Regional OP says that the most important document in this case was the Integrated Plan and alignment with priority axes of the Regional OP.

**Impacts**

The IEOP is widely known in Poland, many large investments are co-financed from this programme and information about it frequently appears in the Polish media. The Integrated Plan is one of the plans specific to the City of Krakow and related specifically to urban transport. Because of direct reference to the IEOP it can be said that the Integrated Plan and IEOP reinforce each other; their objectives are compatible. The Integrated Plan is not monitored; only general indicators relating to transport are monitored periodically. Each of the OP projects has to be monitored and the results have to be checked against the objectives.

**Funding**

Most projects which receive support from EU funds are included in the Integrated Plan and any changes, e.g. adding or removing new projects, influence the Integrated Plan which is periodically revised to accommodate such changes. An exception is the development of the system of urban traffic management in Krakow which is not included in the Integrated Plan, and its monitoring has no impact on the Plan.

The projects within the Integrated Plan are funded only by the City budget and by EU funds, mostly the ERDF.

Funding from the EU is needed as, without such funding, implementing these projects would take much longer. In some cases it is likely that only parts of projects would be implemented.

- Development of a urban traffic management system in Krakow (from IEOP) – this project started in 2010 and is more or less hal implemented; Budget: 47 million PLN (approx. €11.4 million) including 32.6 million PLN (approx. €7.9 million) contribution from EU funds (ERDF);
- Construction of the tram node Dietla-Starowiślna Street together with the tram line Sebastiana-Blich Street and Post Office node (from the Regional OP). This project was completed in 2009; Budget: 34.7 million PLN (approx. €8.4 million) including 19.89 million PLN (approx. €4.8 million) from EU funds.
Management

The managers of the IEOP are not involved in the preparation and implementation of the Integrated Plan or vice versa. Managers of the Plan are cooperating with the managers of the OP transport projects. For example, it might happen that the managers of the OP projects propose a new project, and this project will then be included in a revised Integrated Plan of Development of Public Transport for Krakow.
CASE STUDY LIVERPOOL

CITY PROFILE

Country / region/ objective

United Kingdom

NUTS 3 - Liverpool (code UKD 52)

RCE/ Phasing In (ERDF)

Geographical factors

Liverpool is a city and port located on the River Mersey. Liverpool forms part of the Merseyside sub-region, which is also described as the Liverpool City Region. The core Liverpool City Region is defined as the City of Liverpool and local authority districts of Knowsley, Sefton, St Helens, Wirral and Halton. The City Region has close economic, social, cultural and transport links with Warrington, Manchester City Region, Central Lancashire City Region and parts of North Wales. The Liverpool City Region is a strategic sea and air gateway to the European Union.
(Source: The North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy to 2021, produced 2009)

Economic and social factors

The core Liverpool City Region contributes some 17% of the North West’s total GVA. Liverpool is the core city and major economic driver for its City Region.
(Source: The North West of England Plan Regional Spatial Strategy)

Liverpool City Centre is the main focus for economic activity and job creation. However, the City Region has multiple problems of deprivation, in particular relating to long term unemployment and poor health.

The latest edition of the City of Liverpool Key Statistics Bulletin (January 2012) does not refer to GDP per capita. However it states that Liverpool’s GVA per capita was £19,821 (approx. €25 000)3 in 2009, with a total GVA of £8 767 million (approx. €11 000 million). It also notes that the employment rates (2010-11) were 59% and 65% in Liverpool and the City Region respectively, compared with 70% in Great Britain as a whole.

Demographic factors

According to the City of Liverpool Key Statistics Bulletin, the populations of Liverpool and the City Region were 445 200 and 1 472 700 respectively in 2010.

In 2010, Liverpool City had a higher proportion of people aged 16-24 (18%) than England as a whole (12%), and a lower proportion of people aged 60 and over (17%) than England as a whole (20%).
(Source: UK Office for National Statistics Neighbourhood Statistics.

---

3 Converted by the rate of £1 = €1.257 as of September 2012.
Challenges faced by the City/City Region

In 2010, Liverpool was the most deprived local authority area in England.

The inner areas of Liverpool, particularly in the north are the key priority for renewal and investment.

The City Region strategy takes the view that connectivity of existing transport networks must therefore be improved, to meet the demands of the business community and other key sectors. This includes access to jobs, support to address worklessness and skills, and supporting the health agenda and a low carbon economy.

Sources: The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2010: A Liverpool Analysis The 3rd LTP for Merseyside; Merseyside Local Sustainable Transport Fund Major Bid Expression of Interest, produced 2011.

URBAN POLICIES

Urban mobility policy

Around 4 million trips start or end in Merseyside every day. Over $\frac{2}{3}$ are under 5 km. Walking plays a critical role in linking trips by car, bus and train. 24% of all journeys involve walking as the main mode. However, over $\frac{1}{3}$ of trips under 10 km are made by car, which is more than walking and cycling combined. Liverpool City Centre provides a focus for travel to/from work.

Source: The 3rd LTP for Merseyside.

The statutory organisation leading transport policy development on Merseyside is Merseytravel. This Integrated Transport Authority is responsible for co-ordinating public transport in the sub-region, working in collaboration with operators. It also promotes walking and cycling.

There are relatively well developed bus and train networks in the Liverpool City Region. There are a number of major bus operators and a diverse range of community transport operators. Merseytravel provides six staffed bus stations, unstaffed bus stations, over 6 000 stops and shelters and interchanges across the City Region. Park and Ride services operate from many rail stations in the City Region. There is also a night bus network operating mainly on Saturday nights between Liverpool City Centre and Widnes, Runcorn and the Wirral. A ferry service runs across the River Mersey between Liverpool City and Wallasey on the Wirral peninsula. The following map shows the rail network in the City Region as well as connections to other parts of Great Britain and Ireland. The main operator in the City Region is Merseyrail.

Sustainable mobility policy for Liverpool and the wider City Region is covered in the Merseyside LTP. The LTP is comprehensive and highly detailed, with three main sections – strategy overview, delivering goals, and implementation plans. It sets out actions required to deliver goals and indicators that are being used to measure performance. The LTP has various goals, summarised below:

- Ensure the transport network supports the sustainable economic growth of the City Region by the efficient movement of people and goods;
- Provide and promote a clean, low emission transport system resilient to changes to climate and oil availability;
- Ensure the transport system promotes and enables improved health and road safety;
- Ensure equality of travel opportunity for all, allowing people to connect easily with employment, education, healthcare, and other essential services, and leisure opportunities;
- Maintain assets to a high standard.

Urban railway network

Merseyrail operates 3 main lines, Northern, City and Wirral.

There is also a City Centre Movement Strategy (CCMS), for which Liverpool City Council is responsible. This is a £73 million (= €91.7 million) programme to improve the roads and public spaces in Liverpool City Centre. It is linked to the LTP and supported by Merseytravel.

Other related policies/activities in the European arena

Through its corporate planning process, Liverpool City Council’s priorities include:
- Investment and job creation;
- Empowering local people;
- Making the city more sustainable, connected and attractive.

Liverpool’s Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) has similar aims. It is made up of key stakeholders such as major businesses, government organisations, public sector...
agencies, and representatives from voluntary and community groups. The LSP has prepared a Sustainable Community Strategy. Priorities relate to economic growth, connectivity, safer and stronger communities, health, housing, and children and young people.

Merseytravel is a member of the UK/Ireland CIVITAS network, known as CIVINET. Liverpool City Council has signed the Covenant of Mayors. Merseytravel has had extensive involvement in EC supported projects, receiving funding for demonstration projects and networking activities. These include projects funded by Intelligent Energy Europe, Sixth Environment Action Programme and DG Employment, such as BIONIC and CATCH.

SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Official name/associated documents

A New Mobility Culture for Merseyside: The Third Merseyside Local Transport Plan (2011)

Source: http://www.letstravelwise.org/content206_Local-Transport-Plan-3.html

Responsible body

Merseytravel, the local transport authority.

Other key stakeholders involved

The LTP was developed and is being delivered in close collaboration with Liverpool City Council and the Metropolitan Borough Councils of Knowsley, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral. Together with Merseytravel they form the Merseyside Transport Partnership (MTP). As noted above Halton is also part of the Liverpool City Region. Its Borough Council has its own LTP, but there has been close collaboration so that the two LTPs provide a unified approach to the City Region’s transport needs.

Aims and objectives

The LTP goals are summarised above in the urban mobility section.

The ELTISplus Guidelines highlight the LTPs in the UK as good examples of SUMP s, also because they are obligatory by national law. The Merseyside LTP meets the SUMP criteria summarised in chapter 2, i.e.:

- Participatory and integrative approach.
  There was a two stage consultation process regarding preparation of the LTP. See also key stakeholders section above. The LTP involves a range of other stakeholders including health, police and fire and rescue services, universities, public transport and freight operators, business sector, charities, community related groups and representatives of different faiths. The LTP’s vision, goals and measures are aligned with other relevant local policies such as health, economic regeneration, social inclusion, energy use and land use;
- Overall sustainable mobility principles.
  The goals are summarised in the urban mobility section and priority measures

---

Integrated urban transport plans and cohesion policy

summarised below;

- **Short term objectives and strategic vision.**
  The LTP vision for 2024 is contained in its first section on strategy. Short term objectives (towards 2015) are presented in this section, with more detailed consideration in section 2 on delivering goals;
- **Review of transport costs and benefits.**
  Section 1 on strategy addresses anticipated benefits of planned transport interventions. The cost of LTP implementation is considered in section 3 on implementation plans. The LTP is supported by a detailed evidence base in the form of a number of detailed technical annexes e.g. a report on forecasting and modelling to assess the transport policy measures for the LTP.

**Budget**

The main source of funding is from the UK government via the Department for Transport (DfT). Although the LTP runs from 2011-24, budgets are set over shorter periods. Government funding is confirmed for 2011-12 and 2012-13 financial years, but indicative for 2013-14 and 2014-15. (Financial years run from April to March.) The total government funding over 2011-12 to 2014-15 (two years confirmed + two years indicative funding) is £107 million (= €134.5 million).

The DfT also set up a national Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF), to which transport and local authorities may apply in a competitive process. The aim of the LSTF is to help build strong local economies and address the urgent challenges of climate change. The MTP was successful in winning a bid of £4.8 million (= €6.03 million) for facilitating sustainable access to employment in Merseyside, and another bid is currently being considered. The confirmed funding of £4.8 million (= €6.03 million) and any further funds won will both contribute to LTP implementation.

