



CiViTAS
Cleaner and better transport in cities

ARCHIMEDES

AALBORG • BRIGHTON & HOVE • DONOSTIA-SAN SEBASTIÁN • IAŞI • MONZA • ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM

Brighton & Hove

D11.10 – SUTP Process & Achievements

Brighton & Hove

December 2012



THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE
IS CO-FINANCED BY THE
EUROPEAN UNION

Project no.	TREN/FP7TR/218940 ARCHIMEDES
Project Name	ARCHIMEDES (Achieving Real Change with Innovative Transport Measure Demonstrating Energy Savings)
Start date of the Project	15/09/2008
Duration:	48 months
Measure:	No.
Task:	
Deliverable:	D11.10
Due date of Deliverable:	15 September 2012
Actual submission date:	December 2012
Dissemination Level	Public
Organisation Responsible	Brighton & Hove City Council
Author	Tom Campbell
Quality Control	Alan Lewis
Version	1.0
Date last updated	7th December 2012

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 BACKGROUND CIVITAS.....	4
1.2 BACKGROUND ARCHIMEDES.....	5
1.3 PARTICIPANT CITIES.....	5
1.3.1 <i>Leading City Innovation Areas</i>	5
2. BACKGROUND TO THE DELIVERABLE	6
2.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE TASK.....	6
3. CITIES INVOLVED.....	6
3.1 BRIGHTON & HOVE	6
3.2 MONZA.....	7
3.3 ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM.....	7
4. SUTP PROCESS & ACHIEVEMENTS.....	8
4.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK DONE.....	8
4.2 SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.....	8
4.3 MAIN OUTCOMES	9
4.4 PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED	11
4.5 MITIGATING ACTIVITIES.....	12
4.7 FUTURE PLANS	12

Annex 1: SUTP Workshop Notes October 2009

Annex 2: SUTP Workshop Notes May 2010

Annex 3: SUTP Workshop Notes October 2010

1. Introduction

1.1 Background CIVITAS

CIVITAS - cleaner and better transport in cities - stands for City-VITALity-Sustainability. With the CIVITAS Initiative, the EC aims to generate a decisive breakthrough by supporting and evaluating the implementation of ambitious integrated sustainable urban transport strategies that should make a real difference for the welfare of the European citizen.

CIVITAS I started in early 2002 (within the 5th Framework Research Programme);
CIVITAS II started in early 2005 (within the 6th Framework Research Programme) and
CIVITAS PLUS started in late 2008 (within the 7th Framework Research Programme).

The objective of CIVITAS-Plus is to test and increase the understanding of the frameworks, processes and packaging required to successfully introduce bold, integrated and innovative strategies for clean and sustainable urban transport that address concerns related to energy-efficiency, transport policy and road safety, alternative fuels and the environment.

Within CIVITAS I (2002-2006) there were 19 cities clustered in 4 demonstration projects, within CIVITAS II (2005-2009) 17 cities in 4 demonstration projects, whilst within CIVITAS PLUS (2008-2012) 25 cities in 5 demonstration projects are taking part. These demonstration cities all over Europe are funded by the European Commission.

Objectives:

- to promote and implement sustainable, clean and (energy) efficient urban transport measures
- to implement integrated packages of technology and policy measures in the field of energy and transport in 8 categories of measures
- to build up critical mass and markets for innovation

Horizontal projects support the CIVITAS demonstration projects & cities by :

- Cross-site evaluation and Europe wide dissemination in co-operation with the demonstration projects
- The organisation of the annual meeting of CIVITAS Forum members
- Providing the Secretariat for the Political Advisory Committee (PAC)
- Development of policy recommendations for a long-term multiplier effect of CIVITAS

Key elements of CIVITAS

- CIVITAS is co-ordinated by cities: it is a programme “of cities for cities”
- Cities are in the heart of local public private partnerships
- Political commitment is a basic requirement
- Cities are living ‘Laboratories’ for learning and evaluating

1.2 Background ARCHIMEDES

ARCHIMEDES is an integrating project, bringing together 6 European cities to address problems and opportunities for creating environmentally sustainable, safe and energy efficient transport systems in medium sized urban areas.

The objective of ARCHIMEDES is to introduce innovative, integrated and ambitious strategies for clean, energy-efficient, sustainable urban transport to achieve significant impacts in the policy fields of energy, transport, and environmental sustainability. An ambitious blend of policy tools and measures will increase energy-efficiency in transport, provide safer and more convenient travel for all, using a higher share of clean engine technology and fuels, resulting in an enhanced urban environment (including reduced noise and air pollution). Visible and measurable impacts will result from significantly sized measures in specific innovation areas. Demonstrations of innovative transport technologies, policy measures and partnership working, combined with targeted research, will verify the best frameworks, processes and packaging required to successfully transfer the strategies to other cities.

1.3 Participant Cities

The ARCHIMEDES project focuses on activities in specific innovation areas of each city, known as the ARCHIMEDES corridor or zone (depending on shape and geography). These innovation areas extend to the peri-urban fringe and the administrative boundaries of regional authorities and neighbouring administrations.

The two Learning cities, to which experience and best-practice will be transferred, are Monza (Italy) and Ústí nad Labem (Czech Republic). The strategy for the project is to ensure that the tools and measures developed have the widest application throughout Europe, tested via the Learning Cities' activities and interaction with the Lead City partners.

1.3.1 Leading City Innovation Areas

The four Leading cities in the ARCHIMEDES project are:

- Aalborg (Denmark);
- Brighton & Hove (UK);
- Donostia-San Sebastián (Spain); and
- Iasi (Romania).

Together the Lead Cities in ARCHIMEDES cover different geographic parts of Europe. They have the full support of the relevant political representatives for the project, and are well able to implement the innovative range of demonstration activities.

The Lead Cities are joined in their local projects by a small number of key partners that show a high level of commitment to the project objectives of energy-efficient urban transportation. In all cases the public transport company features as a partner in the proposed project.

2. Background to the Deliverable

2.1 Summary Description of the Task

The objective of the task was to support the development of Sustainable Urban Transport Plans (SUTPs) by the Learning Cities, Monza and Usti nad Labem, which formed a major element of their involvement within ARCHIMEDES.

A SUTP is a strategic plan designed to satisfy the mobility needs of people and businesses in cities and their surroundings for a better quality of life. It builds on existing planning practices and takes due consideration of integration, participation, and evaluation principles.

A SUTP aims to create a sustainable urban transport system by addressing – at least - the following objectives:

- Ensure the accessibility offered by the transport system is available to all.
- Improve safety and security.
- Reduce air and noise pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption.
- Improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the transportation of persons and goods.
- Contribute to enhancing the attractiveness and quality of the urban environment and urban design.

