

GENERAL INFORMATION

PETUS description of tool in use						
Name of the case		"Optimisation of planning procedures to implement transport infrastructure"				
Name of the tool		Traffic planning – a SEA-based guideline for the regional level				
Country		Austria				
City / region		Styria				
Total area (km ²)						
Population						
Density (people/km ²)						
Tool user's profile						
a. Organisation name (municipality, NGO, national or regional department, company, etc.)		Provincial Government of the county of Styria				
b. Field of activity		Road infrastructure, planning and construction				
c. Detailed contact/feedback (project website, e-mail, address, tel., fax)		Wolfgang Fehleisen Landhausgasse 7, A-8010 Graz, Austria Tel: 0043 316 877 2213 Fax: 0043 316 877 2318 E-Mail: wolfgang.fehleisen@stmk.gv.at Website: Fachabteilung 18A Straßeninfrastruktur - Planung und Bau				
Reviewer, date		Norbert Plass, May 2003/updates: March & October 2004				
Short description of the case						
<p>The regional authority responsible for transport planning is obliged to provide a programme that deals with the future development of traffic and transport on the regional level. The overall goal is to develop and operate a sustainable traffic policy, considering national and international legislation and directives. So the traffic planning unit has made a transport concept based on the federal "National Transport Programme" which formed the basis for other concepts on the regional level. Within this concept, certain emphasis is placed on environmental friendly, alternative traffic options such as to provide and increase the public traffic share, and infrastructure for cycling and pedestrians.</p> <p>In order to reach the above objectives and being able to realise the necessary procedural steps, the planning unit developed a tool which follows in principle the SEA-idea. The tool follows a SEA-template adapted for local requirements within the regional context, aiming to optimise the planning and procedural requirements for integrated large-scale projects. Numerous aspects from the different sectors need consideration and the involvement of the public is one of the central concerns.</p>						
<p>Why was the case chosen? To which PETUS key-problem is this case study related?</p> <p>The case is a good example where cross <i>sectoral co-operation</i> as well as the involvement of the citizens are regarded as important preconditions for planning procedures and finally the realisation of a plan or project.</p>						
Sector		Waste	Energy	Water	Transport	Green/blue Building & Land Use
					X	
Scale of project		Component	Building	Neighbourhood	City	Region
					x	X
Status of project		Starting up	Ongoing	Finished	Start date	End date (exp.)
				X		
Key words						

Traffic, transport; SEA, public participation, cross sectoral, citizens, region, transport programme, planning procedure, transport infrastructure, policy	
Project a. Object (building, city park, wind farm, etc.) b. Type of activity (regeneration, renovation, new development, etc.) c. Type of product (plan, scheme, design project, etc.)	Transport infrastructure Building new roads or build some in addition to increase capacity and release the existing ones. Planning procedure / guideline
Tool a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc) b. Benchmarks (qualitative or quantitative) c. Availability (paid/ free)	a. <i>Process & planning tool</i> The tool includes a number of procedural steps, incorporates and addresses the relevant sectors & departments which need to bring in their expertise. b. The evaluation criteria in use come from different sectors: regional planning; water department, nature protection, transport department, environmental department, geology, noise, fishery and hunting. The selected evaluation criteria from these departments are both quantitative and qualitative to enable an integrated planning process. c. The tool has been developed by the transport department, who should be contacted for availability.
Decision-making process a. Stage of the tool implementation (preliminary, midterm, etc.) b. Level (political, technical, etc.) c. Public participation	The tool has been designed after the SEA idea and therefore its goal is to be implemented at an early stage of the planning procedure. Its major users are technicians and planners from the several departments/sectors. The tool is supposed to inform the higher level decision making and at the same time provide proper argumentation for the decision makers. The integration of the public aims to inform from the very beginning of a planned project. It is of central interest to include those citizens who are directly affected through such an infrastructure project.
Other (optional, if needed)	

DETAILED INFORMATION

A. Detailed description of project and tool	
1. Description of context (existing strategies, laws, policy, action plans, etc.): EU, national, regional, municipal	The implementation of large scale infrastructure projects has always created enormous efforts for the technical and administrative personnel involved as well as having effects on the public. The complexity of such projects needs to consider and reflect on numerous national and international legislation. These are: transport / road construction, water management, nature conservation, spatial planning, heritage, forestry, geology, mining, noise, immissions, emissions energy, hunting/fishery, aviation, railways and waste management. It was the aim to better co-ordinate between those sectors, while including the relevant interest groups which should lead to achieve an environmental sound project in the end.