**Main measures**

An extensive range of detailed measures has been specified to deliver LTP goals. Priorities for the period 2011-15 are:

- Maintenance programmes, ensuring that the transport network allows efficient, safe and sustainable movement of people and goods;
- Expanding the range of public transport services including examining the role of other providers and introducing Statutory Quality Partnerships (SQP) on key bus corridors;
- Beginning to implement the next generation of technology, to improve information systems for all users and integrate a wide range of transport uses. This includes introducing smart cards;
- Working with the Freight Quality Partnership (FQP) and other parties to develop and enhance the freight and logistics network;
- Implementing the Active Travel Strategy, to improve and expand cycling and walking facilities;
- Implementing the Low Emissions Strategy, to reduce carbon emissions, and improve air quality and health and provide a stimulus to the creation of new jobs in support of the low carbon economy;
- Increasing promotional activities regarding sustainable travel and behaviour change;
- Confirming the role of the Road Safety Partnership and introducing measures to control excessive speed on the highway network.
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Status of implementation

The third LTP has been published and is currently in the first year of an implementation period covering 2011-24. Each year of implementation runs from April to March.

Monitoring and evaluation

This will be achieved through maintenance of a set of performance indicators. These are specified in the first section of the LTP on strategy. There is a system of designed ‘indicator owners’, each with responsibility for monitoring specific indicators. Progress will be reported on an annual basis.

As the third LTP is still in the first year of implementation, no evaluation results are available yet. The first annual results are due in June 2012. The previous (second) Merseyside LTP ran from 2006-11, for which annual progress reports have been published. The most recent report covered 2010-11. This indicated that most LTP core targets were met or exceeded. Highlights included:

- The cycling target being significantly exceeded. There was an increase of 25% in cycling since 2006;
- The WorkWise project helped people overcome transport barriers to accessing employment opportunities, exceeding its target of assisting 6 000 Merseyside residents;
- Merseyrail continued to be amongst the best performing rail operators in the country in terms of punctuality, reliability and passenger satisfaction. Passenger numbers continued to grow, with 39.9m in 2010/11 compared to 35.9m in 2009/10.

RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)

Official name/associated documents

Operational Programme 'North West England' (2007UK162PO008)


See also website of the Managing Authority (MA): http://www.erdfnw.co.uk/.

Managing authority

Department for Communities and Local Government

Context

The North West of England is RCE, except for Merseyside which is Phasing In.

The general objectives of the UK National Strategic Reference Framework are to support the UK Government’s aim to increase the rate of sustainable growth and achieve a better quality of life, with economic and employment opportunities for all. Priority axis 3 of the OP (see below) will include support for Merseyside such as exploiting the economic potential of major gateways.
The OP document indicates that, with regard to transport investments in Merseyside, the focus will be on LTP priorities. This emphasises the role of transport in supporting economic development. Within the context of the OP, this means prioritising facilitating access to the labour market by concentrating on public transport, cycling and walking and, exceptionally, highways investments. It also means controlling congestion so that economic growth is not impeded. The OP document notes that LTPs and transport authorities are a source of co-funding for OP projects.

The MA’s ERDF North West website contains a list of funding beneficiaries as of September 2011 ([http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/xls/2026372](http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/xls/2026372)). There are at least 33 projects involving Liverpool City, mostly concerned with transport, public realm improvements, cultural and tourism development, linking research and enterprise, business development and innovation. The main funding beneficiaries are Liverpool City Council, Merseytravel (local transport authority), and both Liverpool based universities. Nearly half of these projects (14) focus on urban transport.

**Overall aims and objectives**

The overall vision is to create a dynamic and sustainable economy which competes on the basis of knowledge, advanced technology and excellent quality of life. The Programme seeks to stimulate high productivity and improve enterprise levels. The emphasis is on developing a low carbon economy which is driven by innovation, excellent leadership and high skill levels. The objective is to achieve high employment rates while eliminating concentrations of low employment that currently exist within the region.

The North West England OP is supported mainly by the ERDF, although the ESF is also used. In the table below all funding allocations are in Euros. Support for the Merseyside features strongly due to its phasing-in status.

**Priority axes:**

1. Stimulating enterprise and supporting growth in target sectors and markets;
2. Exploiting innovation and knowledge to improve performance of the region’s businesses and institutions;
3. Creating conditions for sustainable growth;
4. Improving employment opportunities for those areas and social groups which require help to participate in the labour market;
5. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €756 million.

**Source:** EC Regional Policy weblink.

**Transport-related aims and objectives**

It is worth noting that, in addition to the priority axes, the OP has two cross cutting themes, ‘environmental sustainability’, and ‘equality and diversity’. Mitigating climate change is identified as a key factor in achieving environmental sustainability, for example by promoting sustainable transport and discouraging the growth of private car use (see also references to targets under monitoring and evaluation below). Regarding equality and diversity, the OP document states that transport improvements will need to be accessible and useable by all, including people with disabilities. In Merseyside, transport objectives mainly have an urban focus on:

- Provision of improved access to economic gateways to support the development of
employment sites in close proximity to the sub-region’s Ports, Liverpool Airport, and Liverpool City Centre;

- Tackling the productivity gap across the entire sub-region by various means including sustainable transport accessibility;
- Enhancing the sub-region’s appeal to visitors by various means including sustainable accessibility.

**Transport Projects and associated funding**

The MA’s published list of projects (September 2011) shows that 14 projects are transport-related and involve Liverpool City either specifically or as part of projects with wider scope. These projects have a focus on urban transport and belong to priority axis 3. The total funding for these projects is £21.6 million (= €27.15 million).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Total costs (£ million/ € million)</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Corridor Gateway</td>
<td>1.4/ 1.8</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre Underground Station Improvements</td>
<td>0.42/ 0.52</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Transport Plans</td>
<td>0.37/ 0.46</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Lane Strategic Gateway</td>
<td>1.5/ 1.9</td>
<td>Liverpool City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Corridor B Gateway</td>
<td>0.91/ 1.15</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Corridor D Gateway</td>
<td>1.4/ 1.8</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Corridor F Gateway</td>
<td>1.7/ 2.2</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Street Underground Station</td>
<td>0.68/ 0.86</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Quarter Public Realm Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>2.5/ 3.2</td>
<td>Liverpool City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Central Station Phase 2</td>
<td>2.7/ 3.4</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool Cycle Strategy</td>
<td>0.59/ 0.75</td>
<td>Liverpool City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier Head New Landing Stage</td>
<td>4.0/ 5.0</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Passenger Information</td>
<td>0.26/ 0.33</td>
<td>Merseytravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URC LV Lime Street Gateway</td>
<td>3.1/ 3.8</td>
<td>Liverpool City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priorities/ measures and associated funding**

Priority axis 3, quoted above, is the most relevant to transport, followed by priority axis 4. The emphasis is on supporting urban transport. The main transport measures for Merseyside are related to urban transport, summarised below:

- Access to regional gateways by sustainable transport modes, and more sustainable movement of goods and services, particularly rail freight;
- Investments in public transport links, to provide improved services to international visitors and workers accessing employment locations. These include rail links to the major gateways, bus corridors and priority measures, multimodal transport schemes and intelligent transport systems to manage infrastructure, provide high quality, up to date information to travellers and facilitate integration between transport modes;
- Improvements to public realm in parts of Liverpool including cycling and walking.
facilities (there are various OP projects, including one of the project examples featured later in this template);

- Personalised travel plans, tailored to individuals;
- Promotional activities to encourage use of sustainable transport modes;
- Production of green transport plans for key tourism and leisure destinations (one of the OP project examples described later).

There is a slightly different allocation of resources for Merseyside compared to the rest of the North West region, with relatively more for priority axes 3 and 4. This reflects a greater need to tackle worklessness and employability issues. For Merseyside overall ERDF allocations by priority axes are:

- Priority axis 1 - 20%, €61.6 million;
- Priority axis 2 - 20%, €61.6 million;
- Priority axis 3 - 30.5%, €93.9 million;
- Priority axis 4 - 25.5%, €78.5 million;
- Priority axis 5: 4%, €12.3 million.

Total allocation for Merseyside is approximately €308 million.

**Use of technical assistance budget**

Technical assistance is covered by priority axis 5. The overall ERDF allocation for priority axis 5 Merseyside is shown above. The OP document states that technical assistance:

- Supports day-to-day management and administration of the management of the programme, including monitoring, evaluation and communications;
- Supports trans-national and inter-regional co-operation in sharing best practice and partnership development;
- Supports specific sectors where necessary (for the voluntary and community sector to access the ERDF in the region);
- Provides advice on project design, implementation and monitoring, awareness raising and knowledge sharing, in order to embed cross cutting themes within OP projects.

Key outputs will include a Technical Assistance Strategy. The MA’s published list of projects as of September 2011 includes a project for technical assistance for the Merseyside Partnership over 2007-13, with funding of £592 000 (= €744 167). Technical assistance supports Merseyside transport-related OP projects indirectly with provision of guidance, i.e. via:

- Funding the MA;
- Funding colleagues in Merseyside who act as the first point of contact on the EEDF, who will have had contact with transport-related OP projects.

**Status of implementation**

The OP is currently in the fifth year of an implementation period running from 2007-13. See below for use of and progress regarding indicators.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

The programme has three global targets by which progress will be measured:

1. To support the creation of 26 300 new jobs by 2015;
2. To boost the region’s gross value added figures by an additional €1 550 by 2015;
3. A 25% reduction in additional CO2 emissions generated by the programme.

There are also indicators against which progress will be measured, relating to support for/creation of businesses and jobs.

The MA’s ERDF North West website publishes an Interim Evaluation Report, dated November 2010 (http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/pdf/1956120.pdf). The report noted that the recession and the policy changes triggered presented a significant challenge to the OP. These changes included removal of the regional tier of governance and greater focus on sub-regional and local decision making, after the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Government came into office in May 2010. (This meant that the MA transferred from the North West Regional Development Agency (NWDA) to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on 1 July 2011). The evaluation’s conclusions included that the OP had the depth and flexibility to adapt to change without having to be significantly modified, strategic objectives continued to be relevant in the face of recession, and a need for stronger emphasis on low carbon economy.

With reference to priority 3, the report highlighted a strong flow of transport infrastructure projects coming forward from Merseyside. The report noted that projects broadly met the expectations of the investment framework to exploit the economic potential of gateways in Merseyside and to help create conditions for sustainable growth. It was also commented that projects reflected the priority Merseyside attached to improvements of Liverpool City Centre transport and visitor infrastructure.

