



**Report on Task 15:
Identification of Barriers and Constraints**

Version of Report: Final
Date: 28 March 2001

PROJECT FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION UNDER THE ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME OF THE 5TH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

Preface

PROSPECTS (Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European City Transport Systems) is a project funded under the European Commission's Environment and Sustainable Development Programme. It is designed to provide cities with the guidance they need in order to generate optimal land use and transport strategies to meet the challenge of sustainability in their particular circumstances. The PROSPECTS consortium is led by ITS, University of Leeds and includes the partners TUW (Vienna), TOI (Oslo), KTH (Stockholm), UPM (Madrid) and VTT (Helsinki).

This note contains the report on task 15 of PROSPECTS, for which UPM has responsibility. It is not a part of the formal Deliverables of the project. The report was written by Prof. Andrés Monzón, José-Dionisio González and Dra. María López-Lambas. All PROSPECTS partners have contributed to the work on the task.

We would like to thank representatives of planning authorities, politicians and organisations in the six cities of Edinburgh, Vienna, Oslo, Stockholm, Madrid and Helsinki for their contribution during a series of interviews, and special thanks to Antonio García-Pastor, from the Madrid Regional Transport Consortium for his constant support and advice. The views expressed by the interviewed representatives have, however, been personal and do not necessarily reflect the standpoints of the cities.

Madrid, February 2001-02-20
UPM - Escuela de Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos
Transport Department

Andrés Monzón
Chief Research

Identification of Barriers and Constraints

Preface

Summary

1	Introduction	6
1.1.	Background	6
1.2.	Concept and types of barriers	6
1.3.	Methodological Approach.....	7
2	Legal Barriers and Constraints	7
3	Financial Barriers and Constraints	8
4	Political and Cultural Barriers and Constraints.....	9
5	Summary of Barriers	10
6	Policies to remove Barriers	10
	• Comprehensive Land use and Urban Transport Planning	10
	• A key role of local Administrations and Public Transport Authorities.....	11
	• The viability of pricing schemes.....	11
	• The role of the private sector.....	11
7.	Bibliography.....	12
	APPENDICES.....	13
	APPENDIX I: PROSPECTS Tasks 14/15 questionnaire.....	14
	APPENDIX II: PROSPECTS Task 15 tables	19
	APPENDIX III: PROSPECTS Nature of the Barriers. Summary	24
	APPENDIX IV: PROSPECTS How to deal with the Barriers? Summary ...	26

Summary

Task 15 report: Identification of Barriers and Constraints

PROSPECTS is an European project, funded under the European Commission's Environmental and Sustainable Development Programme, whose main objective is to provide cities with the guidance which they need in order to generate optimal land use and transport strategies to meet the challenge of sustainability in their particular circumstances.

The present report corresponds to task 15 of PROSPECTS, part of WP 10, whose aim is to identify the range of legal, fiscal, institutional and technological barriers, to implementation of policy options, since these barriers form important constraints upon the decision makers and upon modelling and optimisation processes.

For our purpose, we have categorised barriers and constraints in three groups:

- Legal
- Financial
- Political and cultural aspects

In order to identify each on of the above mentioned type of barriers, we have carried out two parallel activities: basically, a common survey along with task 14 -decision making process-, and a check list identifying specific barriers for each of the measures selected, and the ways to overcome them.

Finally, and based on the answers obtained from the questionnaires¹, we make some suggestions on policies with a view to overcoming the barriers.

A summary of the results from Task 15 can be found in PROSPECTS Deliverable 1 (Report on Workpackage 10. Cities' Decision- Making Requirements), available at:

http://www_iw.tuwien.ac.at/projects/prospects/html

The main and summarised conclusions are the following:

- Regarding legal barriers, we have found that land use options and pricing measures are specially rigid, basically due to legislation in the first case, and lack of political willingness in the second case.

¹ As Appendix 1, we include the Task 14/15 questionnaire sent to core cities.

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European
City Transport Systems

- With regard to financial barriers, in general terms we could say that the private sector is not involved in financing transport strategies and budgets are generally limited. Basically, only public finance is available for transport infrastructure investments, through local, regional or national taxes or allowances.
- Related to political barriers, we have found that the implementation process or transport/land use policy measures is generally slow, but depending on the size of the measures: the bigger, the slower.

