

NGO voting recommendations TEN-T Guidelines for 2014-2020

*TRAN Committee (Co-rapporteurs: G. Koumoutsakos, I. Ertug)
Vote on Tuesday 18 December 2012, from 09:00*

Environmental NGOs from the *Coalition for sustainable EU funds* would like to highlight the opportunity to improve key aspects of the TEN-T Guidelines in order to ensure stronger coherence with EU priorities, to move towards a low carbon and resource efficient transport sector, which is both economically and environmentally sustainable.

What is at stake? With very long lifetimes for transport infrastructure, today's decisions on EU transport spending will set the path for transport beyond 2050 and into the next century. Decisions taken now will either lock Europe into further emissions, carbon-intensive development and biodiversity loss, or set us on a more sustainable course.







This briefing focuses on ensuring 5 key priorities are met:








1. Prioritise sustainable projects
2. Respect environmental laws, in particular in waterway development
3. Encourage spending on innovative clean projects
4. Improve public consultation and transparency to avoid costly conflicts
5. Don't undermine EU transport policy with a wishlist of unsustainable projects

1. PRIORITISE SUSTAINABLE PROJECTS

In light of budget limitations at EU, national and regional level, funding will not be available for every project listed in the annexes. It is essential the TEN-T Guidelines clearly show how to screen, compare and select eligible projects, on the basis of both economic and environmental sustainability criteria.








Projects with a better cost-benefit assessment, explicitly taking into account the environmental costs and climate impacts, should take precedence. For example, demand management measures and upgrades should be prioritized over new infrastructure wherever possible.

SUPPORT <u>Compromise 1</u> – defining EU added value, including measurably improved sustainability.	
SUPPORT: AM211: Bottlenecks can also be tackled by better management, more efficient use and upgrades.	
SUPPORT AM27 (rapporteurs) – defining Social Cost-Benefit Analysis.	
SUPPORT AM28 (rapporteurs) – defining Climate Impact Assessment , or AM228 including mention of Aarhus Convention.	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 4</u> – Objectives including sustainability, reduction of external costs and emissions, consistent environmental protection.	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 5</u> – Member States to plan resource-efficient network considering traffic management, upgrading and maintenance, and including social cost-benefit analysis with environmental and climate impacts.	

SUPPORT: AM281 – require contribution to all objectives of Article 4 and 5.	
REJECT AM31 – weakens the COM proposal, by only requiring consideration of 3 objectives from efficiency, users, sustainability or cohesion.	
REJECT: AM282 only requiring positive net present value, ignoring environmental costs	
SUPPORT: <u>Compromise 6</u> - requiring priority to be given <i>inter alia</i> to climate target, fuel security, climate adaptation, and mitigating urban impacts.	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 16</u> – on core network corridors, aiming for environmental improvements and supporting traffic management.	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 48</u> Recital on concentration including reduction of greenhouse gases	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 51</u> Recital on reducing energy use and environmental impacts on corridors	




2. RESPECT ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS, IN PARTICULAR FOR WATERWAYS

























As demonstrated by the debate around waterways development, it is critical to ensure existing environmental laws and standards are fully respected when planning and implementing transport infrastructure projects. We support the amendments which reiterate and clarify these safeguards, and advise strongly against those aiming to decrease the level of environmental protection against the existing laws.


SUPPORT <u>Compromise 10</u> – clarifying requirements for sustainable development of inland waterways, respecting environmental laws.	
SUPPORT: <u>Compromise 11</u> - on the condition that the reference to free-flowing rivers is kept	
SUPPORT AM578: - noting the importance of both health and environmental protection	
SUPPORT AM 579 – giving emphasis to consideration of cross-border impacts	
REJECT AM581, 580 – attempting to undermine existing environmental laws and impact assessment requirements	
SUPPORT AM582 – clarifying transparency and consultation requirements	
SUPPORT AM727 – reminding of the obligation for SEA and EIA at corridor level (provision against ‘salami slicing’ tactics)	

3. ENCOURAGE CLEAN & INNOVATIVE PROJECTS



The Guidelines should positively incentivize each project in all modes to minimize all negative impacts, by stimulating innovative ways to switch to renewable, clean energy sources, requiring efficiency in both energy use and operations, and reduction of all external costs, impacts on biodiversity and public health.