The ERDF North West website also publishes a document of Key Achievements 2008-10 (http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/regeneration/pdf/1956100.pdf). It indicates ERDF investments created 5,790 businesses and 39,082 jobs and safeguarded 22,684 jobs over this period.

Project contracts give basic guidance on evaluation requirements. OP projects provide progress reports to the MA during their lifespans. The MA is interested in impacts of Merseyside transport-related OP projects and how they fit into the wider OP strategy. This includes specific, straightforward outcomes (e.g. number of new bus stations built) and wider impacts (e.g. reduction in CO2 emissions). Most projects will end this year, and beneficiaries such as Merseytravel have undertaken monitoring continuously, e.g. cyclist counts within cycling projects. The MA will ask beneficiaries for reports on impacts once all projects have completed.

**Additional support for the city: JESSICA**

JESSICA has provided a £100 million (= €125.7 million) Northwest Urban Investment Fund effective from April 2010. The Fund comprises two Urban Development Funds, one for Merseyside, Chrysalis, and one for the rest of the region, Evergreen. Both will focus on commercial development projects. The Northwest Urban Investment Fund is one of the earlier JESSICA schemes. It is a groundbreaking initiative and there has been a steep but good learning curve.

Chrysalis has now been launched. The first project investments are forecast for spring 2012, with significant opportunity for investment against a strong pipeline of projects.
Expressions of interest are now being invited for projects in relation to sub-priorities of priority axes 3 and 4. These cover developing regionally strategic, high quality sites and premises, and supporting employment creation in areas of regeneration. The aim is to provide loans to stalled developments that are commercially viable but cannot get ordinary bank finance because of the current economic situation. Thus the projects would not go ahead without support from JESSICA. There is a requirement to match JESSICA funds. Therefore project applicants will provide match funding from private and public sector sources.

The MA has provided useful input from the outset. EIB assistance has also been useful. The EIB set up a Regional Board with the NWDA before its function was transferred to the DCLG. Chrysalis is run by a consortium of three private companies, concerned with regeneration, property and finance. There is a unique partnership approach and good governance structure. This brings together private and public sectors, via a Merseyside Steering Group, involving the Consortium, the Local Economic Partnership between local authorities and businesses with a role in promoting local economic development, two local authorities including Liverpool City Council and the EIB. There is also a Board of Directors and Advisory Committee, both with representatives from the consortium and public sector.

JESSICA-supported projects will be in line with local and regional urban plans. Arrangements are in place for monitoring and reporting on approved projects. The impacts on sustainable urban mobility are more likely to be considered in relation to larger projects where JESSICA is supporting part of a wider scheme also including transport measures.

Other Operational Programmes

Merseyside is also involved in the following OPs. Both relate to the European territorial co-operation objective and are co-funded by the ERDF:

- Atlantic Area. This focuses on coastal areas. Priorities include improving accessibility and internal links, and promoting transnational synergies in sustainable urban and regional development. Merseytravel is a partner in the CLIMATLANTIC project and is also to participate in a new project, SITE, funded by this programme;
- North West Europe. Priorities include improving connectivity promoting intelligent and sustainable transport and ICT solutions. Merseytravel was previously involved in the PARTNER project. Merseytravel is also to participate in a new project, ECOLOGISTICS, funded by this programme.

Examples of Transport Projects Financed by the OP

Project 1: Knowledge Quarter public realm Mount Pleasant


Responsible body

Liverpool City Council
**Other key stakeholders involved and their roles**

Liverpool Vision - the city’s economic development company.

University of Liverpool - the University is located in the project area and the project is aligned with the University’s strategy for development of its site.

Merseytravel - covered transport perspective, i.e. transport infrastructure including highway linkages and bus routing, and links with bus operators.

**Objectives**

The project was part of the CCMS. This strategy is also supported by Merseytravel, who have introduced new bus lanes, improved bus stops and passenger information systems in Liverpool City Centre. The project delivered public realm improvements and reductions in the amount of traffic in the Knowledge Quarter of the city centre. The changes aimed to improve the quality of the built environment, road safety, pedestrian and cycling links, and connectivity with other parts of the city centre.

**Budget**

- OP: £2.53 million (= €3.19 million)
- Other funding sources and associated budgets: £6 million (= €7.54 million) scheme in total, with
  - £2.6 million (= €3.27 million) from the NWDA single programme;
  - £700 000 (= €879 930) from University of Liverpool and private sector;
  - £200 000 (= €251 400) from the LTP via Merseytravel.

**Main elements**

Public realm improvements around the University of Liverpool, along Mount Pleasant, Upper Mount Pleasant, Rodney Street, Clarence Street, Oxford Street and by the Metropolitan Cathedral. These included:

- New pavement and road surfaces;
- Removal of unnecessary clutter on footpaths;
- Improved, co-ordinated signage;
- Improved CCTV, lighting and street furniture;
- New cycle parking facilities;
- Tree planting;
- Extending public space in front of the Metropolitan Cathedral.

Reductions in the amount of traffic a) around some of the city’s architectural gems, from the Metropolitan Cathedral and across to the historic Hope Street and b) using Upper Mount Pleasant, limited to buses, taxis and access to car parks. Measures included:

- Reconfiguring the complicated traffic junction between Mount Pleasant and Hope Street, with associated removal of pedestrian barriers and allocation of priority to pedestrians;
- Upgrading the traffic junction between Mont Pleasant and Clarence Street with pedestrian priority;
- Introduction of bus priority on Mount Pleasant via a bus gate.
**Status of implementation**

The project ran from March 2010 – October 2011.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

Original objectives where largely met. Actual public and private investment in the project was as originally predicted. The project delivered 23,200 m² public realm improvements along the main vehicular and pedestrian routes linking the Knowledge Quarter and other parts of the city centre. High quality spaces and routes were created into some of Liverpool's high profile visitor areas including the Metropolitan Cathedral.

**Project 2: Green travel plans**


**Responsible body**

Merseytravel

**Other key stakeholders involved**

- Leisure and tourism destinations that implemented travel plan measures following receipt of advice from Merseytravel. A mixture of urban and rural sites was involved, including Tate Liverpool, the Floral Pavilion and Liverpool Cathedral. There was an urban focus, on sites located in Liverpool City Centre;
- Liverpool City Council and the Metropolitan Borough Councils of Knowsley, Sefton, St Helens and Wirral, especially transport, tourism and leisure professionals;
- Hotels in Merseyside co-operated in providing travel information to visitors;
- The Merseyside Partnership, a strategic partnership of regeneration and tourism organisations, which has since become the Local Economic Partnership.

**Objectives**

To capitalise on the growth in tourism resulting from Liverpool's success as 2008's European Capital of Culture by encouraging at least 50 tourism and leisure providers to develop travel plans to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes. The aim was to:
- Ensure the benefits of increased tourist trade were not offset by the negative effects of traffic congestion and increased air pollution;
- Support national objectives to improve access to leisure and exercise opportunities;
- Increase participation in culture and sport;
- Enhance sites' existing marketing activity;
- Potentially increase visitor numbers.

**Budget**

- OP: £368 000 (approx. €462 600)
- Other funding sources and associated budgets: LTP and Sefton and Wirral local authorities.
Main elements

All Merseyside tourist and leisure sites, regardless of their size and location, were eligible for 12 hours free advice and ongoing support from the MTP, to help visitors consider more sustainable travel options. There were 15 organisations which were particularly engaged. On behalf of the MTP, Merseytravel appointed a dedicated Visitor Economy Officer to work with attractions to:

- Produce travel plans;
- Address car park capacity being exceeded;
- Help attractions communicate how best to reach their sites via public transport, walking or cycling, e.g. via ‘how to get to’ guides, online journey planner that could be used on attractions’ websites, cycling maps, organised bike rides to attractions and provision of information to hotels.

Status of implementation

The project ran from March 2010 – December 2011.

Monitoring and evaluation

Proposed outputs were achieved. Use of the journey planner was monitored, as was the number of tourism/leisure providers joining an Employer’s Network which is being funded by the LSTF. The project has a legacy through continuing engagement with sites through this network. The online journey planner won the Association of Commuter Transport (ACT) TravelWise’s Innovation of the Year award in 2011. (ACT TravelWise is the UK’s main network for organisations working to promote sustainable travel.) There has been interest from other areas of the UK in using the journey planner tool.

LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECTS AND SUMP/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Beyond the OP and the third LTP for Merseyside. The CCMS is also relevant to sustainable urban mobility planning. In this section, reference is also made to proposed JESSICA-supported projects in Merseyside, given there is significant opportunity for investment via the Chrysalis Urban Development Fund.

Objectives and targets

The LTP/CCMS and the OP/project examples have comparable objectives. As already noted, the OP document indicates that, with regard to transport investments in Merseyside, the focus will be on LTP priorities. Transport-related OP projects support the LTP and the staff check that the LTP’s objectives are aligned to regional, national and European policies. The LTP/CCMS and OP/project examples are all driven by the aim of ensuring transport supports sustainable economic development in the Liverpool City Region.

The Knowledge Quarter public realm Mount Pleasant project was formally part of the CCMS, so the project’s objectives and targets are in line with the CCMS. The project was not formally part of the LTP but was aligned with it. This would have been specifically checked at the start of the project, given the LTP provided co-funding for the project. The green travel plans project was formally part of the LTP, so it was specifically ensured the project’s objectives and targets were in line with the LTP. The two projects complemented each other, since the improvements in the Knowledge Quarter contributed to travel planning activities of organisations in that area.
The two OP projects contributed to LTP/CCMS objectives and targets, by:

- Improving traffic conditions, public transport links to other parts of the city centre, and walking and cycling facilities, in the case of the Knowledge Quarter public realm Mount Pleasant project;
- Enabling targeted engagement and ongoing links with the tourism/leisure sector (with which there had previously been limited engagement), increasing travel choice and promoting sustainable travel in the case of the green travel plans project.

The Policy Officer at Liverpool City Council was aware of the LTP, and there has been contact with LTP staff. However, the 1st phase of JESSICA-supported projects will not have a strong, direct relationship with sustainable urban mobility planning. These projects will not formally be part of the LTP or its budget. However, as initial projects will relate to commercial development, they will have transport infrastructure requirements. Mobility will be considered as part of the planning process for new developments. These must be sustainable which will include production of associated travel plans. Sustainable urban mobility may feature more heavily in future rounds of projects.