Finally, we have considered some policies to remove barriers, among which we have pointed out the following:

- Comprehensive land use and urban transport planning
- To increase the role of local administrations and public transport authorities
- Development of urban road pricing schemes, which represent a unique opportunity to finance urban transport schemes
- The complementary role of the private sector in financing transport schemes.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

Once *trends and scenarios* (task 12) have been defined and the *policy options* (task 13) identified to foster a better integration of *land use and transport planning*, it is necessary to have a clear picture of the limits and setbacks that might arise from the implementation of these policy options, both in the medium and long term.

1.2. Concept and types of barriers

A barrier is an obstacle that prevents the coming-into-force of a particular measure, being liable at the same time for delays or difficulties stemming from their implementation. In both cases planning activities fail to achieve results within schedule, and therefore land use and transport measures might as well produce unexpected negative results.

Barriers can be of different types depending on the measure to be implemented. On the one hand, a barrier could be rigid or flexible. Infrastructure measures tend to face more rigid barriers than, say, the behavioural type.

Barriers can, on the other hand, be positive or negative. A positive barrier is bound to ease off the planning process –among them, environmental or public acceptance constraints, which could improve the measure or its performance. By contrast, a negative barrier, such as inadequate legislation, may cause delays and excess costs on the implementation of the measure.

When analysing the application and potential effect of a certain policy, it is vital to define which constraints may cause implementation problems. For the purpose of PROSPECTS, barriers have been grouped into three categories:

- **Legal:** distribution of competence among institutions and administrative bodies, legislation that restricts control over activities affecting land impacts or inhibiting the application of some policy measures, private sector involvement, enforcement of policies and constitutional mobility rights.
- **Financial:** taxes, fares and subsidies concerning transport and land use activities. Budget limitations for land use and transport measures and their co-ordination.
- **Political and cultural aspects:** priorities in the political agenda, public acceptability, activist groups for or against planning measures.

Results from the surveys in the core cities are reported in separate sections for each of these aspects.

1.3. Methodological Approach

Identification of barriers and constraints was carried out through two parallel activities. First, a common survey along with task 14 (see Appendix I) was conducted with 22 technical experts responsible for city planning in the 6 core cities. These results were supplemented by a check-list (see Appendix II) where respondents identified, firstly, specific barriers for each

of the selected measures, indicating whether they viewed them as rigid or flexible, and suggested ways to overcome them. Secondly, core cities representatives selected the top ten policy measures indicating their barriers and the way to overcome them.

2. Legal Barriers and Constraints

Land use options and *pricing measures* were pointed out in all the surveys as especially rigid legal constraints.

On the one hand, *development patterns*, *extra-value taxes* and *taxes on infrastructure* are the policies that are faced with these legal issues. The barriers are the extremely rigid legislation and the lack of an adequate legal framework. Proposals to overcome the constraint seem to favour the introduction of changes in the legislation coupled with broader and better consultation systems.

On the other hand, in relation with *pricing measures*, the main barriers are *national government policies on parking charges* and *road pricing*. Solutions proposed to overcome them are to develop appropriate legislation to allow taxation on private parking, to plan awareness campaigns (targeted to improve public acceptability of such measures and their legal enforcement), and finally the earmarking of revenues to a general public utility that could thus boost new initiatives (while avoiding lack of political willingness).

Due to lack of legislation in the field, *flexible working hours* and *company travel plans* are considered to have flexible constraints, since in-house information and awareness campaigns can actually overcome the above mentioned obstacles.

Most of the policies included in the group of *management measures* introduced to limit car use (*restriction&parking control*) must be introduced in a broader policy framework based on a clear political willingness to reach the goals and wide awareness campaigns for social acceptance.

Cycle lanes, *cycle parking* and *priorities* are viewed as key areas for enforcement (legislation and finding sponsors) in those countries where the bicycle is in general use. In other countries, like Spain, there is no legal problem because of the low share of cyclists.

Lorry routes and *bans* have already been discussed at European level, because they influence long distance freight road traffic. The legal constraint is still strong because it depends upon the process of transferring the EU Directives to the national legislative frameworks.