Brighton and Hove City Council led the process of supporting Monza and Usti nad Labem through the process of producing their SUTPs, providing advice on the content and the stages of developing an SUTP in order to ensure that it has an ongoing relevance to city policies and the local population.

3. Cities Involved

3.1 Brighton & Hove

Brighton & Hove is an historic city, in the south-east of England, known internationally for its abundant Regency and Victorian architecture. It is also a seaside tourist destination, with over 11km of seafront attracting eight million visitors a year.

In addition, it is a leading European Conference destination; home to two leading universities, a major regional shopping centre, and home to some of the area's major employers. All of this, especially when set against the background of continuing economic growth, major developments across the city and a growing population, has led the city council to adopt a vision for the city as a place with a co-ordinated transport system that balances the needs of all users and minimises damage to the environment.

The sustainable transport strategy that will help deliver this vision has been developed within the framework of a Local Transport Plan, following national UK guidelines. The ARCHIMEDES measures also support the vision, which enables the city to propose innovative tools and approaches to increase the energy-efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of urban transport.

3.2 Monza

Monza is a city on the river Lambro, a tributary of the Po, in the Lombardy region of Italy, some 15km north-northeast of Milan. It is the third-largest city of Lombardy and the most important economic, industrial and administrative centre of the Brianza area, supporting a textile industry and a publishing trade. It is best known for its Grand Prix.

The City of Monza, with approximately 121,000 inhabitants, is located 15 km north of Milan, which is the centre of the Lombardia area. This area is one of the engines of the Italian economy; the number of companies is 58,500, i.e. a company for every 13 inhabitants.

Monza is affected by a huge amount of traffic that crosses the city to reach Milan and the highways nodes located between Monza and Milan. It is also an important node in the Railways network, crossed by routes connecting Milan with Como and Switzerland, Lecco and Sondrio, Bergamo and Brianza. "Regione Lombardia", which in the new devolution framework started in 1998, has full responsibility for establishing the Local Public Transportation System (trains, coaches and buses) and has created a new approach for urban rail routes using an approach similar to the German S-Line or Paris RER.

Monza has recently become the head of the new "Monza and Brianza" province, with approximately 750,000 inhabitants, so will gain the full range of administration functions by 2009. Plan-making responsibilities and an influence over peri-urban areas will require the city to develop new competencies.

In this context, the objective of the City of Monza in participating in CIVITAS as a Learning City is to set up an Urban Mobility System where the impact of private traffic can be reduced, creating a new mobility offer, where alternative modes become increasingly significant, leading to improvements to the urban environment and a reduction in energy consumption (and concurrent pollution).

3.3 Ústí nad Labem

Ústí nad Labem is situated in the north of the Czech Republic, about 20 km from the German border. Thanks to its location in the beautiful valley of the largest Czech river Labe (Elbe) and the surrounding Central Bohemian Massive, it is sometimes called 'the Gateway to Bohemia'. Ústí is an industrial, business and cultural centre of the Ústí region.

Ústí nad Labem is an important industrial centre of north-west Bohemia. The city's population is 93,859, living in an area of 93.95km². The city is also home to the Jan Evangelista Purkyně University with eight faculties and large student population. The city used to be a base for a large range of heavy industry, causing damage to the natural environment. This is now a major focus for improvement and care.

The Transport Master Plan, to be adopted in its first form in 2007, will be the basic transport document for the development of a new urban plan (2011), which must be developed by the City subject to the provisions of the newly adopted Building Act. This will characterise the development of transport in the city for the next 15 years, and so the opportunity to integrate Sustainable Urban Transport Planning best practices into plan development during the project means an ideal match of timing between city policy frameworks and the ARCHIMEDES project.

The projects main objective is to propose transport organisation in the city, depending on the urban form, transport intensity, development of public transport, and the need for access. The process, running until 2011, will include improving the digital model of city transport that Ústí currently has at its disposal. The plan will have to deal with the fact (and mitigate against

unwanted effects that could otherwise arise), that from 2010, the city will be fully connected to the D8 motorway, running from Prague to Dresden.

4. SUTP Process & Achievements

4.1 Description of the Work Done

The task was carried out in 2 phases:

- 1) The principles and theory of SUTPs
- 2) Individual mentoring

A number of documents guided the approach to supporting SUTP development in the Learning Cities. In particular, PILOT guidelines on producing a SUTP were used to guide the earlier stages of development whilst the European Commission document “*Guidelines: Developing and Implementing a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan*” produced as part of the Eltisplus project was used in the later stages of SUTP development.

4.2 Summary of Activities Undertaken

The first stage of the task was to provide the Learning Cities with the theoretical base for preparing an SUTP. To achieve this, a number of initial workshops were held on the theory and methodology of constructing SUTPs.

Workshops were held alongside the 6-monthly Consortium Meetings to ensure that all relevant personnel were able to attend. In recognition of the broad remit of SUTPs all ARCHIMEDES partners were invited to the workshops, however staff with experience of producing SUTPs or responsibility for implementing them were particularly encouraged to attend.

The 3 workshops held were:

1) Introduction to SUTP principles

Brighton & Hove, October 2009

This session introduced the Learning Cities to the purpose and content of SUTPs and the process used to develop them. The structure of the session was informed by work carried out as part of the PILOT project.

2) Stakeholder engagement

Usti nad Labem, May 2010

The workshop was delivered in 3 parts:

- An introduction to the importance of stakeholder engagement and its role within SUTP development.
- Presentations on examples of best practice in stakeholder engagement.
- A group discussion on how stakeholder engagement can be effectively carried out in the Learning Cities.

3) Securing political approval / individual progress updates and advice

Donostia San-Sebastian, October 2010

The first part of the workshop focussed on methods to secure political approval. For the second part of the workshop the Learning Cities outlined their progress to date and the leading cities provided advice on how to proceed.

The workshop reports are included as annexes to this deliverable.

At the conclusion of the third workshop a discussion was held on progress to date. The cities felt that they had good background knowledge of the principles of SUTPs which would allow them to create a good quality plan. They had begun work on drafting their own SUTPs applying the principles learned.

It was felt that the system of presentations within group sessions had worked well during the theory phase. However as the cities progressed with their own SUTPs they would need more tailored support focussing on specific issues with their own plans and therefore a mentoring style of support was adopted.

The format for the later stage of support was mostly telephone conferencing but other methods such as written communication and face to face meetings in conjunction with the consortium meetings were also used. In order to provide most benefit to the Learning Cities the agenda for the meeting was developed by the Learning Cities. In most cases they would submit a draft of their SUTP or a written question ahead of the meeting. Feedback would then be given by the Leading Cities after consultation amongst relevant staff.