**Measures/projects**

The LTP was taken into account when drawing up the OP document. The OP’s transport measures focus on LTP priorities. The OP document indicates that it will support the LTP through targeted transport investments relating to major Merseyside gateways, and transport schemes which link deprived communities with local employment opportunities. Therefore the LTP and OP consider the same kind of measures/projects.

The OP document refers to both the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) and Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for North West England as policy drivers, although these have become less relevant with the removal of the regional tier of governance. Certainly in relation to Merseyside, these strategies did not appear to be more important than the Merseyside LTP with respect to the design and implementation of the OP and its projects. In fact the OP, RES, RSS and LTP reinforce each other as they all aim to support sustainable growth.

**Impacts**

The LTP, OP and OP project examples all monitor progress against outputs/indicators. Within Merseytravel largely the same staff is involved in LTP and OP project implementation. There is an implementation strategy for the third LTP, through which OP project staff are made aware of LTP monitoring requirements.

Impacts of the second LTP (2006-11) are known and first annual impacts of the current third LTP will be published in June 2012. The comparison of documents, data and interviews suggest that the impacts of the second LTP, the OP and two OP project examples reinforce each other.

The local transport authority considered that OP projects in general had a very positive impact on the LTP. It would not have been possible to achieve measures within the LTP timeframe without ERDF co-funding. The impacts of transport-related OP projects went beyond the transport sector, contributing to social initiatives such as access to work and improving health. The OP interim evaluation report also referred to the indirect (rather than immediate) contribution) of priority axis 3 transport-related Merseyside OP projects to key
targets for that priority regarding job and business creation. The MA also considered that the LTP and OP activity supported each other; they helped to drive OP development in a bottom-up way and therefore contribute to the Phasing In objective for Merseyside; the OP projects massively contributed to the LTP because they would not have been possible without ERDF co-financing. The interviewees also referred to the link between transport-related Merseyside OP projects and other OP priorities such as tourism and development of strategic sites.

**Funding**

Transport-related OP projects on Merseyside receive co-funding from various sources including UK government Department for Transport (DfT), Merseytravel/LTP, local authorities and private sector. All interviewees stressed that these projects could only go ahead with OP co-financing, enabling either new activities to proceed or the scope of existing activities to be expanded. The MA interviewees noted that this was a specific eligibility requirement for receipt of ERDF support - if projects could be fully funded from other sources they would be ineligible.

The local transport authority interviewee at Merseytravel noted that LTP staff were used to working with a mixture of sources to fund the LTP. OP funding (mainly ERDF) was used to co-finance LTP projects, by expanding their scope or bringing implementation forward. The LTP’s internal capital programme identifies an ‘other sources’ line, which includes the ERDF (JESSICA-supported projects will not be included in the LTP budget.) Other sources of funding for the LTP include the DfT, bus operators and primary care (health) trust. Therefore OP and LTP projects have similar co-funding sources.

**Management**

The MA was not involved in the design and implementation of the LTP. However, transport-related Merseyside OP projects were proposed in a bottom-up way by Merseytravel and local authorities, which were also involved with the LTP. In this way LTP managers had informed the design and implementation of the OP. The ERDF Programme Delivery Northwest has a Merseyside Subcommittee which meets regularly and oversees the ring-fenced ERDF allocation to Merseyside as a Phasing In sub-region. A representative of Merseytravel sits on the subcommittee to help ensure transport-related Merseyside OP projects fit with the LTP. The MA checks that all OP projects are in line with OP criteria. The contract monitoring manager had regular contact with OP project staff to ensure the projects delivered as planned. Co-operation between LTP and MA managers was seen as fine, and there was a good relationship with Merseytravel. Any problems that had occurred had been resolved quickly.

The funding beneficiary was happy with the level of co-operation between OP project staff and the MA, and had good working relationships. However, concerns were raised about clarity and consistency of advice given by the MA and the nature of ERDF reporting requirements:

- For the green travel plans project, it took a long time to agree the scope and key definitions e.g. which tourism sites could be supported and how a visitor should be defined. This led to a delay in the project starting;
- The changeover of the MA from the NWDA to the DCLG seemed to have affected the
advice provided by the MA, with a ‘moving of goalposts’ which was disruptive. For example, originally the green travel plans project was advised there was no need to operate a carbon calculator, but this was subsequently queried by an auditor. Also, administrative forms had been changed e.g. relating to financial claims, but this had not been notified to OP project staff;

- Increasing bureaucracy in administrative, reporting and audit requirements for OP projects. It was recognised that accountability in spending public funding was needed, current requirements were driven by the EC, and individual officers at the NWDA and DCLG had tried their best to be flexible while undergoing a process of restructuring. Some staff had transferred from the NWDA to the DCLG, but a number of staff had been lost so continuity was undermined. The green travel plans project manager had used some aspects of ERDF reporting mechanisms as a model for reporting on other projects. However she spent as much time reporting to the MA as on delivery; even though all project outputs were achieved, more effort could have been spent on delivery if reporting requirements had been less bureaucratic.

Largely the same Merseytravel staff was involved with the LTP and transport-related OP projects, OP project managers had contributed to the design and implementation of the LTP. Merseytravel LTP staff included personnel working at the strategic policy level and personnel implementing policy via projects such as those co-funded by the OP. There was constant dialogue between both sets of staff, including monthly meetings. Regular meetings were also held between LTP policy staff and other beneficiaries of ERDF supported transport projects, including Liverpool City Council. The main issues discussed were progress updates, outputs, ensuring spend was on target and sharing of ideas, experiences, problems and solutions. Annual reports on OP projects were provided to LTP staff covering how objectives had been met, progress in delivery and data on indicators. Generally it was stated that there was a good level of co-operation between LTP and relevant OP project managers.
CASE STUDY RENNES

CITY PROFILE

Country/region/objective

France (Bretagne)
NUTS 3 - Ille-et-Vilaine (code FR 523)
RCE (ERDF)

Geographical factors

- Rennes is built on a hill, with the north side being more elevated than the south side;
- Located at the intersection of the Ille and the Vilaine rivers;
- Area of region: 6775 km².

Economic factors

GDP per capita: €27 951.60 (2005).

The GDP has increased annually since 1999, even in the last couple of years despite the global economic recession.

Demographic factors

- Population Metropolitan Area: 987 470 (2010),
- Population City: 206 600 (2009)
- Rennes has a large student population (around 60 000);
- Population density of metropolitan and urban areas is similar to that of other small French cities (Bordeaux, Nancy);
- Population of the region has grown by about 10 000 per year.

Challenges faced by the city/city region

- Majority of population in the metropolitan area comes to the city centre by car for work (see figure);
- Due to insufficient connections between the neighbourhoods and districts in the metropolitan area, the car remains the main mode of transportation.
Commuting in Ille-et-Vilaine


**Urban Policies**

**Urban mobility policy**

- The car is the main mode of transport (41% in Rennes and 55% in Rennes area);
- Walking is the second most frequently used mode (37% in Rennes and 28% in Rennes area);
- Public transport network has 41 urban and suburban metro and bus lines;
- In 2006, “KorriGo” smart cards were introduced to improve network;
- Metro: 1 line, 15 stations;
- Bus: STAR de nuit, night bus line 4 and metro operates during the night from Thursday to Sunday.
Metro Line A in Rennes

![Metro Line A in Rennes](image)


Gares metro stations connect with SNCF trains, which provide connections to other cities. The urban mobility policy (Plan de Déplacement Urbains, PDU) has the following main aims:

- Reinforce the economic and social attraction of agglomeration;
- Consolidate the quality of life of the city and metropolitan areas;
- Facilitate mobility for everyone;
- Improve the environment.

The PDU is set around six concrete actions.

**Other related policies/ activities in the European arena**

Energy and Climate Plan (Plan climat énergie Rennes Metropole)
Rennes is a CIVITAS Forum Network city.

**SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**Official name/associated documents**

(Urban Mobility Plan [http://www.rennes-metropole.fr/plan-de-deplacements-urbains,68365/](http://www.rennes-metropole.fr/plan-de-deplacements-urbains,68365/)):

- PDU – Diagnostic et enjeux (Diagnosis and issues)
- PDU – Accessibilité financements et suivi (Accessibility funding and monitoring)
- PDU – Le PDU en action (The PDU in action)
Responsible body

Rennes Métropole

Other key stakeholders involved

- STAR: local bus and metro company
- Conseil Générale de Ille-et-Vilaine (General council of Ille-et-Vilaine): responsible for the intra-urban transport company ‘Illenoo’
- TER Bretagne: regional train company
- SNCF: national train company, connecting Rennes to other parts of the country
- Region of Bretagne: funding, assistance
- Surrounding municipalities: assistance with interregional transport connections

Aims and objectives

The aims are:

- To pursue an equitable and united development;
- To preserve the quality of the environment and living standards;
- To confirm mobility as a vector in a dynamic economy.

The ELTISplus Guidelines highlight the PDUs in France as good examples for SUMP, also because they are obligatory by national law. The PDU Rennes fulfils the following criteria summarised in chapter 2:

- Participatory and integrative approach;
  All important policy sectors, authority levels and neighbouring authorities, were involved in setting up the plan. The PDU’s vision, goals and measures are aligned with other relevant local policies such as health, economic regeneration, social inclusion, energy use and land use.

- Overall sustainable mobility principles, e.g.
  - Reduction of air and noise pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption;
  - Contribution to enhancing the attractiveness and quality of the urban environment and urban design;
  - Ensuring the accessibility offered by the transport system is available to all.

- Short term objectives and strategic vision;
  The PDU contains a long term vision as long as many short term measures towards a more sustainable urban transport.

- Review of transport costs and benefits;
  The PDU aims at improving the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the transportation of persons and goods.

One of the main objectives is to preserve the quality of the environment. Several of the initiatives aim to reduce the amount of car traffic.

---

5 See Footnote 4.
**Budget**

The budget is €1.5 billion capital costs, plus €14.8 million in annual costs. It is provided by Rennes Métropole, the surrounding municipalities, the Department (Ille-et-Vilaine), the Region (Bretagne), the State (France), road managers, transport authorities, the French Environment and Energy Management Agency, private financiers and the European Union.

**Status of implementation**

Measures were implemented between 2007 and 2017 (see details in the table above).