<p>2. Description of project</p> <p>a. Background (What caused the initiation of the project?; What was the problem? Who initiated the project?);</p> <p>b. Objectives/aims (sustainability statement – what issues of sustainability were attacked);</p> <p>c. Time interval and stages of project realization;</p> <p>d. Financing – amount, sources, institutions involved, partnerships, levels.</p> <p>e. Other sectors involved in the particular project/problem (conflicts and/or links)</p>	<p>a. The main reason to design this tool has been the complexity of the planning process of large-scale infrastructure projects, where these guidelines were meant to lead through the project. On the other hand it became obvious that certain planning steps are recurring and that efficiency could be improved when these routines and operations are well established within the planning process. The Styrian Government initiated to develop a concerted structural scheme for transport infrastructure projects with the purpose to assemble an interdisciplinary working group from all relevant governmental departments aiming to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • optimise existing planning procedures, • achieve an environmental sound project • improve public participation <p>Another interesting aspect has been to implicate SEA procedural steps, in order to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Come after international and national regulations • Apply evaluation criteria aiming to be more sustainable in decision making • Set steps for a better public involvement <p>b. The main objective has been to increase efficiency in the existing transport planning procedures and with that to achieve a better environmental performance. Besides the national regulations, there are also some EU directives, e.g. the FFH-Directive or the SEA-Directive which were taken into account when implementing the national regulations and laws. The stated environmental objectives from these regulations set the frame for the new planning approach.</p> <p>c. The procedure includes a staged process: It starts with a <i>preliminary check</i> of the project, referring to different regulations and laws. Followed by <i>screening</i> (gathering different information) and <i>scoping</i> (optimisation) phase. This leads to a recommendation for the further project development, including the frame for a concept for an environmental assessment. The next stage is to submit the planned project and the project itself.</p> <p>d. The preparation of the tool has been done by the transport department in co-operation with different other departments. There is no information on costs to prepare the tool.</p> <p>e. A number of other departments are involved – for example the departments for spatial planning, transport, nature protection, forestry (see also above listing in 1), aiming to better co-ordinate the co-operation between those departmental units.</p>
<p>3. Description of tool</p> <p>a. Character (according to WP3final0704.doc) - calculation tools, process tools, assessment methods, generic tools, simulation tools, guidelines, framework tools, schemes, indicators and monitoring, checklists, case-specific tools;</p> <p>b. Availability of the tool (web-based / paper, paid / free, etc.)</p>	<p>a. The tool is a process tool, which includes also “checklists” on “what to do steps” for large scale infrastructure projects.</p> <p>b. The tool is described in a handbook and is available from the transport department.</p>