This mentoring method was effective for the second stage of the task as it was important that the principles learnt in the first stage were applied effectively. For example in one instance a Learning City submitted a draft of their SUTP which had followed the principle of identifying the current transport problems in the city to the detriment of identifying actions. During a telephone conference the Leading Cities were able to explain that the draft Plan was unbalanced and lacking direction.

4.3 Main Outcomes

Monza

In developing a Sustainable Urban Transport Plan for their city, Monza wanted to address particular issues that were already affecting, or forecast to affect the city. These were:

- A high level of future development. Monza had remained relatively static in the years preceding their SUTP, however the city had allocated a large amount of land for development and was therefore expecting its population to grow and subsequently its travel needs to change.
- The current transport system was approaching capacity and the associated congestion, noise and air pollution were an issue.

Monza used an innovative planning method in their SUTP, as the focus was on modal shift rather than on elements such as air quality and congestion.

A detailed household survey was carried out that identified the travel behaviour of local residents and their attitude towards alternatives to car travel. The survey results were inputted into a transport model in order to identify the proportion of car trips that the population would be prepared to give up in favour of sustainable modes, if the correct infrastructure was in place. Resources were then allocated proportionally according to the potential modal shift for each mode.

Monza submitted their first draft SUTP in September 2011. This draft was produced and published internally as a document designed to gain political support for development of another formal SUTP. Therefore much of the document focussed on the current transport situation and issues likely to affect transport in the future.

The first draft was reviewed by the ARCHIMEDES Technical Manager and the Leading Cities and feedback was provided. As a result of feedback from the first draft Monza re-wrote their SUTP and submitted a final draft in summer 2012. The revised Plan took into account the feedback and had a logical structure. It began by outlining its 5 high level aims:

- Offer to all people accessibility to public transport.
- Reduce negative impact of traffic to people's health and safety.
- Reduce noise, atmospheric pollution and energy consumption.
- Improve efficiency of the transport system.
- Improve the quality of the environment and of urban planning.

This was then followed by more detailed targets, for example a 10% reduction in congestion over 2-3 years, and an action plan, resource plan, and evaluation plan.

Following submission of the SUTP deliverable, the intention was to submit the Plan for formal approval by Monza Municipal Council. Once approved, the SUTP will be implemented through a series of Implementation Plans.

Usti nad Labem

The SUTP for Usti sought to tackle several issues as priorities. These were:

- The city is due to become fully connected to the D8 motorway, which links Prague to Dresden. This is anticipated to significantly increase traffic levels in the city.
- The city is an industrial centre in the region and a former base for a wide range of heavy industries, which has led to damage of the natural environment. Regeneration is therefore a priority.
- The city is a business centre and a cultural centre within the region, and has a university, resulting in a high population density.
- The surrounding countryside generates tourism and leisure trips, which need to be catered for.
- The growing economy and increasing level of motorisation in the Czech Republic generally has resulted in additional demands on the transport system.

Usti found gaining political support for their SUTP to be problematic, and as a result their SUTP was delayed. However, in September 2012 Usti was able to submit their first draft SUTP. The lack of political consensus did effect the quality of the document as many aspects were not able to gain approval.

Usti's SUTP has a strong background and baseline section based on a number of detailed studies, campaigns and initial implementations conducted as part of ARCHIMEDES. The document is informed by several citywide development strategies and high-level policies. These inputs are used to identify 8 high-level transport objectives for the city;

- Improve conditions for motor transport.
- Improve the urban environment.
- Support development of cycle transport.
- Support use of road-based public transport.
- Improve conditions for pedestrians.
- Support use of railway transport.
- Support use of water transport.
- Ensure sustainability of transport development in the city.

Following on from these high level objectives, the report looks at the current state of transport in the city, providing a baseline with which to inform actions and monitor progress. The baseline was inputted into a transport model and used to project how congestion will affect the city in future years. The results of this model helped to develop the Plan's actions.

The second major part of the document is the Action Plan. This is divided up into 11 plans for separate elements, for example actions for mobility improvements and actions for city logistics. Although the structure works well there are a number of areas in which the Action Plan could improve:

- More detail on each action would be helpful, and would help create the link between the objectives and the actions.
- Detail about how an action would be carried out, by whom and at what cost.

Unfortunately, as mentioned previously, Usti struggled to obtain full political approval for their SUTP and it is possible that both issues identified above are related to this. Development of the Action Plan in particular was difficult for Usti as resources were not allocated politically.

Moving forward Usti plans to continue development of its SUTP in conjunction with their politicians. The objective will be for the SUTP to receive formal political approval and resources allocated to the Action Plan.

The benefits of the process

For the Learning Cities the SUTP principle for planning transport infrastructure was entirely new and involved a very different way of working. This task's objective was to provide support to the Learning Cities in order for them to understand the principles of SUTPs and to apply them to their own cities. The approach taken was to separate the theoretical aspect from the practical aspect, and this appears to have worked well.

The first stage of the task was to introduce the basic principles of SUTPs to the Learning Cities. These principles are applicable to any setting and therefore were delivered in a group format with a series of presentations on relevant topics. Feedback for these workshops was positive in terms of content and the opportunity to have a discussion of their own preparations.

Following completion of the basic principles element of the task, support changed to a more tailored approach. It was at this point that the cities began using the knowledge gained from the theory workshops to start drafting their own SUTPs. Group sessions were felt to be less effective during this stage as the requirements of the Learning Cities became more specific and detailed.

The approach taken by this task has mirrored the stage of development of the Learning Cities' SUTPs, ensuring that support remained relevant throughout. This has been reflected in the positive feedback from the Learning Cities. The outcome of the task has been two draft SUTPs with clear structures and aims. Although Usti has not achieved political approval yet, they have made good progress in identifying the issues, engaging with stakeholders and preparing a SUTP.

4.4 Problems Identified

The first draft produced by Monza had several issues, in particular:

- The structure could be improved. A clearer definition of the background, objectives, actions, and impacts was necessary.

- There was too heavy an emphasis on future development demands, targets, and projections. Although these elements are important for an SUTP they need to lead into objectives and actions. The first draft did not provide an adequate Action Plan.

Usti found gaining political support for their SUTP to be problematic and as a result their SUTP deliverable was delayed. However, in September 2012 Usti were able to submit their first draft SUTP. A lack of political consensus affected the quality of the document as many aspects were not able to gain approval.

4.5 Mitigating Activities

The review and advisory processes put in place to support the Learning Cities meant that issues with Monza's first draft were identified and responded to by the Leading Cities and the Technical Manager. Monza made necessary changes to their Plan.

Usti experienced political issues throughout the process. The first phase of the task, which focussed on providing guidance on the theory of SUTP development, covered the skills required to gain political approval and the Leading Cities provided guidance during later stages. Although the political issues were never fully resolved Usti were able to manage the situation and it is hoped that formal political approval will follow in the near future.