**Monitoring and evaluation**

An evaluation study of various French PDUs has been conducted in June 2011 by CERTU (Centre d’étude sur le reseaux, les transport, l’urbanisme et les constructions publiques). Moreover, a specific study for Rennes was carried out in March 2007 by CODESPAR (Conseil de développement économique et social du pays et de l’agglomération de Rennes). Furthermore, an annual evaluation has been taking place since 1999, which is called l’observatoire des déplacements.

Various projects are underway in the framework of the Rennes SUMP. The main points made in the evaluation are that the various authorities need to continue to cooperate and collaborate in order to carry out the projects effectively.

**Main measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Financers</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axis 1: Development urban environment that is favourable to alternative transport modes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal Transport plans revision of the PLU</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality, surrounding municipalities</td>
<td>2007-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axis 2: Affirm multimodality in transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR : evolution of the service (3% annual increase of km)</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality, surrounding municipalities</td>
<td>2006-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of metro</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality, surrounding municipalities, to be defined</td>
<td>2007-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport study in major urban areas</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality</td>
<td>2007-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility study for creating mixed transport modes</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality, Bretagne, Ille-et-Vilaine</td>
<td>2007-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hub connections</td>
<td>Transport authorities, surrounding municipalities, France, Ille-et-Vilaine, Bretagne, SNCF</td>
<td>2007-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual connections between transport modes</td>
<td>Road management, transport authorities</td>
<td>2007-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information systems at main STAR stations</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality</td>
<td>2007-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social pricing of public transport</td>
<td>Rennes Municipality</td>
<td>2007-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Axis 3: Valorising the modes of transport**

| Cycling plan | Rennes Municipality | 2007-2008 |
| Bicycle parking | Transport authorities, Rennes Municipality, surrounding municipalities, | 2007-2017 |
| Expand cycling service from City of Rennes | City of Rennes | 2008-2009 |

**Axis 4: Reduce usage of individual motorised modes of transport**

| Park & Ride | Transport authorities | 2007-2017 |
| Public parking | Ville de Rennes, surrounding municipalities | 2007-2017 |
| Parking on private property | Communes | 2007-2008 |
| Carpooling | Transport authorities, Rennes municipality, Ille-et-Vilaine, ADEME, Europe, private funds | 2007-2017 |
| Carsharing | Rennes Municipality | 2007-2008 |

**Axis 5: Adapting transport infrastructure**

| Dor Breizh (information system and management system for car traffic) | France, Bretagne, Ille-et-Vilaine, Rennes Municipality | 2004-2009 |
| Changing priorities of buses and cars | Road managers, transport authorities, Rennes Municipality, surrounding communities, | 2007-2017 |
| Merchant deliveries | Rennes Municipality | 2007-2017 |

**Axis 6: Informing and “sensibiliser”**

| Transport observatory (observatoire) | Rennes Municipality | 2007-2017 |
| Transport survey | Rennes Municipality, Ille-et-Vilaine, Bretagne, France | 2007-2008 |
| Transport count | Rennes Municipality | 2007-2008 |
| Multimodal information service | Transport authorities | 2007-2017 |
| Corporate transport plans | Companies, Rennes Municipality, other transport authorities | 2007-2017 |

**Axis 7: Accessibility**

| Accessibility of public transportation | Transport authorities | 2007-2017 |
| Adapted transport service | Rennes Municipality | 2007-2017 |
RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)

Official name/associated documents

Operational programme 'Brittany' (Bretagne) (2007FR162PO007)

EC Regional Policy weblink:

Managing authority (MA)

Prefecture of the Region of Brittany (Préfecture de la région Bretagne)

Context

This OP comes under the Regional Competitiveness and Employment Objective and has a total budget of around €878 million. The aid provided by the European Union (EU) under the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) amounts to some €302 million, representing about 2.1% of EU aid to France under the cohesion policy for 2007-2013.

One of the objectives of the OP is to increase the accessibility of the region of Brittany and to limit the impacts on the environment and climate change. One of the major focuses of the region and the departments is the expansion of high speed railways. This meets both the accessibility and environmental impact objectives.

The city/metropolitan region is mostly focused on increasing public transport and alternative modes of transportation within the city and is not directly involved in the high speed rail line expansion in the region. The beneficiaries are focused on construction of new train lines and the renovation of existing lines.

Overall aims and objectives

The strategy of the operational programme has been developed on the basis of the following issues:

- The accessibility of the region;
- Vulnerability to economic crises;
- Enhancing innovation potential;
- The impact of climate change and pressure on the environment.

Priority axes:

1. Make Brittany an accessible and attractive European region in order to foster a balanced, sustainable development;
2. Improve competitiveness and regional economic performance through innovation and knowledge;
3. Optimise the exceptional assets of Brittany in the maritime economy and marine sciences with a view to achieving sustainable coastal development;
4. Preserve the environment and prevent natural risks;
5. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €301.7 million
(Source: EC Regional Policy weblink)

Transport-related aims and objectives

- To increase of the percentage of travellers using rail (between Brittany and Ile-de-France) from 43.5 to 48.5%;
- To increase of the percentage of commuters using public transport from 3.4% (in 1999) to 5%.

Priorities/ measures and associated funding

Transport:
- To improve connections between land-locked regions;
- To promote environmentally-friendly, sustainable transport;
- To encourage environmentally-viable transport networks.

Urban transport:
- To promote environmentally-friendly, sustainable transport

Status of implementation

Status: implemented

Period: 2007-2013

Monitoring and evaluation

Budget for priority axis 5 (technical assistance) can also be used for monitoring and evaluation.

No evaluations have been conducted to date as it is too early in the process. It is expected that an evaluation will take place in 2-3 years time. At the moment, progress is estimated by predicted outcomes.

Additional support for the city

Involved in the CDA (Commission des droits et de l'autonomie) which tries to take into account the needs of the physically disabled. This has been another consideration of the Rennes Metropolitan PDU/SUMP.
EXAMPLES OF TRANSPORT PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE OP

Project 1: TGV Rapid train link to Brittany (Le TGV arrive en Bretagne)


Responsible body
Managing Authority of the Prefecture of Brittany region

Other key stakeholders involved

- Ille-et-Vilaine Department as beneficiary;
- RFF (Réseau Ferré de France – French Railway Network) for construction works;
- Other departments in Brittany (Côtes d’Armor, Finistère, Morbihan) as beneficiaries.

Objectives
Will bring Brittany closer to the heart of Europe, in terms of both goods and people, as connections with the Paris region represent the main flows to and from Brittany

Budget
Total cost: €258.8 million.
- OP: €98.9 million;
- Other funding sources and associated budgets.

Main elements
Seven sections of track will be built (totalling 336 km) and 217 km of railroad track will be revamped. The works include excavations, improving existing structures and building new tracks and infrastructure.

Status of implementation
- Project drafted in February 2011;
- Project is part of European Regional Development Fund for the 2007 to 2013 programming period;
- Five out of the seven lines are completed.

Monitoring and evaluation
No evaluations have been conducted to date as it is too early in the process.
Project 2: 2nd metro line / support public transportation projects (Deuxième ligne de metro / Soutenir les projets de transports en commun propres)

http://metropole.rennes.fr

Responsible body
Rennes Métropole

Other key stakeholders involved
- French government: financial support
- European Union: ERDF resources
- Bretagne Region: financial support for updates of stations
- Ille-et-Vilaine Department

Objectives
Increasing multi-modality in the city and the metropolitan area of Rennes.

Budget
- OP: €980 million (line b) and €206 million (extension line a);
- Other funding sources and associated budgets.

Main elements
Extension of line a of the metro and build a second line (line b)

Status of implementation
Timeline of project is from 2007-2017, but project was conceived in 2002, from 2002-2012 various feasibility studies and financing occurred. The construction works will begin in 2013.

Monitoring and evaluation
Construction work is not yet underway, thus evaluations of this specific project cannot yet be done.

LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECTS AND SUMP/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The objectives of the OP and PDU are aligned. Both projects (the high speed rail line and the metro expansion) are aimed at improving the accessibility of Brittany. The OP was considered when drawing up the PDU but not vice versa.
Objectives and targets

The PDU has similar objectives to the OPs and projects; however they differ in terms of scope. The OP is focused on the region of Brittany as a whole, while the PDU is concerned with Rennes Metropolitan region. They overlap, in that Rennes is the capital city of the region and one of the aims of the OP is to improve the accessibility of Brittany (through its major cities) to the rest of France and Europe. Through its projects (the high speed rail line and the metro expansion), the OP helps to realise the objectives of increasing multi-modality in the metropolitan area of Rennes (axis 2 of the PDU). The new high speed train line encourages more travellers to choose non-car modes of transport in the city.

Measures/projects

According to Rennes Métropole, the OP was taken into consideration when drawing up the PDU. The managing authority of the OP was only aware of the PDU after the OP was approved. However, the needs of Rennes Métropole were considered in the OP. The PDU is more focused upon extending public transport and cycling/pedestrian transport modes, while the OP is more focused upon connecting the region of Brittany with the rest of France.

Other urban plans are as follows:

- Contrat de projet État-région (CPER) (primarily focused on region);
- East-west bus axis;
- Buses within Rennes Métropole.

Both the PDU and these other urban plans have helped to inform and to develop the OP and OP projects.

Impacts

The progress and impacts of the PDU are examined in an annual evaluation conducted by Audiar (Agence d’Urbanisme et de Développement Intercommunal de l’agglomération). The OP and its projects have not yet been monitored. This is expected in 2-3 years time.

Funding

PDU projects are funded by a number of different sources. Some of the projects requiring a larger amount of capital use cohesion funding.

Both the OP projects and the PDU projects use ERDF funding. OP projects are not explicitly included in the budget of the PDU, however, the OP (Region of Brittany) does support the metro expansion project.

Management

Although they do have similar goals, the managers of the PDU are completely independent from the OPs. The only communication that does occur is for arranging financing of projects.
CASE STUDY STRASBOURG

CITY PROFILE

Country /region/ objective
France

NUTS 3 - Bas-Rhin (code FR 421)

European Territorial Cooperation (ERDF)

Geographical factors
Strasbourg is the capital of the Alsace region in Eastern France, located close to the border with Germany. While being the capital of the Bas-Rhin department, the historically German speaking city also has strong traditional links to the West: It is part of the transnational Eurodistrict Strasbourg-Ortenau, which covers the West and the East bank of the Rhine river. The Urban Community of Strasbourg is the intercommunal organisation including the City of Strasbourg and 27 suburban communities.