<p>c. Based on existing tool or newly elaborated;</p> <p>d. Adaptation of the tool to the local context (are there local experts involved in tool's development?)</p> <p>e. Other tools implemented to support the project development</p>	<p>c. The tool has been developed new.</p> <p>d. The tool is adapted to "local" needs, with the help of "local" experts.</p> <p>e. The SEA idea stands behind this tool.</p>
B. Tool implementation	
<p>1. Argumentation for choosing the tool</p> <p>a. What were the reasons for the implementation of the tool? (voluntary or requested by what local, national, etc regulation)</p> <p>b. Who took the initiative for choosing /elaboration the tool?</p> <p>c. What were the criteria for choosing the tool?</p> <p>d. Was there knowledge of other tools and were they considered?</p>	<p>a. The main reasons were to optimise the planning procedures among the involved sectors and stakeholders (see also above).</p> <p>b. The transport department of the provincial government.</p> <p>c. The main criteria have been – increasing efficiency, providing a standardised procedure, incorporate the public</p> <p>d. The procedure has been designed after the SEA idea.</p>
<p>2. Barriers for the tool implementation What were the main problems in the tool implementation? (Regulation, information available, public awareness, lack of clear SD definitions and benchmarks, communication etc.)</p>	<p>Overall the idea about the tool has been accepted instantly.</p>
C. Influence of the tool on the decision-making process	
<p>1. Description of the decision-making process/ procedures</p> <p>a. Stages</p>	<p>a.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect information on the legal basis Laws, directives, regulations • Preliminary stage Gathering relevant information about the potential environmental influences by each department. • Screening A selection and rough analysis of some alternatives for route corridors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information to the local government and the public ○ Presentation of the gathered information ○ Road shows ○ On-site visits ○ Visualising – GIS and aerial photos • Scoping Compare selected alternatives and containment of the considered space. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gathering the results and evaluation of the technical/scientific information ○ Providing information for all stakeholders (printed, consultation, media etc.) • Assessment of the environmental impact of land use changes • Presentation of the project considering the results from the environmental assessment.

<p>b. Levels (political, technical, etc.)</p> <p>c. Sources of information used during the decision making process</p> <p>d. Who are the decision-makers?</p> <p>e. Who made the final decision for the project implementation? Was it political or technical decision?</p>	<p>b. The executing level is the technical level, which prepares the evaluation steps and preparation of information for other stakeholders, namely the political level and the public.</p> <p>c. To the extent to which they may exist GIS-based information, aerial photos, sector-relevant information (water, nature protection, geology, ecology etc.), legal background information from the sectors; public concerns are incorporated for the project. A compendium of examples from different departments is listed below:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Road construction Evaluation the requirements of the project in the regional context Surveying potential conflicts with regard to space-environment-traffic</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Water management High water/flooding</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Nature protection Biotope mapping/GIS based information Land use/natural potential FFH-directive</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Spatial planning Local and regional development concepts, referring to their environmental and sustainability objectives Sensibility of certain areas</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Forestry Forest development plans Hazardous zones</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Agricultural areas Quality of agricultural land - prevention of transecting valuable land</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Geology Landslides Waste dumps –contamination through mobilisation Influence on the groundwater</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Noise Preliminary checks about noise emissions</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Hunting/fishery Deer passes and stock</p> <p>d. The technicians take the leading role and primary decisions, however the citizens are involved during the process and politicians are incorporated in the final decision making process steps.</p> <p>e. The technicians take the lead, but officially the politicians have to sign and decide.</p>
2. Tool in decision-making process	