4.7 Future Plans

Both Monza and Usti plan to continue development of their SUTPs in order to gain political approval, and then move on to implementation.

Annex 1 SUTP Workshop Notes October 2009

SUSTAINABLE URBAN TRANSPORT PLAN (SUTP) WORKSHOP

Date: 2 nd October 2009, 1000-1200. Thistle Hotel, Kings Road, Brighton	
Participants	Organisation / City
Sarah Clifford (workshop leader)	Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR)
Kirsty Torode (workshop assistant)	Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR)
Gustav Friis	Aalborg
Ole Jensen	Aalborg
Carmen Gherca	Iasi
Cristian Stoica	Iasi
Paolo Confalonieri	Monza
Melissa Saleri	Monza
Maarten van Bemmelen	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Isabela Velazquez	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Leire Aguirre	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Lenka Chalupova	Usti nad Labem
Katerina Oktabcova	Usti nad Labem
Viola Kralova	Usti nad Labem

Items
<p><u>Introduction by Sarah Clifford, Workshop Leader, TTR</u></p> <p>SC explained that the main aim of the workshop was to receive an update from all partners on the development of their SUTPs to establish a starting point. The workshop was also to identify the future Training and Learning requirements of the cities. (This second action relates to Usti and Monza in particular who are in the process of developing SUTPs). SC gave an overview of the planned agenda for the workshop and asked everyone to complete and return the workshop evaluation forms at the end. The agenda outline was:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brief introductory presentation about SUTPs and guidance documents available (TTR) 2. Brief presentations on SUTPs from some cities (DSS, Usti, Moza and Brighton & Hove) 3. User needs workshop discussion – to identify future training topics and future training activities <p><u>Introductory Presentation: Sarah Clifford, TTR</u></p> <p>SC gave an introductory presentations which gave a general overview of SUTP and covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of SUTPs

- Why SUTPs are needed
- The Policy Framework and regulations affecting SUTPs
- SUTP – aims, scope and approach
- SUTP implementation – the basic elements of an SUTP, the PILOT tasks and Missions
- SUTP guidance – PILOT, GUIDEMAPS and EC Preparatory document (links to these documents are included below).

Guidemaps (http://www.civitas-initiative.org/cms_pages.phtml?id=349&lan=en)

PILOT Guidance for stakeholders - Manual for putting SUTP into practice (2007 for EC DGENV) (<http://www.rupprecht-consult.de/projects/pilot.html>)

EC SUTPs Preparatory Document - follow-up of the Thematic Strategy on the Urban Environment (25/9/07)
(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/urban/pdf/transport/2007_sutp_prepdoc.pdf)

Annex to EC SUTPs Preparatory Document:
(http://ec.europa.eu/environment/urban/pdf/transport/2007_sutp_prepdoc.pdf)

SUTP Presentation: Maarten van Bemmelen, DSS

MvB provided delegates with an SUTP brochure that was produced for the general public and an English summary of the DSS SUTP.

MvB then gave a brief overview of the DSS SUTP which runs from 2008-2024. The key points from his presentation are summarised below.

- The SUTP is in the first year of implementation and incorporates previous plans and measures already implemented, plus solutions to current problems. This process began in the late 1980s / early 1990s.
- The SUTP covers topics not usually covered by transport plans including social integration and other less common goals.
- The SUTP includes goals, policies, working areas, objectives and expected results.
- The SUTP was approved Sept 2008 but reporting has not begun yet.
- Progress reports are due to be produced every year. These refer directly to the set of indicators included in the SUTP.
- Participatory Process – There is a ‘Mobility Advisor Council’ which is made up of various stakeholders including the City Mayor, public transport companies, chamber of commerce, local police and community groups etc. The Mobility Advisor Council has provided feedback on the initial draft of the SUTP.

Question: One of the difficulties we face in Monza is identifying who has to approve the plan. In Italy for example the City Council is required to approve plans. Someone needs to facilitate this process. It is very important that we share experiences of completing SUTPs. The issue is how to import DSS’s framework to fit Monza’s political structure.

Response: As there were already many different plans which have been incorporated into the SUTP, it was straightforward to involve these various stakeholders during the process. The mobility / sustainability achievements in DSS are one of the city’s success stories and the Mayor has been key in achieving this.

The Mayor has been very involved in the process.

SUTP Presentation: Katerina Oktabcova, Usti nad Labem

KO gave an overview of the current transport situation in Usti Nad Labem. She explained that Usti will be drafting their SUTP. In preparation for the deadline of 2012 a number of audits and studies have already been carried out (e.g.: parking audit, safety audit etc) so Usti has the start of a baseline for SUTP development. Key points from her presentation are summarised below:

Two of the key transportation issues for the city are the large factories and the need for road infrastructure developments.

The main motivations for developing a transport plan are to improve safety, improve quality of life in the city, reduce CO₂ emissions, increase walking and cycling, eliminate transit traffic through the city and residential areas and improve the current road infrastructure which is insufficient. Usti also has plans to introduce cycle routes.

The SUTP team has identified the key work areas:

1. Improving existing road infrastructure
2. Safety Audit – identifying black spots
3. Parking in residential areas: a lot of problems with drivers not obeying parking restrictions.
4. Improving public transport
 - vehicles are old
 - integration of modes – currently insufficient
 - bus stations need upgrading
 - Need a good public transport priority system
 - make the infrastructure more appealing to maintain and increase usage
5. Railway network – assessments have been carried out
6. Inland water navigation – have identified a need to build dams and sluices
7. Cycle infrastructure improvements
 - not enough people cycle
 - current infrastructure is not sufficient as the roads are not currently equipped for cyclists
 - - need to promote existing lanes more effectively
8. Pedestrian routes
 - - there are not enough routes
 - - most routes are in a bad condition.

SUTP Presentation: Paolo Confalonieri, Monza

PC gave an overview of the current situation in Monza. Key points from his presentation are summarised below:

- Monza is close to Milan, which impacts heavily on Monza's transportation systems and issues.
- This area of Italy is very densely populated, from Milan through Monza and northwards. There is a large walled park to the north of the city; which is a good natural resource but does impact on transport planning etc. There is a historical

centre and some good pedestrian routes. There is already some good cycling infrastructure in place.

- Current railway lines are concentrated on Milan (Milan only has 1 central station, therefore good interchange for connections to surrounding cities). There are good links between Monza and Milan (a train every 7-8 mins).
- There are some issues regarding the public transport network in Monza. There are also Urban road network issues with many cars on the outer ring roads trying to avoid the city centre.