European recommendations also came out when dealing with the usual Environmental Impact Assessment process and the evaluation of different externalities. However, there appear to be considerable differences regarding application at national level. The lack of a common approach among countries is seen as a legal obstacle to achieve optimal solutions and to improve competitiveness among Regions.

Most cities regard legal constraints under the heading “flexible barrier”, except for Edinburgh, which owns up to a “rigid flexible type”. Also worth highlighting were the lack of legal constraints observed in the Helsinki case-study and the importance attached by Edinburgh to the public participation process in reducing legal constraints.

3. Financial Barriers and Constraints

All the policies evaluated here confront the problem of limited budgets. Basically, only public finance is available for transport infrastructure investments charging local, regional or national budgets. There is also the possibility of using municipal taxes (parking revenues), state allowances, state transfers or funds and loans. An adequate enforcement of the legislation could allow the application of taxes. It could also boost more subsidies and draw new investors.

Generally speaking, the private sector is not involved in financing sectors of the transport strategy. There are, however, some cases in which the private initiative is starting to play an important role, but these methods are still in the first stage.

In this line, there are experiences in Vienna, where the proceeds from public *parking areas* are earmarked to subsidise the construction of parking garages and public transport. In Oslo, rail fares are constrained by the national *rail fare system* of the National Rail Company and PT companies are required to take full responsibility for cost overruns.

The survey also underlines that new investments are much more valued than maintenance and exploitation operations, because the public is less likely to perceive the latter.

Both *infrastructure* and *management measures* are faced with land and budget availability constraints in all the cities and for all the modes (*PT, private cars, cycle, pedestrian and freight*), even when subsidies are applied to both public and privately operated modes.

Policies related to *information provision* such as *real time driver information systems, variable message signals, route guidance*, etc. are also restrained by budget availability.

Attitudinal and behavioural measures were not mentioned at all in any interview when dealing with financial aspects.

The different cities pointed to budget availability, appropriate use of revenues and political willingness as the main issues to be addressed in the treatment of barriers. By contrast, Stockholm paid more attention to the existence of legal aspects.

Once again, Edinburgh focuses on the public participation process. In addition to the policies evaluated in task 13, Edinburgh also underscored the importance of budget resources for staff as another rigid financial constraint.

There are other setbacks, such as fuel taxes, operating as rigid barrier as reported in Oslo and Stockholm.

4. Political and Cultural Barriers and Constraints

There are deep gaps in attitudes and priorities between the political parties. Left wing and centrist parties are normally more willing to accept public transport, while the rest of the somewhat more conservative factions appear to be more supportive of private car use.

The implementation process of transport/land use policy measures is, in general, slow, but depends on the size of the measures (the bigger, the slower), political willingness and other aspects that could speed up -or not- the process. Those measures that somehow reduce the

number of options to the users are seen as more aggressive and therefore should be reinforced with awareness campaigns.

Most cities agreed that land use and transportation planning were not considered very important issues in municipal election campaigns. However, transport planning is gaining foothold and the spotlight of public awareness during the past few years. Politicians are not expected to possess specific technical knowledge, but management skills are highly valued and they usually take professionals' advice.

In theory, the public opinion is, in a first stage, in favour of sustainable transport plans and restrictive traffic measures. However, once the measures have been introduced, those affected by them (we are currently witnessing how the fuel taxes take the lead) take a stance against them. The reluctance of the public to accept policies which give them no choice has also been highlighted.

In Spain, where bicycles are not used for daily trips, there is a cultural barrier against them as transport mode; it is only valued as sport. Actions must be oriented to change the public mentality, which considers cycling as a low class mode.

The relationship between improving alternative modes to attract drivers and introducing restraint measures is generally accepted by the public. Likewise, surveys suggest that many would be prepared to change travel mode if the conditions were favourable. However, citizen profile shows attitudinal differences. On a general basis, most traffic regulations are observed and fines are taken as a serious imposition, even when speed limits are absolutely observed in Madrid and Vienna.

Teleworking is viewed as a current option for the northern parties while Vienna and Madrid regarded the alternative as a technological approach already in the making.

Again, Stockholm gave priority to the legal solutions, whereas the rest of the cities in the study chose some other factors such as political willingness, awareness campaigns, negotiations with car associations and with other agents involved, along with social acceptance, as the key measures to achieve a balance.

