COST Action TU 1002 - "Accessibility instruments for planning practice in Europe"
Oporto, Portugal, the 17th and 18th of February, 2011

Oporto, 21th February 2011

Introductory Short Meeting

MINUTES

17 February 2011 (10:00 – 18:30)

18 February 2011 (09:00 – 16:00)

Venue:

Faculty of Engineering of Oporto University

Local host:

Cecília Silva

Vitor Oliveira

Ana Amante

Index

0. List of Participants

Name	Country
ARCE RUIZ ROSA	ES
BERTOLINI LUCA	NL
CALDERON ENRIQUE	ES
CURTIS CAREY	AU
GEURS KARST	NL
HALDEN DEREK	UK
HULL ANGELA	UK
JOUTSINIEMI ANSSI	FI
LANGELAND ANDERS	NO
MANTYSALO RAINE	FI
MAVRIDOU MAGDA	EL
MILAKIS DIMITRIS	EL
NAESS PETTER	DK
NICOLAS JEAN-PIERRE	FR
OLIVEIRA VITOR	PT
PAPA ENRICA	IT
PINTO NUNO NORTE	PT
SILVA CECILIA	PT
SUBIC KOVAC MARUSKA	SI
TE BROMMELSTROET MARCO	NL
TENNOY AUD	NO
TZUR ORNA	IL
VITALE ELISA	IT
WULFHORST GEBHARD	DE
ZAIDEL DAVID	IL
ZAKOWSKA LIDIA	PL
ANA AMANTE	PT

17th February

10:00 – 10:30: Opening Session

1. Welcome to the participants

The Chair, Cecília Silva, and Vitor Oliveira (representing the Local Organizing Committee) welcomed all participants and presented a couple issues on the venue and the local research centre CITTA (Research Centre for Territory, Transports and Environment) .

2. Adoption of agenda

By suggestion of Thierry Goger, point 21 of the agenda was shifted to the end of the first day (17th February, after point 15) due to his absence during the second day. The agenda of the meeting was approved by the assembly.

3. Minutes of last meeting

Minutes of the last meeting where approved unanimously.

4. Matters arising

No matters arising.

10:30 – 12:30: Scientific Discussion Session

This session held the discussion of the main scientific issues at hand for this first meeting of the MC committee. The following issues were presented and discussed:

5. **Karst Geurs** (Invited Keynote speaker): accessibility instruments in academic research

6. **Derek Halden** (Keynote speaker): accessibility instruments in planning practice; accessibility instruments in science

7. **Marco te Brömmelstroet** (Keynote speaker): bridging the gap between academic research and planning practice

8. Discussion: how will this COST action improve the state of art sketched by the keynote speakers? What are the opportunities and threats?

The final debate, chaired by Luca Bertolini, arose several questions, such as:

- Who will use the instruments? (end-users)
- What is the main problem? (we must start with this questions then we'll have more different topics)
- Uncertainty about the actors involved
- If is sustainable mobility, which will be the contribution? (accessibility tools and goals)
- We are here to combine subjects?
- What are the Academic tools that we have been talking here?
  (...behaviour transport...)
- Multidimensional fields: planning, accessibility, ...? We must balance the measures.
- Etc.

14:00 – 16:00: Strategic Discussion Session

9. **Angela Hull**: Accessibility concepts, measures, instruments and indicators, and their use in practice: a first impression

During this session, Angela Hull presented the results of the work developed so far by WG2 on the accessibility instrument spreadsheet template. This template included the following issues:
- Traveller characteristics: mobility – car owner/driver; employment status; age; culture factors; responsibilities.
- Activities: employment, education and training; health and social; shopping and leisure.
- Ease of reaching/different factors: time; cost; reliability; safety and security; physical features; quality and environment; information and booking.
- Infrastructure: speed of movement; modal integration; costs; benefits for whom?; interaction with changing land use; resource efficiency/climate change mitigation.

10. Conceptual discussion: which accessibility will we deal with in this COST action?

This presentation was followed by a general discussion on the accessibility instrument spreadsheet template. The participants were divided into 4 discussion groups aiming to define the issues to be included in the spreadsheet for the following main questions:

Group 1 – **What is the planning context?**
Group 2 – **What are the planning goals?**
Group 3 – **What characteristics of the instruments are relevant?**
Group 4 – **Who are the end-users and how do they use tools?**

These sub-group discussions produced the following suggestions, listed below:

- Group 1 – **What is the planning context?**
    - (1.1.) Level/scale/geography: international, national, regional, local, neighbourhood
    - (1.2.) Type: transport, urban planning
    - (1.3.) Governance context: key actors, legal/advisory requirements to assess accessibility:
        - i. Urban/transport planning process
        - ii. Top-down/bottom up processes
    - Consequence of a different agenda: sustainability, climate change, "peak oil", low energy development pathways
    - (1.5.) Which way the plan guarantees the public "demands"
- Group 2 – **What are the planning goals?**
    - What are the questions that this instrument is addressing?
    - What are the different stakeholder perspectives?
    Public perspective:
        - i. Secure speed/ cost efficiency/ potential of public transport
        - ii. Location of new houses/ other functions
        - iii. How to boost economy and attract new jobs
        - iv. How to activate satellite, remote regions
        - v. How to revitalize central areas
        - vi. Achieving sustainability
        - vii. Reducing emissions
        - viii. How to facilitate support for light public transport
        - ix. How to ensure access to basic services
        - x. How to ensure efficient, sustainable logistics
        - xi. How to ensure safe mobility?
        - xii. How to move from auto-dependency to a car-free environment?
        - xiii. How to improve cycling and pedestrian access?
        - xiv. How to tackle risks in energy/mobility costs?

        xv.   How to reduce risk and improve safety?

        xvi.   How to increase pleasure in mobility?

Private Investors:

        i.   Where to locate business

        ii.   Where to invest in real estate

Individuals:

        i.   Where to move with my family?

        ii.   How to get to the library in time?

        iii.   Which is the nearest parking space?

- Group 3 – **What characteristics of the instruments are relevant?**
  - Outputs
  - Point to point, physical distance
  - Travel time distinguished by mode
  - Where people are and activities
  - Indicators
  - No of stores by bike in 30 min
  - ....
- Group 4 – **Who are the end-users?**
  - Diversity of end-users: planners, stakeholders, retailers, citizens, practitioners
  - Knowledge/ skills/ motivations of each group (reasons/motivations to use tools)
  - Discursive meaning attached to accessibility

  and How do they use tools?
  - Generation of ideas
  - Selection of options/policies
  - Evaluation of policies
  - Integration of planning perspectives
  - Is interaction fast or slow?
  - Is measurement required by law?
  - Type of use: instrumental, symbolic/learning/enlightenment approach

Closing statements:
- WG2 - Literature review: collect evidence on how accessibility is addressed in plans and policies (recent literature)
- Template shown by Angela Hull in the beginning of this session is not complete (it seems that there are missing the issues of groups 1, 2 and 4). The general discussion developed during this session will be used by WG2 in the development of the referred template.
- Website: the glossary started on the first day will be followed up in the action's website.

16:30 – 18:30: Discussion of practical issues

This session, chaired by Cecília Silva, started with a brief recollection of the Action's objectives and working plan. Some of the main issues presented during the kick-off meeting were recalled and introduced to new participants. Followed by some time for questions and answers for further clarification.

11. **Cecília Silva**: List of Work Units and of their case study cities and preliminary list of Accessibility "Instruments" proposed

The session continued with the presentation of the Work Unit (WU) List. This list was completed during the session for the work unit which had not yet send information on their members, case study city and name of accessibility

instrument. Some WU were still unable to complete all information during the session and agreed to send the remaining information by e-mail in a week's time after the meeting.

12. **Angela Hull**: A short overview of the upcoming tasks for Working Group 2

Angela Hull, manager of WG2 presented the upcoming tasks for WG2.

13. **Marco te Brömmelstroet**: A short overview of the upcoming tasks for Working Group 3

Marco te Brömmelstroet, manager of WG3 presented the upcoming tasks for WG3.

14. **Vitor Oliveira**: A short overview of the upcoming tasks for Working Group 4

Vitor Oliveira, manager of WG4 presented the upcoming tasks for WG4.

15. Operational discussion: what will we deliver in year 1, and how?

Cecília Silva recalled the objectives and elements to be produced during the first year of the Action. The following summary list of tasks to be developed during this year, was presented:

- Several papers presenting each Accessibility Instrument (each WU)
- Fill in the template spreadsheet for accessibility instrument (each WU)
    - The final template will be produced by WG2
- Literature review:
    - WG2: a) collect accessibility concepts, measures, instruments and indicators; b) use/reflexes in plans and policies
    - WG3: methodology for workshops
- Actions Glossary (WG2)
- First draft of research methodology (for case studies) (WG3)

21. Report from the COST Office

Thierry Goger informed the MC on the number of countries currently participating in this Action and of the budget reduction decided by the COST Office for this year.