Political / Planning structure

PC explained that there are currently 3 planning levels:

1. **PGTU** – General Urban Traffic Plan (2 year short term plan). The PGTU covers parking, public transport, street safety and soft mobility. This plan is written and consultation has commenced. Approval is expected in 8 months to 1 year. The plan will be adopted by the City Government, then citizens will be consulted and following this consultation, the definitive version of the plan will be adopted. The content of the current PGTU is a good starting point for the SUTP. **If the PGTU is approved this will provide the ground work for the city's SUTP.**

2. **PUM** – Urban Mobility Plan – a more strategic plan based on the current mobility infrastructures as depicted by the PGT (although this has not yet been fulfilled in Monza)

3. **PGT** – General Territorial Planning – defining urban development of the city in medium terms (5yrs)

Question: If you have 2 overlapping plans (PGTU and SUTP) will it be possible to combine them?

Answer: (Monza) Yes we intend to combine the two plans.

Discussion: A successful SUTP needs to include indicators. The Learning cities will need to incorporate robust indicators into their plans.

SUTP Presentation, Sarah Clifford, Brighton & Hove LTP

On behalf of Brighton & Hove, SC gave a brief overview of the Brighton & Hove LTP. Key points are summarised below:

- Brighton & Hove are currently midway through Local Transport Plan 2. (In the UK, LTP1 ran from 2000/01 – 2005/06 and LTP2 from 2006 to 2011)
- LTP2 was prepared in consultation with stakeholders and a progress report was produced in 2008
- There are links between the LTP and other policies such as the 2008 Air Quality Action Plan, the Local Area Agreement, The South East Plan and the Sustainable Community Strategy.
- Brighton & Hove are currently undergoing the process for the development of LTP3

Hard copies of the (full and summary versions) Brighton Local Transport Plan 2 were

circulated to attendees.

Summary: Iasi's SUTP

CS confirmed that the SUTP is still at draft stage; however the city is now implementing some measures. At present the SUTP is a Public Transport plan for the city and the team is now looking at linking the metropolitan area and the city.

Following the presentations, English copies / summaries of SUTPs in Brighton & Hove and DSS Lead cities were circulated. It was discussed and agreed that it would also be useful for the other Lead Cities to provide a summary of their SUTP contents in English (or the contents page of their SUTPs). (Monza expressed particular interest in knowing the content that has already been approved by the relevant planning bodies in each city). **ACTION: Aalborg and Iasi to provide English summaries / contents page of their SUTPs.**

Workshop discussion – User Needs Roundtable

The purpose of the workshop discussion / User Needs Roundtable was to identify and prioritise training topics and activities for the remaining workshop sessions.

Training Topics

Prioritised for the learner cities:

Workshop topic 1 - Gaining political support (Monza)

This is a key issue identified by Monza – how to transfer the structure from the Lead cities and fit it to the political system in Italy. It was agreed that this topic would be covered at the next workshop. (Following the workshop, it was discussed and agreed with B&HCC that a site visit could be arranged to B&HCC as they are currently trying to gain political support for their third Local Transport Plan (SUTP) **ACTION: organise site visit to Brighton)**

Workshop topic 2(a) - Stakeholder involvement It was felt that learning cities would be particularly interested to hear about the experiences of gaining stakeholder support in Aalborg.

Workshop topic 2(b) - Citizen involvement, There was particular interest in the methods used for citizen involvement such as workshops etc

- DSS already have experience of this and could share their experiences with learner cities.
- Aalborg commented that they could have done more to involve citizens in their SUTP process and would therefore benefit from a workshop session covering this topic.

Workshop topic 3 - Promotion and marketing – Aalborg commented that they would also like to learn more about this aspect of SUTP

Other possible workshop topics discussed were:

1. Social inclusion / gender equity

- DSS have experience of this that they can share.

2. Target setting

- This would be beneficial to the Learner Cities. For example Usti are currently identifying and setting their baselines; they have not set specific targets yet.

It was agreed that at all future workshops, it would be useful for each city to provide a 'road map' update on progress towards their SUTP. This would be particularly relevant for the Learner Cities. **ACTION: ALL**

Future Training Activities

Once the future training topics had been discussed, ideas and suggestions for future training activities were discussed:

Staff exchanges – *this was discussed however it was agreed that generally due to language barriers, site visits would be more useful and more practical.*

- Gustav Friis (Aalborg) has previously been involved in staff exchanges, for example during the MIDAS project. He suggested that a lesson learned from this experience was that staff exchanges need to be more integrated into the day to day work of the host organisation. He added that 2 to 3 days would be about the right amount of time for a staff exchange. Other key lessons learned from this experience were:
 - Important to identify what the participant wants to learn.
 - Important to find a work team that is similar to the road map the Learner City has in mind / needs to use.
 - Language barrier needs to be taken into account. Option: Ensure there is always an English speaker present in the non-English speaking countries.
 - Usti are particularly interested in staff exchanges.

Site visits – *it was agreed that site visits would be more useful and more practical than staff exchanges*

- May be easier than exchanges due to language barrier.
- First site visit could be to Brighton (see previous notes)

On-line discussion forum / Q&A forum – *this was discussed and agreed that it might be appropriate further down the line once the learner cities had started to develop their SUTPs*

- Discussion - do Lead cities have enough resources to provide regular answers to emailed and telephone conversations?

Buddy system – The idea of setting up a 'Buddy System' was discussed. One person is identified who learners can ring to ask questions of (maybe at Brighton?). This was a popular suggestion, however there was then a question about resources available at Lead Cities to support this.

Annex 2 SUTP Workshop Notes May 2010

SUSTAINABLE URBAN TRANSPORT PLAN (SUTP) WORKSHOP

Date: 5 th May 2010, 16.45-18.15. Vladimir Hotel, Usti nad labem	
Participants	Organisation / City
Sarah Clifford (workshop leader)	Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR)
Alan Lewis (workshop assistant)	Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR)
Gustav Friis	Aalborg
Simonetta Vittoria	Monza
Alberto Feroldi	Monza
Carmen Gherca	Iasi
Manuel Coniac	Iasi
Razvan Petrescu	Iasi
Isabela Velazquez	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Leire Aguirre	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Andres Martinez	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Viola Kralova	Usti nad Labem
David Grajovsky	Usti nad Labem
Jiri Landa	Usti nad Labem
Pavel Suntych	Usti nad Labem
Tom Campbell	Brighton & Hove
Olivia Cahn	EPC
Marjan Frederix	VANGUARD

Introduction by Sarah Clifford, Workshop Leader, TTR

SC recapped the content and outcome of the first SUTP workshop held in Brighton in October 2009.

3 priority topics were identified as being important for future discussion, namely:

4. Stakeholder and Citizen Involvement
5. Gaining Political Support
6. Promotion and Marketing

On this basis the agenda for this meeting was set as follows:

- Introductory presentation - background to Stakeholder and Citizen Involvement and summary of VANGUARD workshop update (TTR)
- Presentations from Cities (Aalborg, Donostia San Sebastian Brighton & Hove and Usti nad labem)
- User Needs Roundtable and discussion

Introductory Presentation: Sarah Clifford, TTR

SC gave an introductory presentation which referred to the origins of SUTPs and in particular the work conducted in the PILOT and GUIDEMAPS on the topic of this workshop: Stakeholder and Citizen Involvement.