Also it is worth mentioning the rigid barrier derived from *management measures* in Vienna, where a clear public reluctance to "traffic calming" measures was stated.

Private car ownership is losing ground as a symbol of social status in north-European countries (indeed in Oslo, the share of young urban population who have driver's licence is now decreasing) whereas in Spain it is still considered as very valuable.

5. Summary of Barriers

In Appendix III we include a brief description of the nature of the barriers. Each policy measure is confronted to the barriers which could affect it. They are grouped in three categories (legal, financial and socio-political and cultural) and marked as flexible or rigid, good or bad, according to cities' answers. This table could be a useful toolbox to be considered in designing policy measures and their implementation.

6. Policies to remove Barriers

In most cases barriers are complex, since they often confuse legal, financial and cultural issues. In this section we make some suggestions on policies with a view to overcoming these barriers.

- **Comprehensive Land use and urban transport planning.**

Policies to generate optimal sustainable land use and transport planning are better identified and developed in the framework of comprehensive urban transport plans (UTPs). However, only a handful of countries have legally-binding UTPs. Many times, these policies are mentioned in Strategic or Policy Documents without any reference to specific tools for implementation.

- **A key role of local administrations and public transport authorities**

Public transport authorities should play a key role in developing these policies. The land use/transport systems connection has to be strengthened, making them work together so as to reach a more efficient, environmental-friendly system. Even though involvement from all the administrative levels is necessary, local leadership seems to be most appropriate and might be the key partner to this strategy, extending at the same time their function to the whole system.

- **The viability of pricing schemes**

The development and generalisation of urban road pricing schemes, such as those introduced in some Scandinavian cities, could represent a unique opportunity to urban transport schemes financing. A percentage of the money collected is being used to finance the public transport system or new road construction. There is apparently a change of mentality observed among the public, who may be now more interested in knowing how this money is spent. Policies in favour of reducing car use could probably bring about a more balanced situation when they are assessed as an alternative to the use of the items within the budget that are to be ploughed into transport activities. However, there is still a need to clearly define an appropriate legal framework to regulate those aspects.

- **The role of the private sector**

A complementary role has been cast for the private sector. Private financing could be re-oriented from conventional projects towards new needs, but there is little experience in this field, and prospective private partners might construe it as an additional risk. Nevertheless, this would be an efficient way to associate the private sector with broader land use/transport management strategies. Additional services seem to offer slow financial returns and would probably need extensive public subsidies. Otherwise, they should be linked to broader strategies where the “private for-profit” sector is given the chance to participate.

Finally, Appendix IV summarises some measures suggested by cities to deal with the previously analysed types of barriers in order to overcome them. It includes the same list of policy measures as Appendix III. Therefore the comparison between both tables allows a quick identification of main barriers to each option and how to deal with them.

7. Bibliography

- CHAPLEAU, R., Measuring Impacts of Transit Financing Policy in Geopolitical Context: Montreal Case. Transportation Research Record. Public Transportation 1995, No. 1496, pp. 52-58, National Academy Press Washington, D.C.
- COPLACO, Marco Institucional. Análisis de Problemas y Oportunidades, Madrid, 1979.
- ECMT-OECD Workshop on “Overcoming Institutional Barriers to Implementing Sustainable Urban Travel Policies”. Madrid, December, 2000.
- EURO-TENASSESS. The Barrier Model. EU IV FP. Deliverable 6-a. European Commission, Brussels, 1998.
- GONZALEZ V., J.L., La Financiación de las Infraestructuras del Transporte en la U.E.: Limitaciones y Requisitos de Sostenibilidad. III Simposio Nacional sobre Carreteras y Medio Ambiente, Desarrollo Sostenible y Avances Tecnológicos, pag. 35-68, Madrid, 1996.
- JIMENEZ DE CISNEROS CID, F.J., Principios Jurídicos del Transporte Urbano en España. Estudios Territoriales 33, Mayo-Agosto 1990, pag. 147-176, España.
- NATIONAL COOPERATIVE HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM. Land Use Impacts of Transportation: A Guidebook. National Academy Press Washington, D.C., 1999.
- RUSSINES, J., Inversión Municipal y Financiación del Planeamiento. MOPU, Madrid, 1985.
- SIMMONDS, D. And COOMBE, D., Transport Effects of Urban Land Use Change. Traffic Engineering+Control, Volume 38, pp. 660-665, London, 1997.
- STOKES, G. And TAYLOR, B., The Public Acceptability of Sustainable Transport Policies-Findings from The British Social Attitudes Survey. 23rd European Transport Forum. Transport Policy and Its Implementation, pp. 70-84. UK, 1995.
- VOLPE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM CENTER (W. Lyons, et al.). Reviews of the Transport Planning Process in Major Metropolitan Areas, 1991-1998. U.S. Department of Transportation.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