Economic and social factors
The location at the Rhine as Europe’s most important commercial river leads to a privileged geographical location. Strasbourg is an important centre of manufacturing and engineering, as well as of road, rail, and river communications. The port of Strasbourg is the second largest on the Rhine after Duisburg in Germany. Moreover the tertiary economic sector plays an important role, since the city is the seat of several European institutions and the official seat of the European Parliament.

Source: www.strasbourg.eu

Demographic factors
According to the city’s homepage, the populations of the city and the Urban Community of Strasbourg were 280 000 and almost 450 000 respectively in 2011. Strasbourg is the seventh largest city in France.

Challenges faced by the city/city region
Although Strasbourg has been the first city in France where less than 50% of the people use their car to move about, one of the challenges of Strasbourg is to cope with individual transport which leads to problems with air quality. A big share of commuting traffic between the centre and the suburbs is done by private cars. This is accompanied by ongoing suburbanisation processes in the Alsace Region.


Also the cross border traffic over the Rhine is an issue. Only one road and one regional railway bridge connect Strasbourg to the neighbouring German city of Kehl. The “Europe bridge” (Pont de l’Europe) has to cope with 36 000 vehicles during working days and even more on Saturdays, making it the busiest road link between the regions Baden and Alsace.
URBAN POLICIES

Urban mobility policy

Promoting green transport is an important aim of Strasbourg’s mobility policy. An important milestone was the reopening of the tramlines in 1994, using modern low floor vehicles. Since then the tram system has grown to a length of 53 km, comprising six different lines. The bicycle network extends to 500 km and originated in the 1970s as a measure to encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport. Strasbourg has the most bicycle users in France. Additionally, carsharing and electro mobility are important parts of urban mobility policy.

Source: www.strasbourg.eu

Accordingly one important aim of the urban transport plan is environmental protection and health, with pedestrian traffic becoming the dominant mode. Also the interaction with regional development is of great importance – thinking in 180 degrees should be overcome to include also the German side of the Rhine.

To cope with regional and long distance traffic flows along the Rhine corridor one focal point of mobility policy is the cross-border cooperation in transport projects, e.g. by the Working Group Regional transport policy of Upper Rhine conference.

Source: www.oberrheinkonferenz.org

Public transport is co-ordinated and operated by the Compagnie des Transports Strasbourgoise (CTS).

Sustainable mobility policy for Strasbourg and the wider City region is covered in the Plan de Déplacements Urbains (PDU) de la Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg (Urban Transport Plan of the Urban Community of Strasbourg). The PDU summarises the transport-related challenges and gives a vision for a sustainable metropolis. It contains the following goals:

- Support measures of climate protection and health care;
- Better linkage of transport and urban development measures;
- Promote change of mode of behaviour towards green modes, especially at the urban fringe;
- Consider modal choice on the scale of cross-border metropolitan region,
- Extend the mobility services by focussing on the strengths of each mode.

A special emphasis is placed on intermodal facilities, such as secure bicycle parking facilities. The Plan shows existing low speed areas, priority axes for pedestrians, tram-train intermodality provisions and carpooling areas. The bicycle is highlighted as the most favourable means of transport.
Tram network Strasbourg

Source: Compagnie des Transports Strasbourgoise (CTS).
Other related policies/ activities in the European arena

Strasbourg City Council’s priorities include:

- Setting an example of openness and representativeness;
- Promoting environmental culture;
- Cultivating Franco-German friendship;
- Becoming a capital of the Europe of democracy and human rights;
- Maintaining the existing solid and flourishing economy.

Strasbourg is a member of the CIVITAS Forum Network, which brings together all cities that are committed to introducing ambitious, clean urban transport strategies. Both Strasbourg City and the Urban Community of Strasbourg have signed the Covenant of Mayors.

The Eurodistrict Strasbourg-Ortenau is a partner in the URBACT European exchange and learning programme promoting sustainable urban development. In 1995, cross-border strategic planning became a central objective so as to facilitate cross-border spatial cohesion: the white paper on strategic planning was the first political will to get a global co-ordination on spatial use in the area.


SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/ TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Official name/associated documents

Plan de Déplacements Urbains (PDU) de la Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg (adopted and enacted in 2012)


Responsible body

Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg/ CUS (Urban Community of Strasbourg – Greater Strasbourg).

Other key stakeholders involved

The PDU has been developed by three transport consultant companies on behalf of the CUS. Before the adoption and enacting of the draft by the CUS Council, all municipalities of the CUS, the regional and national government, the departments and all civic associations have been involved. Additionally on the German side, the city of Kehl, the South West German Transport Association (Südwestdeutsche Verkehrs-Aktiengesellschaft, SWEG) and the Tariff Association Ortenau (Tarifverbund Ortenau, TGO) have been involved.

Aims and objectives

The PDU goals are summarised above in the urban mobility section.
The ELTISplus Guidelines consider the PDUs in France to be SUMPs. The PDU Strasbourg meets the SUMP criteria summarised in chapter 2, i.e.:

- Participatory and integrative approach;
  In three forums between 2009 and 2011 the content of the plan was discussed with a wide range of stakeholders.
- Overall sustainable mobility principles;
  See goals summarised in the urban mobility section and priority measures summarised below.
- Short term objectives and strategic vision;
  The PDU vision is described in chapter 3 of the PDU. Short term objectives are among the actions presented in chapter 8.
- Review of transport costs and benefits;
  This is described in relation to each action (policy measure) in chapter 8.

**Budget**

The main source of funding is from the CUS. Additionally sources for the extension of the public transport network for the period 2011 – 2015 are:

- The French government;
- Conseil général du Bas-Rhin (local authority body to run the département);
- Région Alsace.

For the OP-Project “Cross-Border extension of Line D of tram network Strasbourg/ Kehl”, additional funds are provided by the European Commission through the INTERREG-OP.

**Source:** Draft of “Plan de Deplacements Urbains (PDU) de la Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg”, p. 31.

**Main measures**

An extensive range of detailed measures has been specified to deliver PDU goals. They are summarised in the following themes:

- Walking as the heart of the new PDU;
- Towards a policy ‘Cycling 2.0’;
- Active modes to benefit public health;
- Efficient, attractive and accessible urban public transport;
- Towards a harmonization of parking strategies at the community level;
- Urban development-promoting alternatives to the car;
- Better coordination of urban and intercity public transport;
- Optimized and multimodal road network;
- Transport solutions sympathetic towards the elderly and care patients;
- An ambitious policy of managing goods traffic;
- Coaching about mobility behaviour change;
- Travelling more environmentally-friendly, healthily and safely.

For the extension of the public transport network the following measures are envisaged:

- Cross-border extension of line D of tram network Strasbourg/ Kehl;
- extension of line A to Illkirch;
- new tram line between Vendenheim and Eckbolsheim;
- new bus route on own track between Strasbourg Hbf und Schiltigheim EEE.

---

See Footnote 4.
**Status of implementation**

The draft of the PDU has been published. It is due to be adopted in 2013, covering the period 2013-2025. After the adoption, a public hearing will be scheduled. With this new input the draft will be changed and brought before the Council again.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

The current PDU from 2000 was evaluated in 2006. Following the evaluation it was decided to develop a new plan. However, all projects designated have been implemented.

**RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)**

**Official name/associated documents**

Programme opérationnel INTERREG IV A Rhin supérieur (2007CB163P0039)

EC Regional Policy weblink:  

See also website of the Managing Authority (MA): [http://www.interreg-upperrhine.eu](http://www.interreg-upperrhine.eu). The following information about the OP is sourced from these two websites, the OP document itself, and the interview with the officer from the MA.

**Managing authority**

Région Alsace (Alsace Regional Council)/ Programme INTERREG IV Upper Rhine

**Context**

The Alsace Region is subject to the objective of European Territorial Cooperation.

France is paying much attention to the investment in transport infrastructure as part of the industrial policy. However, since the mid 1990s French transport planning has moved on to 'multi-modal' integration of public transport, e.g. unified ticketing of passengers making a combined journey by rail and air.

Priority axis C of the OP focuses on the sustainable development of the region with the one aim of improving the transport systems. Thus the OP has been developed in accordance with the national policy.

The transport strategy of the Alsace Region is based on the strategic challenges of moving people and goods. Being responsible for the quality of regional passenger rail transport in the region it stresses the need of its high quality, comfort, reliability and proper functioning.


The OP document does not explicitly mention certain urban measures. However, it contains the aim of improving transport links, with special focus on crossing the Rhine. This corresponds to the aim of the PDU described above.
Integrated urban transport plans and cohesion policy

The MA’s website contains a list of funding beneficiaries as of June 2011. Around €46.4 million is provided to the beneficiaries.


Out of a total of 72 accepted projects there are seven projects involving the Urban Community, the city of Strasbourg or the Eurodistrict, concerned with tourism, education, culture and building. There is one project related to urban transport, namely the cross border extension of tram line D to the German city of Kehl. Another important beneficiary is the University of Strasbourg, which is involved in projects regarding history, education and research.

Overall aims and objectives

The overall vision is to use the “cross-border potential and remove the obstacles linked to the border, so that the area develops in an integrated manner, taking account of sustainable development in the social and environmental field, while offering its inhabitants a diversified and attractive living environment.” Apart from transport, the programme seeks to enable access to many institutions and SMEs, the creation of new tourist products, the protection of cross-border natural areas, development of use of renewable energy and job training for over 20 000 people.

The Upper Rhine INTERREG OP is supported by the ERDF, with the cooperation of Switzerland. In the table below all funding allocations are in Euros.

Priority axes:

1. Joint use of the potential of the Upper Rhine area;
2. Making the Upper Rhine area an integrated region in terms of training, work and habitat;
3. Ensuring sustainable development of the Upper Rhine area;
4. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €67 million.

Source: EC Regional Policy weblink.

Transport-related aims and objectives

The SWOT analysis of the OP also states that the dominance of the car with 88% of all trips is comparatively high in the Upper Rhine region. Especially the conurbations Basel and Strasbourg/ Kehl are characterised by transport problems due to local and transit traffic. However, because of the location of the region at the intersection of several European transport axes, its sustainability is greatly determined by the quality and performance of the transport infrastructure. With regard to the impacts of climate change especially the cross border links have a strategic importance. Thus, the expected impact of the OP is the creation of at least ten additional cross-border links for individual or public-transport.