SUTPs originated in the PILOT project and that project produced detailed guidance for stakeholder engagement as part of its annual for putting SUTP into practice, which is available at: (<http://www.rupprecht-consult.de/projects/pilot.html>)

This was based around 5 tasks and 10 parallel missions (preparatory and accompanying activities that are crucial for the success of the SUTP process), 2 of which are directly relevant “citizen participation” and “stakeholder involvement”.

Citizen participation comprised:

- Ensure citizen participation in all stages of the SUTP process
- Consider the needs and participation capacity of different citizen groups
- Provide sufficient and transparent information on SUTP in order to enable informed participation and to avoid negative perceptions (“secrecy” and corporatism)
- Implement follow-up mechanism to ensure that the citizen’s messages are “taken on board”
- Consider different participation tools and techniques and select the most suitable ones for your local context

Stakeholder involvement comprised:

- Ensure a sound identification of all SUTP stakeholders and involve them in all stages of the SUTP process
- Take into account the different interests, resources and capacities of stakeholders
- Provide sufficient and transparent information on SUTP in order to enable informed stakeholder involvement and to avoid negative perceptions (“secrecy” and corporatism)
- Implement follow-up mechanism to ensure that stakeholders’ requirements are “taken on

board”

- Consider different involvement tools and techniques and select the most suitable ones for your local context

The 1st CIVITAS VANGUARD Training event, held on 18/19 Nov '09 in Ghent (in cooperation with CIVITAS ELAN), covered:

- successful transport decision making,
- stakeholder consultation,
- engagement processes to support CIVITAS Plus cities.

It provided:

- theoretical background,
- management and involvement tools,
- case studies and good practice examples

The key focus covered the 5 key questions of:

- What?
- Why?
- When?
- Who?
- How?
- As well as looking at the challenges faced by the process.

The presentations are available on the CIVITAS website at the following address:

http://www.civitas.eu/downloadcenter.phtml?top=602&s_topic=600&rows=17

Additional information is available from the Guidemaps project on this topic at:

http://www.civitas-initiative.org/cms_pages.phtml?id=349&lan=en

Site Presentation: Gustav Friis, Aalborg

Gustav began by pointing out that the process in Aalborg has not been based on any guidebooks. They use 2 separate techniques, public participation and stakeholder involvement, in different ways.

Public participation is used at 2 stages in the formal 4 year cycle of the SUTP planning process in Denmark: an initial debate about the potential contents of the plan and then a formal consultation on the draft plan prior to implementation.

This has involved a range of techniques including public meetings that provide a qualitative input and then a telephone survey to gauge the opinions of a larger number of people, which provides the municipality to assess the combined importance and satisfaction with the various measures.

Important	22,5%	24,3%	31,0%
Neutral	2,3%	4,4%	4,2%
Not important	5,6%	2,3%	3,3%
	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied

There were various plans in development at the same time and they were able to use common public meetings to gain opinions on all the plans for efficiency and consistency on a wide range of topics.

When it came to stakeholder involvement GF used the example of ARCHIMEDES measure 63 – the environmental zone. Because they were aiming to implement a voluntary scheme a good level of stakeholder participation was essential and in order to achieve this they used a series of frequent, well organised meetings with the key stakeholders so that they accepted the measure as ultimately implemented. This helped the way in which the measure was implemented by the municipality.

Site Presentation: Isabella Velasquez, Donostia San Sebastian

The SUTP in Donostia San Sebastian is a synthesis plan, with various individual components comprising the full plan. It involves a 3 phase process with participation at each stage.

The local public transport system is a hot topic for the local press, with frequent public comment on problems and suggested improvements.

There is a strong tradition of public participation in Donostia San Sebastian which has helped the process in relation to the SUTP. This allowed the use of a lot of separate, targeted communications strands, with a particular focus on not just relying on the internet as a communication medium.

Efforts were made to engage with those who do not normally get involved (because it is often the same people who get involved again and again on different topics and by different means).

IV gave several examples of ARCHIMEDES measures for which public participation and stakeholder engagement were important, including:

- Safety measures 46 / 47 where the newly constituted road safety pact was developed through a heavily consultative process
- Measure 33 – commuter travel plans, which requires participation from stakeholder businesses

Site Presentation: Tom Campbell, Brighton & Hove

TC used the example of the innovative personal travel planning to show how they used

modern social marketing techniques to supplement the traditional doorstep interviews in a complementary manner.

Research has confirmed the traditional notion that what is important is to get over a message about what is in it for them (or possibly the local community).

This has targeted the top of the social chain through the use of community groups for the traditional route and Twitter for those who are open to the use of newer means. This is based around identifying the people and means that have the greatest influence as a way to engage change.

Monitoring via face to face questionnaires on travel behaviour is difficult because it requires a large sample size to gain accurate (statistically significant) results. Monitoring the success of this type of initiative involves a review of materials, numbers of followers and qualitative / anecdotal results.

Site Presentation: Jiri Landa, Usti nad Labem

JL provided an update on the progress of the SUTP process in Usti. It is being written in parallel to the overall city masterplan that is currently in the concept phase. This is being helped by the fact that many of the ARCHIMEDES measures are in support of the SUTP.

Summary

A range of strategies was seen to have been used in each city that presented their experiences, chosen according to what is believed to be most appropriate in each local situation. Overall there appears to be success in these cases.

However, ongoing concerns were raised by the representatives from Iasi about the difficulty that they have in engaging with businesses as stakeholders in producing their new freight distribution strategy.

The response from those who have experience in these issues was to address specific problems relevant to the businesses in question and, again, explain the benefits to them.

Future SUTP Training Activities

Following a discussion of the experiences in Monza, where the GUTP and SUTP had become a political weapon for the minority with 1400 detailed amendments proposed, it was confirmed that "Gaining Political Support" would be the main focus at the next SUTP training session.

In relation to this there was some desire to try to involve politicians directly in the discussion, and potentially to go back to some business stakeholders and also ask them to participate directly in the training event.

In terms of the SUTP process then it was suggested that each site could produce a roadmap for its own SUTP at the next meeting.