PROSPECTS Tasks 14/15 questionnaire

T14: DECISION MAKING PROCESSES

T15: IDENTIFICATION OF BARRIERS

1. ORGANISATIONAL FRAMEWORK

A distinction needs to be made between long term "strategic" plans and medium/short term more "tactical" plans.

- Long Term (LT)
- Medium Term (MT) (See task 12 definition of medium/long term in each case).

Questions:

1. What are the typical time horizons for strategic plans? Long term? Medium term?
2. Are decision-making processes different for long term and medium term plans? Describe the processes in general outline.
3. How often are the strategic plans reconsidered (regularity)? LT? MT?
4. How prescriptive in practice is a strategic plan with respect to intermediate future years?, i.e. are future decision-makers expected to be bound by decisions made in the present day? (The other way round: Are present-day tactical plans consistent with strategic plans made in the past?)
5. Is there a difference of importance and/or credibility between long term and medium/short term plans?
6. Are there laws requiring municipalities to produce strategic plans for land-use and transportation? If so, with what regularity? Do such laws require that the national government must agree to these plans (so that if the government does not agree, new plans need to be produced)?

2. RESPONSIBILITIES

Questions:

1. Who has responsibility for the following in the city
 - road building
 - traffic management
 - public transport infrastructure
 - bus and rail operations
 - parking and demand management
 - land use control?If there are several bodies jointly responsible how is decision making coordinated (if at all)?
2. Are there any aspects of policy not listed in 1. which are not the responsibility of the city council?

3. DECISIONS LEVELS

It is important to understand at what level decisions need to be made as part of a formal procedure.

- EU
- National
- Regional
 - County
 - Region/Metropolitan Area
 - Municipality/City
 - Sub-city

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European City Transport Systems

Questions:

1. Even if a decision needs to be made formally at municipality level, can national or regional governments exert practical control over the decision (for example by withholding grants if the "wrong" decision is made)?
2. What role does the EU have in influencing city decision making?
3. How do neighbouring municipalities co-ordinate decision making? Do such municipalities try to agree upon integrated packages of measures or single measures?

4. CHANGES

It is important not to look at decision making in an atemporal manner. The answers to most (if not all) of the questions given above will change over time.

Questions:

1. What major changes have taken place over the past 20 years with respect to decision making processes (as opposed to the decisions that result from these processes)?
2. What changes are currently taking place in both decision making processes and their consequent decisions?
3. What is driving these changes? (could the agents for change be categorised as political, economic, technical or some other category?)
 - What happens if there is a change in political control of the city or nation?
4. If current trends persist, what form will decision making take in the future (say in 2020)?
5. Ways of improving decision making?

5. LEGAL CONSTRAINTS

Questions:

1. Are there any legally imposed standards or targets to which the policy must adhere?
2. Are there legal constraints on the implementation of any of the following in the city (e.g. laws inhibiting the use of a policy measure):
 - road building
 - traffic management
 - public transport infrastructure
 - bus and rail operations
 - parking and demand management
 - land use control?
3. Are there any other policy measures or processes on which there are legal constraints?

6. FINANCIAL CONSTRAINTS

The purpose is to identify taxes, fares, subsidies and other financial measures in general concerning transport activities and land use.

Questions:

1. What finance is available for transport infrastructure investments?
2. What finance is available for other transport policy measures?
3. What constraints are imposed on how this finance can be used?
4. Are subsidies applied on different transport modes, both public and private operated?
5. Is the private sector involved in financing parts of the transport strategy?
6. What constraints are imposed on, or by, other involvement?