18th February

16. Discussion of WG functions and member list

The list of current members of each Working Group was presented: WG1 – 0 members; WG2 - 22 members; WG3 - 15 members; WG4 - 5 members (Chair, Vice-chair and WG managers). The Chair recalled the functions of each WG. WG2 and WG3 were reminded that they would have to chose 2 members to represent their WG in WG1 and in WG4. WG managers should inform Action chair after the WG meeting of the names of the members.

The chair presented a list of people interested in participating in particular WG's and opened the discussion of acceptance and of how new requests should be dealt with. The MC decided that in total the Action have a maximum of 4 participants per country (2 for each WG, WG2 and WG3), and so most countries would fill up their places with the 2 MC members and with the 2 MC substitute members. In case there are vacant places, request for WG participation should be forwarded to the WU (or WU's) of the country of origin of the request.

17. Action Planning (including meetings)

The presentation of general schedule and the detailed overview of next years' schedule was skiped considering that it had already been presented the previous day. Discussion concerning the next annual meeting reach the following decisions:

<div align="center">

Location: <u>Torino (Italy)</u>
Date: <u>16th and 17th of February, 2012</u>

</div>

The MC decided on the possibility of having an extra meeting during this first year for WG2 (to be decided according to the budget).

For the long-term planning some suggestion were made for Pilot Workshops:

- 1st Pilot meeting - Location: Amsterdam; Date: July, 2012
- 2nd Pilot meeting/MC meeting - Location: Munich; Date: Feb 2013

For the remaining meetings no decisions or suggestions were made (2014: February and June meetings + 2 meetings pending).

18. Discussion of STSM for next year, applications

The MC decided to define the subject and objectives of the STSMs for each year beforehand during the preceding MC meeting.

For the first year, the MC decided:

- to accept the application from Marco te Brömmelstroet (NL MC) for 1 STSM in Munich (invitation by Munich confirmed personally by Gebhard Wulfhorst (DE MC)) in the fall 2011.
- to launch open calls for applications to STSMs defined as follows (the following list is by order of importance and to be launched in accordance to the budget):
  - 2 STSMs defined by WG2 aiming to support the tasks of literature review; detailed tasks and priority list to be defined by WG2 and send to Chair to open call
  - 1 STSM defined by WG3 aiming to support the tasks of literature review; detailed tasks and priority list to be defined by WG3 and send to Chair to open call
  - Remaining STSMs for P&D students (selection of the best "application" with possible invitation to come to the next Short Meeting of the Action). Contribution to the Action: literature review.

19. Discussion of the functions of the Core Group including powers delegated from the MC to the CG

The Chair presented the elements of the Core Group (CG) – the managing board for this Action – and proposed the list of powers to be delegated from the MC to the CG.

Elements of Core Group:

- Chair (Cecília Silva)
- Vice-Chair (Luca Bertolini)

- WG Managers (WG2 – Angela Hull, WG3 - Marco te Brömmelstroet, WG4 – Vitor Oliveira)
- Financial Rappoteur (Angela Hull, Enrique Calderon)
- Local Organiser of meetings (former and next; changes every year)

The main function of the CG is the general management of the action including evaluation of implementation.

List of powers delegated from MC to CG, approved by MC:

- Approve and select STSM candidates (strategic decision in MC)
- Organizational matters in connection with forthcoming MC meeting
- Allocation of previously approved funds
- Any matters of urgency to be latter sanctioned by the MC

Also approved by the MC was the procedure for MC decision through e-mail, as follows: the chair contacts all MC members by e-mail on a specific decision requesting that disapproval be communicated by e-mail in a limited period of time; decision will be considered approved by the MC if less than 50% of MC members manifest their disapproval.

20. Agenda for first meeting of the CG

No meeting or agenda was discussed.

22. Annual Progress Conference (preparation and/or feedback from DC)

The chair will ask input from managers of WG2 and WG3 for progress report closer to the conference.

23. Other issues

- Mailing subject to be used in all e-mails for this Actions: TU 1002
- Cecília Silva suggested the creation of an Accessibility Researchers (+ and practitioners) Association.
- Enrique Calderon and Nuno Pinto suggested the creation of a Junior Researchers Network Initiative within this Action. Nuno Pinto made a brief presentation of his experience in another Junior Researchers Network. This suggestion was taken with interest by the MC. The MC is waiting for further information from Nuno and Enrique to discuss how to engage this Initiative.
- Potential collaborations/other research opportunities: Australia, project in "Public Transport in 25 cities" (this action may help to select cities for the study putting a potential list on the website) – referred by Carey Curtis.
- Presentation of a book by Nuno Pinto. Next meeting of another Cost Office will be in October, Lisbon (Portugal).
- Gebhard Wulfhorst informed the MC of the International Scientific Conference on Mobility and Transport, April 2011, in Munich (Germany).

24. Closing