Priorities/ measures and associated funding

Within the priority to ensure sustainable development (priority axis C) the improvement of transport systems, especially the cross border links of the national and regional systems, is one of the major aims. With regard to the ecological aspect of sustainability the green
modes are highlighted. The subordinate objectives are:

- Closure of gaps in cross border transport infrastructure and service, first of all at Rhine crossings and where there are obstacles of equal use of the networks. As an example, cross border bicycle and walking links are mentioned;
- Promotion of efficient cross border usage of transport systems (ports, airports, multimodal platforms, transport control and information systems).

**Use of technical assistance budget**

Technical assistance is covered by priority axis D. The overall ERDF allocation for this priority axis is shown above. The OP document states that technical assistance aims at:

- Enforcement, administration and smooth management of the programme;
- Announcement, public relations and raising the awareness of the public as well as programme and project partners;
- Attendance, advice and support of project partners in the design of their projects;
- Attendance of project implementation after approval;
- Carrying out programme evaluation, and
- Ensuring control of projects and programme.

**Status of implementation**

The OP is currently in year five of an implementation period running from 2007-13. For use of and progress regarding indicators see below.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

The OP defines indicators at the level of the programme (1) as well as those on the level of priority axes (2) and context indicators (3):

(1) Programme indicators:
- 30 commonly developed, managed and funded projects by 2015;
- 30 projects promoting cross border economic cooperation by 2015;
- 30 projects to alleviate isolation by better access to transport axes, ICT and services by 2015;
- 15 projects to promote and improve common environmental protection and management by 2015;
- 10 projects to mitigate discrimination by 2015;
- 125 new created jobs by 2015.

(2) Priority axis indicators:
As for priority axis C which is relevant for transport projects, the following indicators and target values are stated:

- 35 projects allocated to priority axis C by 2015;
- 10 projects to promote common use of infrastructure by 2015;
- 1 000 km² new protected area as a result of common measures, and
- 10 additional cross border transport links for individual or public transport.

(3) Context indicators:
These indicators have been voluntarily introduced in order to evaluate the program implementation within its context. They are based on the suggestions elaborated within the SWOT Analysis.


**EXAMPLE OF TRANSPORT PROJECT FINANCED BY THE OP**

**Project: Cross-Border extension of Line D of tram network Strasbourg/ Kehl with horizon 2014**

[http://www.kehr.de/wStadt/tram/index.php](http://www.kehr.de/wStadt/tram/index.php)

**Responsible bodies**

- Communauté Urbaine de Strasbourg (Urban Community of Strasbourg - CUS);
- City of Kehl.

**Other key stakeholders involved and their roles**

Compagnie des Transports Strasbourgeois (CTS) as the responsible body for the detailed planning and construction of the line.

**Objectives**

Improving the public transport links across the Rhine between Strasbourg and its neighbouring town Kehl

**Budget**

The costs for the projects (including additional costs) are as follows:

- Section between station “Aristide Briand“ to Kehl station = €87 million;
- Section between Kehl station to Civic Hall Kehl = €11.5 million.

Around one third of this sum is invested by the German side for the section from the middle of the Rhine to Civic Hall Kehl (= €35.5 million).

The funds provided by the INTERREG-OP amount to €3.25 million. Generally the OP is limited to fund projects at a rate of 50 %. As well as EU money, national, regional and local as well as private funding sources are used.
Main elements

- Aims to reduce enormous cross border car traffic (36 000 vehicles per working day);
- Tram project as a result of joint spatial planning in the border area;
- In line with the promotion of urban redevelopment of old industrial sites on the French side;
- housing opportunities for 18 000 people are planned along the tram line.

Source: [http://www.kehl.de/wStadt/tram/plaene.php](http://www.kehl.de/wStadt/tram/plaene.php)

Status of implementation

Ongoing

Monitoring and evaluation

The project has been ex-ante evaluated by a cost benefit analysis (“Standardisierte Bewertung”).

**LINK BETWEEN OP, PROJECTS AND SUMP/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The linkage between the OP and the tram project is clearly given although the INTERREG Programme – by its nature – only finances a minor part of the project. Moreover, the project will be a major element in the forthcoming transport plan PDU.

Objectives and targets

The PDU draft, the tram project as well as the INTERREG Programme have comparable targets:

- Improvement of cross border transport links;
- Promoting sustainable mobility.

Measures/projects

Only a minor part of the projects funded by the OP belong to the group of transport projects and are implemented in Strasbourg. Other transport projects are:

- Cross-border touristic development for cyclists and hikers in the PANIMA Rhine Park;
- Other cross-border hiking and cycle ways;
- Construction of a cross-border automatic Block signaling system between Neuenburg (D) and Bantzenheim (F);
Integrated urban transport plans and cohesion policy

- New cross-border bus route from Grenzach-Wyhlen (D) to Basel (CH);
- Strengthening of public transport and P&R stations in trinational Eurodistrict Basel;
- Feasibility Study: Improvement of Rhine crossings between Gambsheim/ Rheinau (D) and Lauterbourg (F).

It is important to state that the OP funds many different projects (cultural, touristic, educational, transport-related), but their link lies in the special challenges of the cross-border situation. For instance, if a joint educational facility is promoted, it also needs to be considered how people from both countries can reach it, thus the focus is on the transport infrastructure.

**Impacts**

The PDU and OP seem to reinforce each other, at least in terms of the tram line extension project. The OP and its funding options was one reason to write this project into the new draft PDU.

The excellent cooperation between the two transport authorities on both sides of the Rhine in processing the project deserves a special mention.

The interviewees also referred to the link between transport-related OP projects and priority B: “Making the Upper Rhine area an integrated region in terms of training, work and habitat”. The integration of educational facilities or the promotion of tourism, for instance, implies well developed cross-border transport links.

**Funding**

Generally, cohesion funding is needed for improving the cross-border transport and traffic situation. The funding has been in place since 1990 and has already contributed to better cross-border cooperation in many fields.

However, the INTERREG program only finances the additional costs incurred by the cross-border situation. Thus, it was mentioned in the interview that several interested applicants decided to save on the time and effort involved in applying for co-funding to the MA.

**Management**

The OP was not explicitly taken into account during the development process of the PDU, but there was an awareness of the funding option of the cross-border tram extension by EU funds. For the follow-up OP for the next funding period, the OP manager promotes round tables, which are already established in the trinational EuroRegion Basel.

An important favourable element with respect to the link between OP and SUMP is the strength of the personal relationships, which result from regular meetings in working groups and the steering committee. Moreover, a joint technical secretariat, implemented in the regional authority and responsible for all questions around project funding from the OP, ensures a close cooperation between the MA and the OP project manager. Moreover, there is a technical working group and the steering committee. Therefore, the progress of the projects and any obstacles are often discussed and well known.
CASE STUDY TALLINN

CITY PROFILE

Country /region/ objective

Estonia

NUTS 3: Põhja-Eesti (Harju County) (code EE 001)

Convergence (ERDF, Cohesion Fund)

Geographical factors

Tallinn (recent historical name: Reval) is the capital city and main seaport of Estonia. It is located on Estonia’s north coast on the Gulf of Finland, 80 kilometres south of Helsinki. It comprises 3 bigger peninsulas: Kopli peninsula, Paljassaare peninsula and Kakumae peninsula and occupies an area of 159.2 km².


Economic factors

Tallinn is the centre of Estonian political and business life and the driving force of the country’s economy. The city is home to about half of all Estonian companies, which are responsible for ca 50-60% of GDP and nearly ¾ of total business profit. More than half of the companies operating in Estonia on foreign capital are located in Tallinn. The economy is closely connected with the neighbouring Scandinavian countries. This has attracted extensive foreign investments, facilitated the acquisition of modern expertise and boosted trade.

Source: http://www.tallinn.ee.

Demographic factors

The registered population of Tallinn is 416 470 (as of 1 Apr 2012).

In 2004, Tallinn had the largest number of non-EU nationals of all EU member states' capital cities in 2009 around 22% of its population were non-EU citizens.


Challenges faced by the city/city region

Tallinn and its close vicinity form Estonia’s leading transport node, where all the main rail and road connections, as well as maritime and air links rundown together. The primary cargo and passenger ports and rail terminals are concentrated in Tallinn, as well as the international airport and bus station. Almost half of Estonia’s residents and two thirds of the country’s economy are based in the Tallinn urban region, where approximately 550 000 people live. This results in huge requirements for the transport infrastructure.

Yet the planning of public transport has failed to view the urban conglomerate as a whole; the planning processes in the city and the surrounding county have occurred independently of each other. This has resulted in the major challenge of integrating the transport systems of Tallinn and its vicinity. An added challenge lies in the fact that
intensive urban sprawl is taking place within the Tallinn agglomeration.


**URBAN POLICIES**

**Urban mobility policy**

Tallinn transport system comprises 57 bus lines, 8 trolley bus lines, and 4 tram lines that operate from 5 o'clock in the morning until midnight. The bus is the prevalent mode of transport in Tallinn, and the total length of the urban bus route is about 644 km, with 823 bus stops. Trolley buses are the second most developed mode of transport in the city: the routes have length of 67 km, with 124 trolley bus stations and an average distance of 560 meters between stops. The tram lines are the shortest of the public service lines in the capital: the total length measures 33 km and the total number of stops is 62 with an average of 530 meters between the stops.

Sources: [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/qaser/pdf/publications/starbei3](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/qaser/pdf/publications/starbei3); information provided by Tallinn Transport Department.

**Overview of the public transport lines in Tallinn**

![Overview of public transport lines in Tallinn](http://eng.yhistransport.eu/index.php/route-network-and-infrastructure)

In order to cope with the increase of car use as a result of economic growth, investments in road network infrastructure have been undertaken. However, to resist the trend of declining use of public transport, it has been recognised that the existing network (bus, trolleys, tramways and suburban trains) needs to be renewed and extended so as to support sustainable urban development. Several measures have been introduced to improve the image of public transport. Moreover, other ambitious measures are being implemented to contribute to a sustainable urban transport system. These include public transport ticketing system, mobility management and bus lanes.

Other related policies/activities in the European arena

The urban development is mainly driven by private interests. Therefore the city has had little success in halting the problem of urban sprawl. The privatisation of retail and services since 1990s has led to a development of the city centre as a business and trade centre. At the urban fringe, the development of industrial and technology parks is prevailing.


Current urban development projects cover the following topics:
- Conversion of the historical old town;
- Conversion of old industrial sites;
- Harbour development.