Annex 3 SUTP Workshop Notes October 2010

SUSTAINABLE URBAN TRANSPORT PLAN (SUTP) WORKSHOP

Date: Thursday 28 th October 2010, 09.00 to 11.15am. Donostia San Sebastian	
Participants	Organisation / City
Sarah Clifford (workshop leader)	Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR)
Alan Lewis (workshop assistant)	Transport & Travel Research Ltd (TTR)
Gustav Friis	Aalborg
Simonetta Vittoria	Monza
Alfonso Sanz	GEA21
Aivard Martinez	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Andres Martinez	Donostia San Sebastian (DSS)
Dalibor Darilek	Usti nad Labem
Jana Nova	Usti nad Labem
Jiri Landa	Usti nad Labem

Introduction by Sarah Clifford, Workshop Leader, TTR

SC recapped the content and outcome of the two previous SUTP workshops held in Brighton in October 2009 and in Usti nad Labem in May 2010.

She explained that at the Brighton & Hove workshop, 3 priority topics were identified as being important for future discussion, namely:

7. Stakeholder and Citizen Involvement (covered in Usti nad Labem)
8. Gaining Political Support (to be covered in Donostia San Sebastian)
9. Promotion and Marketing

She recapped some of the key points discussed at the workshop in Usti nad Labem and then set the agenda for this workshop as follows:

1. Introductory Presentation - Background to gaining political support – TTR
2. Breakout discussion sessions on issues and solutions (all)
3. Feedback from breakout sessions
4. Brief presentations from all partners on their SUTP roadmaps (all)
5. Discussion about possible future workshop topics (all)

1. Introductory Presentation: Sarah Clifford, TTR

SC started by saying that more information is available from the Guidemaps Handbook for successful transport decision-making available at: (http://www.civitas-initiative.org/cms_pages.phtml?id=349&lan=en). It contains more information about gaining political support through institutional marketing and working with elected officials.

SC gave an introductory presentation which highlighted the importance of gaining political support for SUTP and outlined some of the reasons why there is sometimes a lack of political support. For example;

- politicians doubt that the SUTP / measures will have an impact;
- politicians doubt that the SUTP will be accepted by citizens or stakeholders
- politicians have wrong or insufficiently informed viewpoints

She went on to explain that one way of increasing political support for projects and SUTP was to introduce an Institutional Marketing (IM) Strategy. She gave more information about IM Strategies. Below is a summary of the key points raised in the presentation:

- **Project Champion** – it is useful to find a politician who is keen to support the SUTP / project and who is willing to act as the Project Champion
- **Other policy areas** – highlighting synergies with other policy areas such as health, environment and climate change can help to increase political support for SUTP / policies
- **Examples** (from CIVITAS) – providing politicians with examples of other CIVITAS cities where similar policies have been introduced successfully can help to inspire politicians and to demonstrate the importance of political support
- **Study tours** – taking groups of politicians on study tours to cities where similar policies have been introduced successfully can help to gain political support
- **Media** – it is really important to get the media on board at the very early stages of the SUTP / project. Once the media is on board, it is much easier to gain political support.

- **Road safety** – policies and projects that claim to increase road safety are more likely to be supported by politicians
- **Public support** – if the general public supports a scheme or policy, it is more likely to gain the support of politicians. It helps to highlight public support (demonstrated through results of opinion polls etc) in IM material.
- **High profile events** – Cities that hosted high profile events in CIVITAS II found that following the event, it was easier to gain political support for their schemes and policies
- **Timing** – the timing of elections and any votes on projects / schemes should be taken into account when planning IM campaigns
- **Opposition** – it is important to involve politicians from the opposition in any IM campaigns as transport schemes often spread over more than one political term.

2. Breakout discussions / 3. Feedback from breakout sessions

The group was split into two smaller groups for the 45 minute breakout session. One discussion group was led by Alan Lewis and one discussion group was led by Sarah Clifford. Each group discussed the following points:

- Issues with SUTP implementation
- Lack of political support
- Solutions to lack of political support (and consider an action plan for gaining political support)

The discussion group leaders then provided feedback to the group.

Group 1

- **Issues with SUTP implementation** – issues discussed were:
 - In Usti nad Labem, planned activities include introducing parking fees and limiting access to the city centre. Once announced, these activities will get a negative reaction from the public and politicians.
 - In Donostia San Sebastian, there was initial public and political opposition to the pedestrianisation of areas and the introduction of cycle routes. However now that these measures are in place, the general public and politicians are very supportive of them.
 - In Spain generally, the planning system causes problems as there is insufficient time and insufficient budget to allow liaison with the opposition. Also, the opposition almost always objects to any planning proposals.
 - In Aalborg, the Alderman was and is still very supportive of the SUTP and the SUTP measures.
- **Lack of political support** – issues discussed were:
 - In Usti nad Labem (as in most cities) budgets have been cut significantly which causes problems with implementation of SUTP
 - In Aalborg approval of politicians is always needed, but the politicians are generally supportive.
 - In Donostia San Sebastian, the time between elections is always problematic for gaining political support
- **Solutions to lack of political support** – issues discussed were:
 - Usti nad Labem will hold meetings with all politicians, including the opposition politicians. At these meetings they will discuss; why the policies are being introduced and what is

acceptable to politicians. They intend to highlight the safety, noise and clean air benefits of the policies.

- Usti nad Labem will also consider taking politicians to visit other CIVITAS cities where similar policies have been successfully introduced.
- Usti nad Labem is also gathering public views on the various schemes through a Facebook site and an online discussion forum.
- Elections in Usti nad Labem are every two years, following the recent elections, it is confirmed that the Mayor is not changing.
- In Donostia San Sebastian, it was suggested that the solution to gaining more political support would be to have more time available and more money available. This would then enable more liaison with politicians – from both the main party and the opposition.

Group 2

- **Issues discussed were:**

In Monza, there are issues with the GUTP – it is a complex process. The GUTP was not adopted due to political delays and eventually Monza started the SUTP anyway. The SUTP is not mandatory. In Monza there are 3 levels of planning by law;

- Urban Planning
- Mobility Urban Plan (includes infrastructure)
- GUTP (Short term)

In Monza the political agreement period is longer than that needed for other policies. The person who is responsible for the SUTP is also responsible for a number of other areas too.

The perception in Monza is that sustainable mobility is left wing and that enterprise is more oriented to the private car. Railways have been the focus in the Lombardy region and buses at the more local Province level (this contract is fixed until 2014, which makes it difficult for the city administration to make changes without incurring significant additional cost).

In Monza the starting point is the urban management plan. The territorial plan is being used as a political weapon.

In Usti transport has a lower priority than the general urban plan for the area. Transport changes have sometimes had to be introduced before consultation / studies have taken place. An open public discussion was held but this focussed on land and communications rather than transport.

In Usti, politicians are more interested in other issues and there is less political involvement than in the UK, for example there is no politician specifically allocated to transport (or other key functions) because they all tend to focus on the key issue of economic development. There is a lack of integrated planning and with the extra cost of transport, transport issues are often dropped. (There is, therefore, a lack of provision)

In Usti, there is not much (opportunity for) cycling, and the focus for the SUTP is on buses and trolley buses.