7. OTHER CONSTRAINTS

Questions:

1. What other barriers (other than legal and financial) stand in the way of implementing
 - new infrastructure
 - traffic management schemes
 - public transport services and fares charges
 - traffic restraint measures
 - land use charges?
2. How serious are these barriers, and is it possible to overcome them in the longer term?

8. POLITICAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS

Questions:

1. How fast/slow is the implementation process of transport/land use policy measures?
2. Are there marked differences in attitudes and priorities between the political parties?
3. How important are land use planning and transportation planning as issues in municipal elections?
4. Are decisions based on political targets, city's targets, good practice or objective planning tools?
5. Are politicians expected (officially/unofficially) to have specific skills if they take responsibility for land-use or transportation planning? If so, what skills? How are these politicians chosen?
6. Is the public opinion pro or against sustainable transport plans?
7. Which is the general attitude about restrictive traffic measures (such as pedestrian areas, carpool dedicated lanes, bus lanes, etc.)?
8. Is traffic regulation respected, or fines are not seen as something serious?
9. Is private car seen as a status symbol? Among what groups?

9. MODELS AND/OR OTHER PLANNING METHODS

One aim in PROSPECTS being to produce guidance on using models in particular and analytical techniques in general, an important question concerns the role of such techniques in the planning process.

Questions:

1. Does a municipality run its own models?
2. Has a municipality employed consultants who run models?
3. If models are used:
 - What role do model results take in the decision-making process?
 - Are model results given more weight than the observable success/failure of particular policies in other municipalities? (i.e. the logic that policy X works successfully in City Y, and since city Y is similar to our city, policy X should work here)?
 - Are the models believed to be "objective"? If so, what does this mean?
 - Has any attempt been made to verify whether model results from studies in the past actually turned out to be correct?
4. If models are not used:
 - Does decision-making use any other sort of quantitative prediction?
 - Is any form of qualitative prediction used?

10. PARTICIPATION - PERSONS INVOLVED OFFICIALLY/ UNOFFICIALLY

It is important to understand who is actually driving the adoption of policies. Whilst it might be clear who the "official" decision-makers are, are they in practice subservient to "unofficial" decision-makers?

- Planners/officers
- Consultants etc.
- Politicians
- Public
- Commerce
- Residents groups
- Private providers of public transport, parking etc
- Police
- Media (both local and national)
- Other lobbying groups

Questions:

1. What is the relationship between officers and politicians (both in theory and in practice)?
2. What is the relationship between the public and politicians (both in theory and in practice)?
3. Is the municipality proactive in obtaining the views of the public or organisations with vested interests (such as chambers of commerce):
 - Does it organise public meetings or meetings with organisations? If so, who is involved in these meetings and how much power do they have in practice?
 - Are there laws governing whether there needs to be public participation in the planning process? If yes, in which stage and to what extent?
4. Some sections of society will have no part to play in the decision making process, and are thus by definition "socially excluded".
 - Who are these people and what are the mechanics underlying their exclusion?
 - Is it common practice to make special efforts to draw socially excluded people into the decision-making process?
5. How much control over policy does commerce have (as recipients of transport services)?
6. How much control over policy do private sector transport operators have?

APPENDIX II
PROSPECTS Task 15 tables

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European
City Transport Systems

POLICY OPTIONS		<u>CONSTRAINTS</u>				
		LEGAL	FINANCIAL	SOCIO-POLITIC- CULTURAL	OTHERS	How to deal with?
Name						
Land use measures						
Attitudenal and behavioural measures						
Infrastructure measures	To influence car use					
	To influence PT use					
	Provision for Cyc., Ped., Fre.					

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European
City Transport Systems

POLICY OPTIONS		<u>CONSTRAINTS</u>				
		LEGAL	FINANCIAL	SOCIO-POLITIC- CULTURAL	OTHERS	How to deal with?
Name						
Management measures	To influence car use					
	To influence PT use					
	Provision for Cyc., Ped., Fre.					
Information Provision	To influence car use					
	To influence PT use					
	Provision for Cyc., Ped., Fre.					