Tallinn City has been a demonstration city of CIVITAS II (2005 – 2009) in the SMILE project (Towards Sustainable Mobility for People in Urban Areas), through which a public transport priority system has been introduced and the equipment of the vehicles has been improved. Tallinn is also a member in CIVITAS PLUS with the current MIMOSA project (Making Innovation in MObility and Sustainable Actions), running from 2008 to 2012. It contains the following measures:
- Alternative fuels;
- Public transport ticketing system;
- Mobility management - Making public transport more popular;
- Eco-driving training for bus drivers;
- Marking routes for smooth freight and city logistics;
- Bus lane and red light cameras;
- Traffic monitoring;
- Improving safety at pedestrian crossings and on bicycle tracks;
- Real-time information system;
- Developing Park and Ride and school bus services;
- Public transport communication system.

Tallinn City Council has signed the Covenant of Mayors. Moreover, it has participated in other EU projects (Pilot, MAX project of 6th Framework Programme).

SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY PLAN/TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Official name/associated documents

2. Transport Plan for the City of Tallinn and its Vicinity (2010) (Cohesion Fund project No. 2002/EE/16/P/PA/009)

Responsible bodies

# 1. Tallinn City Council, Transport and City Planning Department
# 2. Tallinn City Council, Municipal Engineering and Services Department
Other key stakeholders involved

#1.
- Deputy mayors;
- Tallinn City Government’s Development Director;
- members of Tallinn city council’s environmental commission;
- members of Tallinn city council’s public works commission;
- Harju county government and the council of the Harju Association of Local Authorities;
- Tallinn University of Technology.

#2.
- Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communications (the projects intermediate body);
- Road Administration (the projects final beneficiary);
- Tallinn Transport Department;
- Tallinn Environment Department;
- K-Projekt Ltd. (consultant);
- AS PricewaterhouseCoopers Advisors (financial consultant);
- Tallinn Municipal Engineering Services Department (the authority that commissioned the project);
- other institutions involved: AS Eesti Raudtee (Estonian Railroad), AS Talinna Lennujaam (Tallinn Airport), AS Tallinna Sadam (Tallinn Harbour), AS Edelaraudtee (railroad carrier), surrounding local governments (Harku, Viimsi, Kiili, Rae, Saku, Saue, Jõelähtme, Maardu).

Aims and objectives

Document No.1 has been developed as a *Sustainable Urban Transport Plan* (SUTP) with support by the European PILOT Project (Planning Integrated Local Transport). It aims at mapping the current transport system in Tallinn and its strategic land use and transport system objectives are:

1. An attractive, liveable urban environment;
2. Reduced traffic congestion and an effective transport system;
3. A high proportion of public transport and light traffic;
4. Diverse access and equal opportunities;
5. A healthy, safe and secure traffic space;

As an integrated plan the SUTP fulfils part of the criteria of a SUMP:
- Participatory and integrated approach;
  Many stakeholders have been consulted including the regional authority and the university. Moreover, citizens had the option to participate and several round table discussions took place.
- Overall sustainable mobility principles;
  The plan focuses on the environment and on measures towards sustainable mobility.
- Review of transport costs and benefits;
  The plan includes a review of costs and alternative costs and also addresses the external costs of transport.
The criteria of a SUMP which are not fulfilled are:

- Short term objectives and strategic vision;
  The plan contains a strategic vision for 2035, but does not contain short term objectives. It does not go into any detail on concrete measures.

Document No.2 has been designed to meet the requirements for receiving EU funding for one specific road transport project, required by the Ministry of Economic Affairs in their role as MA. However, it is not accepted as a “transport plan” by the Transport and City Planning Department.

**Budget**

# 1.: no financial plan associated with the document
# 2.: according to the “long-term financial plan” budgets are allocated to three different transport sectors:
- Public transport: tram project;
- Light traffic roads;
- Streets & highways: roads and connections.

**Main measures**

# 1: Compliance of measures with the vision and objectives was assessed using the analytical hierarchy method and by analysis of alternative costs. As a result, the following five most important strategic objectives were defined:
- Land use planning;
- Mobility management and practical alternatives to the car;
- Effective traffic management and infrastructure;
- Road safety and environmental protection;
- Raising awareness and changing attitudes.

# 2: The measures of this document, associated with its visions, are:
- Land use vision – transport guides the direction of urban development:
  - Transport is planned at all stages with a view to being integrated with land use and economic development;
  - Development of transport policy takes into account everyone’s interests;
  - Reducing people’s need to use transport;
  - Updating the system for financing transport;
  - Reorganizing transport policy implementation and the system of supervision.
- Environmental vision – Transport is environmentally friendly:
  - Promoting the adoption of environmentally-friendly and energy-efficient technology;
  - Preventing a negative environmental impact from transport and easing the consequences;
  - Preservation of natural, historical and cultural heritage.
- Safety Vision – for goods and people:
  - Establishing a safe and secure infrastructure;
  - Implementation of traffic calming methods;
  - Establishing districts reserved for light-vehicle traffic and expanding existing ones.
- Vision of functionality - Transport infrastructure is high-quality and reliable:
- Ensuring the development and maintenance of light-vehicle roads, transport infrastructure, carriageways, garages and lots, infrastructure to service railway transport, infrastructure to service marine transport, infrastructure to service air transport;
- Ensuring the functioning of critical transport services;
- Adopting innovative construction technology, better construction materials and improved technologies;
- Improving connection possibilities between areas;
- Improving availability of transport and reliability;
- Increasing the efficiency of transport;
- Taking into account road users with special needs;
- Implementing a traffic management system.

Social vision - availability and affordability for all groups of road users:
- Coordination of the development of public transport involving various parties to develop a single development policy;
- Integrating the network of public transport routes in Tallinn and its vicinity;
- Increasing the competitiveness of public transport;
- Popularizing public transport and light-vehicle traffic;
- Creating a network of light-vehicle routes;
- Promoting light-vehicle traffic;
- Mobility management.

Economic vision – profitability:
- Increasing the profitability of the transport system;
- Planning investments in the transport system.

Status of implementation

Both plans are elaborated, but not adopted as official development documents, because they do not match the structure of the “Statute of processing development documents” issued by the City Council.

Document #2 is based on an insufficient number and quality of wide scale studies and surveys. But it is considered as a base on which to start further efforts to work out a sustainable urban mobility plan for Tallinn and its vicinity.

RELEVANT OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME (OP)

Official name/associated documents

1. Operational Programme for the Development of Economic Environment (2007EE161PO001)

2. Operational Programme for the Development of Living Environment (2007EE161PO002)
Managing authority (MA)

Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Estonia

Context

Both OPs are co-funded by the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund under the Convergence objective.

Overall aims and objectives

The main objective of the Economic Environment-OP is to further improve the environment where economic competitiveness and productivity of enterprises can increase. The Living Environment-OP focuses on improving the quality of life in Estonia in environmental and social terms.

# 1.: OP Economic Environment

Priority axes:

1. Innovation and growth capacities of enterprises;
2. Enhancing the competitive ability of Estonian Transport investments of strategic importance;
3. Development of regional transport infrastructure;
4. Promotion of information society;
5. Horizontal technical assistance;
6. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €1 463 million

Source: EC Regional Policy weblink

# 2.: OP Living Environment

Priority axes:

1. Development of water and waste management infrastructure;
2. Development of infrastructures and support systems for sustainable use of the environment;
3. Development of energy sector;
4. Integral and balanced development of regions;
5. Development of education infrastructure;
6. Development of health and welfare infrastructure;
7. Horizontal technical assistance;
8. Technical assistance.

Total EU budget = approximately €1 549 million

Source: EC Regional Policy weblink.

Transport-related aims and objectives

The purpose of OP No.1 is – among others – to undertake investments aimed at improving the environment, for instance through better transport networks. The expected result is for the competitiveness of public transport in Estonia to remain at least at the current level, especially by providing sustainable electric transport in and around Tallinn.
Transport Projects and associated funding

A new generation of vehicles for the tram network has been financed by the sale of “assigned amount units” (AAU) of CO₂ emitting allowances under the European Trading Scheme (EU ETS) to Spain.

Due to technical constraints preventing the new vehicles from fitting onto the old network (because of their weight) the tram network needs to be partly upgraded with new tracks.

Priorities/ measures and associated funding

Priority Axis 4 of the OP on Economic Environment highlights the “Development of regional transport infrastructure” in order to improve the accessibility of the Estonian regions. Special focus is given to the upgrade of the secondary road network, the regional ports and the airports.

However, Priority Axis 2 of the OP on Living Environment emphasises the sustainable use of the transport infrastructure. This includes the development of environmental education infrastructure, improvement of environmental monitoring and supervision, preservation of biological diversity and improvement of preparedness for environmental emergencies.

Status of implementation

The OP is currently in year five of an implementation period running from 2007-13. See below for use of and progress regarding indicators.

EXAMPLE OF TRANSPORT PROJECTS FINANCED BY THE OP

Project “Reconstruction of Tramline No.4 to be adjusted to the new vehicle fleet”

Responsible body

Tallinn City Council

Other key stakeholders involved

The MA was involved in finding a funding source for the tram track renovation. Since the budget from the OP “Economic Environment” is already allocated to certain projects, a solution has been found to include transport measures in the OP “Living Environment” and redirect money towards Tallinn’s tram project.

Objectives

See above

Budget

A total of €22.2 million; €18.9 million thereof from the OP “Living Environment”
**Status of implementation**

Under preparation

**Monitoring and evaluation**

No monitoring or evaluation has been carried out yet.

**Link between OP, projects and SUMP/Transport development plan**

A strong link is given for the Living Environment-OP and the tram renovation programme, since the OP needs to be adjusted for the envisaged project.

**Objectives and targets**

As for the Living Environment – OP and the two urban transport plans the common objective lies in the emphasis on sustainable and integrative infrastructure measures.

**Measures/projects**

The “Transport plan for the City of Tallinn and its vicinity” could not be taken into account when analysing the OP, because it was developed afterwards.

**Impacts**

As described above, the local transport plans are only relevant for the administrative unit under whose responsibility it has been developed. Therefore their impacts are very limited. The impact of the OPs however, is large, because it is the main funding source for (transport) infrastructure projects. National governments do not usually co-finance local infrastructure projects.

**Funding**

Since the money from AAU sources were already allocated to the tram vehicles, another source of funding had to be found for the tram track renovation. Generally, it needs to be said that funding from the EU is needed as, without such funding, implementing these projects would take much longer. In some cases it is likely that only parts of projects would be implemented.

**Management**

There is an informal cooperation between the MA and the OP project manager. Therefore, all stakeholders involved are aware of the progress and obstacles of the projects.
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