<p>a. At what stage was the tool implemented? By whom? (experts, politicians, etc.)</p> <p>b. How did the tool output influence the process (added or skipped levels/stages in the existing decision-making process, etc.)?</p> <p>c. Quantitative goals or benchmarks defined? (If YES, which – and what were they compared to?)</p> <p>d. Was the tool used to support argumentations?</p>	<p>a. Overall the idea about the tool has been accepted instantly.</p> <p>b. One of the main improvements is the introduction of tiered process steps, which should guide the user during his work. Moreover, the co-operation between sectors, which has been a major requirement in the process, has led to a better commitment of the personnel and a greater efficiency.</p> <p>c. from the different, before mentioned sectors a number of qualitative and quantitative criteria have been chosen. They refer to existing data and “status quo” information, which in turn are used as reference values.</p> <p>d. Providing argumentation, which should be understandable for all the stakeholders involved, is one of the objectives and a must, since the official decision has to be made by the political level.</p>
<p>3. Transparency of decision-making process</p> <p>a. How was the information of the decision making process disseminated? - directly (decision makers – public) or indirectly (decision makers - NGO, PR company, etc. - public); sources of dissemination used (mass media, internet, brochure, etc.)</p> <p>b. How was the public involved?</p> <p>c. Was there a public discussion over the project and at what stage of the project development?</p>	<p>a. The decision making process is described and recorded throughout the whole process. Each process step is explained and visualised by maps and technical information, but understandable proof.</p> <p>b. Public presentation, road shows, field trips, media etc. have been used to inform the public about the planning process and about the progress.</p> <p>c. The public is informed about the various stages in the process. Public hearing is regulated and handled according to EIA-regulations.</p>
<p>D. Expert assessment/analysis/comment of the tool effectiveness</p>	
<p>1. Assessment by tool users</p> <p>a. Were there measurable improvements as a result of the tool implementation? If YES, what? If no: why not?</p> <p>b. Were there any spun-off's or unintended consequences?</p> <p>c. General view on the tool? Lessons learned?</p>	<p>a. The improvements could be subsumed that due to the tool a more even balance between the environment and socio-economic development could be observed. So the interests from the stakeholders could have been met. Moreover, the guideline proved to be a valuable vademecum for the experts to incorporate important issues.</p> <p>Public involvement starts rather early during the planning phase. Relevant information is well prepared for the public, emphasising not to give the impression that the decision making has been done already. Additionally, external consultants are involved both to provide information for involved stakeholders and to represent public opinions and interest.</p> <p>b. No information about this issue.</p> <p>c. The tool proved to be a valuable source for guiding the various stakeholders through the project. Some issues nevertheless would need still special attention in the future: Budgetary questions dominate the discussion and options for planned projects.</p>

<p>d. Potentials for further use of the tool?</p> <p>e. Will the actors recommend it or use it in other cases - why / why not?</p>	<p>The need for an overall, sector-crossing policy Improving the coordination between sectors on an official basis – based on a single coordinating unit A good tool provides good argumentation for people and politicians and improves strategic decision making</p> <p>d/e. A transfer of comparable procedures to other sectors should be considered: In general, mid-term and long-term programmes are prepared within the traffic unit. These programmes consider spatial development issues, take up discussion with the responsible planning bodies at the local level, and collect data and information on street conditions, traffic frequencies and the like, to picture the importance of planned infrastructure projects in the region. In this respect it became obvious that the transport and the spatial planning sector should be stronger linked in strategic planning issues. With the establishment of so called “<i>county development programmes (Leitbilder)</i>” a step forward towards that direction has been made. Practical guidelines would complement this approach. Moreover, an integration of all relevant players would be needed in order to find joint solutions for the dominating economic developments. The guidelines should become a standard procedure in the near future.</p>
<p>2. Reviewer’s assessment of the tool (usefulness, sustainability relevance, who are the actors excluded? etc.) Suggestions and needs for further development of the tool</p>	<p>As above mentioned, the guideline is applied just for large scale projects. Among the different planning units EIA is an accepted procedure and various steps are adapted in the planning authorities work, SEA however is not yet officially introduced. In addition to that, SEA has a bad reputation (retardation, “one more evaluation” etc.), perceived as being another procedural burden. Therefore alternative terms or different designations find greater acceptance among practitioners. With respect to strategic planning and decision making a first step was done in producing an internal guideline with respect to the SEA idea.</p> <p>All people involved in this process proved greater interest and commitment in fulfilling the sequential steps, also because they accepted the set up procedural steps in its comprehensive form.</p>
<p>E. Additional information on the case study available</p>	
<p>Websites</p>	<p>The tool is not web based.</p>
<p>References concerning the case but also the key words or problem (papers, articles, reports, laws, etc.)</p>	<p>FFH-Directive Birds Directive SEA Directive EIA Directive</p>
<p>Other sources (Interviews, conferences, discussions, etc.)</p>	
<p>Contact details for further information</p>	<p>Wolfgang Fehleisen Landhausgasse 7, A-8010 Graz, Austria Tel: 0043 316 877 2213 Fax: 0043 316 877 2318 E-Mail: wolfgang.fehleisen@stmk.gv.at Website: Fachabteilung 18A Straßeninfrastruktur - Planung und Bau</p>

--	--