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European
City Transport Systems

POLICY OPTIONS		<u>CONSTRAINTS</u>				
		LEGAL	FINANCIAL	SOCIO-POLITIC- CULTURAL	OTHERS	How to deal with?
Name						
Pricing measures	To influence car use					
	To influence PT use					

APPENDIX III
PROSPECTS Task 15

Nature of the Barriers. Summary

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European City Transport Systems

POLICY OPTIONS	8. Rigid / Flexible	Good/ Bad	9. Nature of the barrier
10. LEGAL BARRIERS			
11. * Land use options			
-development patterns -extra-value taxes -taxes on the infrastructure	12. 13. R	B	-extremely rigid legislation -lack of an adequate legal framework -lack of an adequate legal framework
14. * Pricing measures			
-parking charges -road pricing	R	15. 16. B	-not allowed taxation on private parking places -lack of political willingness
* Attitudenal and behavioural measures			
-flexible working hours -company travel plans	F	B	-lack of information and legislation -lack of appropriate legislation to foster them
* Management measures			
-car usage -parking control -cycle lanes&parking , priorities -lorry routes and bans	17. F R	B G	-high dependence on car for daily trips -lack of political willingness and public acceptability -lack of legislation (North), lack of culture (South) -complicated local legislation
18. FINANCIAL BARRIERS			
19. * Land use options			
-extra-value taxes	20. R	21. B	-lack of legislation to levy taxes
22. * Management measures			
-ITS, UTC -PT service levels	R	23. B	-lack of political willingness and budget -budget constraints
* Infrastructure measures			
-road construction -off-street parking -to influence PT use	R R F	B B B	-lack of land&budget availability -lack of strict legislation -lack of political willingness to foster PT
* Information provision			
-real time driver info -real time passenger info -PT staff resources	F	B	-lack of political willingness to invest -lack of political willingness to invest -lack of budget availability
* Pricing measures			
-PT fare levels -road pricing	R R	B B	-lack of political willingness to subsidise PT -lack of political decision and appropriate legislation
24. SOCIO-POLITICAL&CULTURAL BARRIERS			
25. * Attitudenal and behavioural measures			
-public awareness campaigns -teleworking	26. R F	B B	- <i>pro-nimby</i> measures -lack of information, no culture
27. * Management measures			
-traffic calming -physical restrictions -regulatory restrictions	F	28. 29. B	-public reluctance

APPENDIX IV
PROSPECTS Task 15

How to deal with the Barriers? Summary

PROSPECTS: Procedures for Recommending Sustainable Planning of European City Transport Systems

POLICY OPTIONS	30. Rigid / Flexible	Good/ Bad	31.How to deal ?
32. LEGAL BARRIERS			
33. * Land use options			
development patterns extra-value taxes taxes on the infrastructure	34. 35. R	B	change in the legislation more&better consultation
36. * Pricing measures			
government policies parking charges road pricing	R	37. 38. B	awareness campaigns appropriate legislation suitable use of revenues
* Attitudenal measures			
flexible working hours company travel plans	F	B	information awareness campaigns
* Management measures			
car usage parking control	39. F	B	awareness campaigns political willingness
cycle lanes&parking , priorities	F	B	legislation&sponsors (N), cultural change (S)
lorry routes and bans	R	G	EU interest but complicated local legislation
EU guidelines	R	B	national enforcement
40. FINANCIAL BARRIERS			
41. * Land use options			
land costs taxes on the infrastructure	42. R	43. B	change in the legislation budget increase
44. * Management measures			
ITS, UTC	R	45. B	more budget
PT service levels	R	46. B	budget, awareness campaigns
* Infrastructure measures			
road construction off-street parking	47. R	B	subsidies from earmarked taxes budget
to influence PT use	F	B	attract investors, political willingness to foster PT, budget, subsidies
* Information provision			
real time driver info real time passenger info PT staff resources	F	B	budget availability more&effective participation political willingness
* Pricing measures			
PT fare levels	R	B	PT compensations
road pricing	R	B	awareness campaigns, use of revenues
48. SOCIO-POLITICAL&CULTURAL BARRIERS			
49. * Political orientation			
Left/right (compromises)	50. R	B	Technical planning&development
51. * Implementation pace			
generally slow restrictive measures	R	52. B	political willingness awareness campaigns
53. * Public behaviour			
pro-nimby measures against restrictive measures traffic regulation	F	54. B	awareness campaigns joint consultation information
teleworking	F	55. B	Enforcement