REJECT AM 232 – poor definition of ‘alternative clean fuels’, not in line with other legislation, including biofuels, methane.	
SUPPORT AM 39 (and/or 398, 396, 399) allowing cost-effective support for at-source rail noise reduction via retrofitting with quiet brake blocks	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 9</u> allowing support for inland port equipment including shore-side electricity supply, waste reception facilities and	

measures to reduce air and water pollution.	
SUPPORT AM455 – allowing support for road traffic management and user charging systems	
SUPPORT AM456 – support for road-rail connections	
SUPPORT AM458 – allowing support for safe cycling and walking infrastructure	
SUPPORT AM 459 – allowing support for Eurovelo network	
SUPPORT AM478 – assuring safe road conditions for non-motorised users	
SUPPORT AM479 – implementation of Eurovignette requirements on lorry charging	
SUPPORT AM483 – requiring consideration of internalisations of external costs for all modes	
SUPPORT AM486 – allowing support for measures to reduce road noise	
SUPPORT AM496 – allowing support for equipment to comply with Sulphur in Marine Fuels Directive (eg CNG/LNG bunkering, scrubbers, etc.)	
SUPPORT AM 504 (rapporteurs) – allowing support for measures to manage traffic and reduce environmental impacts	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 12</u> – to allow support for port equipment included shore-side electricity supply. And/or SUPPORT AM528 requiring impact assessment of Motorways of the Sea plan by end 2013.	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 13</u> (and/or AM535, 533)– requiring port operators to ensure adequate facilities for waste reception, shore-side electricity and to meet sulphur regulation.	
REJECT AM 539 and 541 on last mile rail and road connections to airports (airport connections can be supported by national, regional and/or private financing, and lead to emissions increases)	
REJECT AM542- proposing EU support for more airports	
SUPPORT AM547 – deleting support for increased airport capacity	
SUPPORT AM553, REGI 23 – take economic, social and environmental aspects into account when prioritising freight vs passengers	
SUPPORT AM 50 (rapporteurs)- allowing support for urban freight measures, including consolidation centres	
SUPPORT AM 561 (rapporteurs) – giving particular attention to projects of common interest which (...) contribute to reducing CO2 emissions and other external costs.	
SUPPORT AM 563 (rapporteurs) – support for intelligent transport systems and small scale ancillary infrastructure	
SUPPORT AM569 and 570 – addition: priority to projects including <i>inter alia</i> decarbonisation, safety and reducing external costs, and alternative fuels and shore-side electricity	
SUPPORT AM 571 (rapporteurs) – adding improved transport management	
SUPPORT AM 572 (rapporteurs) – promote measures to reduce external costs, all pollution, noise, congestion and health impacts	
SUPPORT AM 730, 731 noting potential of user charging, including for cross-financing	

SUPPORT <u>Compromise 45</u> Recital on Eurovelo synergies	
---	---












We strongly oppose the inclusion of airports as nodes in the core network. Air travel has extremely high impacts on the climate and environment, and expanding airport capacity using EU public funds contradicts the transport policy goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 60% to 2050, compared to 1990. The same applies to high-speed rail links to airports, which serve to facilitate air travel with high emissions impact. Where a region insists on airport development, funds should be raised nationally or privately – EU money must not influence this decision.

REJECT <u>Compromise 15</u> – including airports as nodes and airport high-speed rail links	
REJECT AM 649 and AM653 – proposing to include more airports	

4. ENSURE TRANSPARENCY AND BETTER GOVERNANCE

Several amendments recognize the vital importance of public consultation from the earliest stage of planning. Early consultation is essential to alert project planners to potential conflicts, for example with protected sites and habitats, to increase public support and so that alternative solutions can be found without causing costly delays, protests or legal challenges.