General issues discussed by the group include:

- There is a mismatch of decision making structure in Monza
- There is no political focus on transport policies in Usti, whereas in Monza the political focus is split.
- Legislation is less in support of SUTP. Therefore more emphasis is needed on the

other benefits.

- Elections are always a problem – in Monza the urban plan is used as a political weapon between parties
- The aim could be to try to get continuity and agree a compromise SUTP as a first step rather than have nothing
- It was generally agreed that there should be more emphasis on other benefits that would support, and tie in the benefits of, the SUTP eg: health etc.
- The group wanted to discuss communications but ran out of time.

4. SUTP Roadmap presentations from partners

SUTP Roadmap presentation: Gustav Friis, Aalborg

The current SUTP in Aalborg is the 2009 SUTP. The SUTP is renewed every 4 years but each SUTP has a 12 year timescale.

GF provided a contents list of the current SUTP:

- Preface; Traffic situation; Road Structure; Traffic Safety; Bicycling; Urban life on foot; Parking; Public Transport; Air quality; Traffic Noise; City Logistics; Traffic Management and ITS and Conclusions

He explained that the SUTP is made up of a number of Action Plans including the Traffic Safety Plan; the Cycling Action Plan; the Parking Action Plan; the Traffic Noise Action Plan and the Parking Strategy.

He then outlined the objectives of the SUTP which are to:

- Increase sustainable transport modes with focus on accessibility, environment and health
- Balance the need for increased mobility and the wish to minimise negative traffic impacts
- Ensure good local and regional accessibility and availability
- Contribute to regional and national transport sustainability with the help of local initiatives

He outlined the nine focus areas of the SUTP 2009; Overall road structure; traffic safety; cyclists; pedestrians; parking; public transport; traffic environment (air quality and noise); heavy goods transport; traffic management and ITS.

He talked about the future SUTP plans for Aalborg which are:

- Aalborg municipality has just started working on the Mobility Plan, which will replace the SUTP 2009 (A strategic decision was made to change the name of the SUTP to 'Mobility Plan' instead)
- The new 'Mobility Plan' is being drafted at the moment and is due to be implemented in 2013.
- The Mobility Plan will have – compared to the SUTP 2009 – a stronger focus on overall strategy and visions for sustainable mobility on a higher level
- Furthermore, more specific areas will be included as specific action plans on a lower level

SUTP Roadmap presentation: Simonetta Vittoria, Monza

SV started by explaining that there are two planning levels for a city like Monza:

- UMP – Urban Management Plan, defining urban development of the city in medium terms (5yrs)

- GUTP – General Urban Traffic Plan, short term plan (2 yrs) concerning the current mobility situation (Parking policies, One-Way implementation for primary roads, creation or suppression of Traffic Light systems for primary road network, Creation of Reserved Bus Lanes...). She added that the GUTP only lasts 2 years and it is difficult to get approval within a political term.

She explained that planning of public transport is split; the railway service is managed by Regione Lombardia following the example of German S-Bahn and Paris RER systems and the bus services are managed by the Province according to a short term (3yrs) Master Plan.

SV explained the main goals of the Monza GUTP draft which are:

- To rationalise usage of existing parking places
- To encourage use of public transport
- To enhance street safety conditions
- To support soft mobility modes
- To contain acoustic and environmental pollution

She explained the procedures for GUTP approval as follows:

- Presentation of the draft to the city (associations, citizens, stakeholders)
- Adoption by the City Government
- Publication of the plan and collection of citizens' comments
- Adoption of the definitive version
- Enrolment in the City Council agenda for discussion (Councillors can present amendments)
- Final approval

She then presented the SUTP Roadmap for Monza and summarised the SUTP objectives:

- **ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION** - PM10, NOx, benzene: technological improvements in vehicles to eliminate limits being exceeded / CO₂ minimum reduction of 20% with the objective of 30%;
- **ENERGY CONSUMPTION** - Minimum reduction of 20% with the objective of 30%
- **NOISE** - One class change with 5 dB(A) reduction
- **TRAFFIC** - Minimum reduction of 5% of vehicle-km with the objective of 15% which may be reduced to 0% and 10% with an increase of 10% of the average speed (congestion reduction) in order to achieve the CO₂ reduction objectives
- **SAFETY** - 50% reduction in road victims by 2020
- **PUBLIC TRANSPORT** - Modal split increase to satisfy travel demand transferred from private vehicles (although SV added that because of financial constraints public transport services will shortly be reduced but fares will be increased).

SUTP Roadmap presentation: Jiri Landa, Usti nad Labem

JL started off by explaining that the motivations for SUTP in Usti are; transport safety and quality of life; reduction of CO₂, dust and noise emissions and promoting active transportation

(walking and cycling). He explained that if it was not for ARCHIMEDES, the SUTP would be delayed. There is no legal duty to have an SUTP in Usti. The SUTP will be valid for 15 years. There are separate action plans for the separate areas of the SUTP.

- He presented the future SUTP milestones and explained that Ing. Viola Králová, DiS (task leader) and Ing. Jiří Landa were the responsible persons. The milestones are:
 - 2011 – all themes shall be proposed in variants for political approval
 - 2011 – 2012 – selection of final variant – political approval
 - 2010 – 2011 Mobility campaign
 - August 2012 – final version SUTP in Ústí nad Labem
- He gave an update on the current situation:
 - UNL Master Plan stage is the approved concept
 - Teams for Master Plan and SUTP are in close cooperation
 - SUTP Target: to be statutory transport plan for the City for next 15 years (2025)
 - To integrate the Accessibility, Air Quality, Congestion Management, Road Safety and Quality of life.
- JL then presented the contents page of the Usti nad Labem SUTP as follows:
 1. Introduction
 2. Vision and targets for UNL
 3. Challenges and opportunities
 4. Existing situation
 5. SUTP objectives and policy
 6. Congestion treatment
 7. Traffic management
 8. Road Safety
 9. Accessibility
 10. Transport, healths and environment
 11. Maintenance
 12. Conclusions, recommendations, tables
 13. Appendixes and maps

He then provided some more detail about each of the transport schemes underway in Usti nad Labem (see slides for details).

5. Discussion about future workshop topics

There was a general discussion about future workshop topics. The following was agreed:

- **Marketing and Communications** – It was discussed and agreed that in line with previous discussions, marketing and communications is still a topic that would be useful for the group. The group expressed an interest in maintaining marketing and communications activities over the long term. It was also suggested that it would also be useful to cover marketing to politicians in this topic.
- **Financial issues** - Financial issues were also suggested as a potential topic for future workshops, in particular what proportion of the budget is used for public transport, other services and how much comes from subsidies.