Just a few examples where early public consultation would have had huge benefit include the Stuttgart 21 rail project, the Via Baltica road project in Poland, and the Lyon-Turin tunnel.

SUPPORT: AM284 on Article 7 requiring independent traffic forecasts, ie. Not done by the project promoters.	
SUPPORT: AM285 requiring EU added value to be demonstrated by a transparent methodology developed by the Commission.	
SUPPORT: AM287 addition on consultation of concerned population	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 19</u> – on role of corridor coordinators including economic and environmental assessment, consultation with civil society	
SUPPORT AM 729 – develop means for public consultation at corridor level, including cross-border to avoid conflict, delays and extra costs.	
SUPPORT AM61 (rapporteurs) – on civil society consultation	
SUPPORT AM63 (rapporteurs) –requiring mandatory corridor plans	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 21</u> – requirement to make information about each project, including financing and progress, easily publicly available via TEN-tec	
SUPPORT AM 67 (rapporteurs) and AM750 obliging MS to involve regional, local authorities and civil society – Commission to present guidelines by end 2013	
SUPPORT AM68 (rapporteurs) requiring Commission to develop methodologies for social cost-benefit analysis and climate impact assessment to be used for assessment of projects of common interest. Deadline for delegated act January 2014.	
SUPPORT <u>Compromise 52</u> Recital on civil society involvement	

5. DON'T UNDERMINE EU TRANSPORT POLICY WITH A WISHLIST

Adding many more projects into the annexes, which are not consistent with the eligibility or 'EU added value' criteria – nor proposed by Member States in bilateral negotiations to prepare the proposal – is not justifiable to citizens, who are acutely aware of existing monuments to wasteful EU spending and poor planning.¹ In the public interest, the 'wishlist' must be cut to projects which are realizable, manageable and reflect common Europe-wide priorities, including emissions reduction and value for money.

The majority of the projects put forward in the compromises to the annexes cannot be justified in these terms. Airports are the most extreme example, as environmental impacts are very high, and because viable projects would find private financing. In the past, EU funding support has forced regional and national authorities to provide matching funds for costly and unviable projects, and saddled them with long-term debts.²

SUPPORT AM668, REGI 28 "initial list of corridors should NOT be understood as an automatic prerequisite for support" from cohesion funds	
REJECT ALL Compromise Amendments 23-41 and amendments which would add to the annexes	
PRIORITY: REJECT Compromises 25, 28, 34, 36, 39, 40 including airport projects	

Contacts

Nina Renshaw, Transport policy officer, T&E,

nina.renshaw@transportenvironment.org, tel +32 2 893 08 44

Sébastien Godinot, Economist, WWF European Policy Office, sgodinot@wwf.eu, tel +32 2 740 0920

Daniel Pullan, RSPB/Birdlife, Daniel.pullan@rspb.org.uk, tel: +44 (0)1767 693101

Markus Trilling, EU Sustainable Funds Coordinator, CEE Bankwatch / Friends of the Earth Europe, markus.trilling@foeeurope.org, tel +32 2 893 1031

¹ Reuters 'Monuments to waste overshadow EU budget battle'

<http://uk.reuters.com/article/2012/11/22/uk-eu-budget-waste-idUKBRE8AL07V20121122>

Media reports on Spain's white elephant infrastructure projects, especially airports:

<http://www.rtve.es/alacarta/videos/comando-actualidad/comando-actualidad-podiamos-permitir-alta-velocidad/1549481/>

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-18855961>

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-19682049>

² Harmful EU funding of Polish airports, see Bankwatch (2012)

<http://bankwatch.org/publications/flights-fancy-case-study-aviation-and-eu-funds-poland>