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Introduction

This paper deals with two case studies of the research “Widespread interventions in urban areas for the creation of best solutions for the pedestrian mobility”, funded by MIUR - Ministry of the Education and University and run by DITS - Department of Hydraulic Transportation and Roads, of University “La Sapienza”, of Rome. DITS is in charge of monitoring the development and of assessing the results of the implementation of two pedestrian paths systems in the case study cities.

State of the Art

In Italy, pedestrians have been always played a minor role both in urban legal and regulatory policies as well as in the more recent social campaigns on sustainability awareness. On the contrary, the massive use of private cars has been the only target of many transportation policies from the '60s to the beginning of the '90s, namely because of economic reasons at national level. Moreover, for many years, local administrations had neither the power nor the political will to change such a trend. The main results of these policies are a natural day-by-day increase in demand for private car shifts - the Italian motorization rate is one of the highest in Europe, in Rome for instance, nowadays it is 950 x 1000 inh. - and a modest supply of collective transportation modes - in Italy car pooling and car sharing are currently still at test level; underground systems are present only in Rome, Milan, Genoa and Naples; railway networks for local duties, as commuting, are totally missing in Southern Italy, with the exception of Naples, Bari and some other minor centers. Congestion, parking problems and pollution thus negatively affect livability of big cities and small towns, of historical centers and modern suburban areas. But these factors are only a part of the whole cost: the social one, especially in terms of safety, will be outlined shortly.

In spite of the supremacy of car traffic, Italians have always loved and still love walking, since it is part of their culture. The afternoon promenade is still a very important part of everyday life for many Italians, especially the elderly and teenagers, but not only. Leisure, everyday duties such as shopping, visiting friends or going to church are activities still performed on foot in virtually all the small towns.

On the contrary, when rush becomes a rule, cars rule again. According to the few available national statistics, in 1996 every morning, 1,300,000 children and youngsters went to schools/universities. Of them, only 29% went by foot - and the majority walked for less than 15 minutes; 69% used motorized modes of transportation, mainly private cars, as passengers. About 60% of “walkers” lived in Southern Italy, where better climate conditions
could affect such a percentage. Those going to work on foot were very few: only 12.7%, most of them using cars either as drivers (64%) or as passengers (6%). (ISTAT, 1998, 55)

The positive attitude towards walking did not correspond to prompt and appropriate policies by administrations. Initially, isolated pedestrianizations occurred in Rome and in Milan in the early 70’s, welcomed by debates and protests mainly by local shopkeepers: prejudice turned into appreciation when the success in terms of number of visitors was undeniable. From this moment on and up to the mid ‘90s, pedestrianization became “the tool” used by every local administration for preserving the most historical parts of cities and towns from traffic problems, with the creation of the so-called “pedestrian islands”, isolated episodes in urban contexts invaded by cars. Indeed, in small towns, pedestrian islands coincided with the main squares, in bigger cities with some representative squares and/or with the areas surrounding monuments. No planning of totally pedestrian links to the other zones or appropriate supply of intermodal exchange points supported such designs. The result was that in small centers, the main square kept playing the role it always had done, i.e. the community “parlor”, while more recent residential areas slowly decayed. In bigger cities, the most important squares and places became a system of scattered, isolated attraction sites, whose power of attraction relied on tourist and commercial facilities, on the presence of landmarks or on the performance of special events.

**Legal and regulatory aspects and citizens’ role**

For too many years safety has not been considered as a priority in all the urban governance phenomena and this can be easily proved by the lack of an appropriate legal and regulatory framework up to the second half of the ‘90s. Until this period, the only regulatory utilities in force were the 1959 National Highway Code - a set of laws for improving traffic conditions with no special regard to pedestrian problems and updated only in 1992 - and some series of prescriptions for infrastructure design, progressively issued in the ‘70s and in the ‘80s, with no legal value and thus not compulsory up to their 2001 edition. The first real step towards an increase of safety standards can be represented by the 1995 Urban Traffic Plan decree (PUT), compulsory for all municipalities with over 30,000 inhabitants. In PUTs, which compel municipalities to adopt traffic plans to organize mobility in synergy with local master plans, many are the very innovative features but among them, two must be pointed out: the first one concerns the role of pedestrians, who become the priority component of the traffic pattern and the second sets up the so-called “Environmental Islands”, i.e. urban areas meant as “systems of local streets aimed at meeting pedestrian requirements and ensuring parking”(according to the text of the law). The name arises from the need to design local street “islands”, surrounded by main roads, whose “environmental” features are based on the assumption that only O/D traffic is allowed, so as to regain livability, namely in terms of safety and air and noise pollution, since through-traffic is expected to be avoided.

Nowadays, PUTs are a reality in many Italian cities and towns but Environmental Islands, meant according to what the decree sets, are few because of the lack of guidelines for implementation. However, in spite of this, they can be considered another important step towards safety and sustainability and they represent, on one hand, the political willingness to start dealing with these problems and on the other hand an increase of awareness among citizens.
Trends of accidents in Italy: the reverse of the medal

Meanwhile, the accident rate has been growing steadily.

In the past ten years, one family out of ten recorded a fatality or an injury. Of these about 1/3 involved persons aged under 30.

In 2000, 211,941 accidents occurred involving persons. 6,410 were killed (13.2% were pedestrians) and 301,559 were injured (5.6% were pedestrians). About 75% of accidents (i.e. 158,215 events) occurred on municipal roads in urban areas (ISTAT, 2001, 24 -37). However, from the comparison of data collected during the 1991-2000 decade, a strong decrease in the number of pedestrians killed (-26.2%) and a slight reduction of injuries (-0.5%) were recorded. However, pedestrians are very vulnerable and among them the elderly are the most exposed to road dangers. In 2000, 53% of all pedestrian fatalities involved persons aged over 65; 9.5% involved persons aged under 24.

In urban areas, driver misbehavior is the main cause of all accidents recorded in 2000 (about 81.5%). Only about 4% was caused by inappropriate behavior of pedestrians.

The average social cost for this problem has been estimated at about 22 million Euros per year. Moreover, the lack of tradition in processing, analyzing, disseminating data and information about safety progressively contributed to create a national culture based on the massive use of private cars.

The National Plan for Road Safety

The above mentioned facts reveal, on one hand, how low the safety standards in recent years have been and, on the other hand, the need to cut such social and economic costs. A prompt reply was needed from the Government in terms of new policies and new tools to be implemented, as well as in terms of citizen awareness on safety matters. For this purpose some local bodies, private associations and universities relentlessly contributed to start this process.

Important changes occurred when, in 2000, the Ministry of Public Works (currently Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation) issued the National Plan for Road Safety (NPRS), the first real attempt to face safety problems by the definition of an appropriate, strict, efficient policy to control all the main risk factors.

According to its definition (as in the Law n.144, 17.7.1999), the NPRS is a system of directions and measures to promote and increase plans aimed at improving road safety standards with special regard to infrastructure design, to accident prevention and control activities, to legal, regulatory and management matters, so to achieve an important EU goal: 40% reduction of the total amount of deaths or injuries in road accidents.

The NPRS content can be summarized according to three directions: problem and risk analysis, setup of suitable interventions on the most dangerous infrastructures, and increase in safety for vulnerable users. The problem and risk analysis outlines a series of negative aspects as a big amount of road rule offenders, the high rate of fatal accidents involving pedestrians, cyclists, young and aged drivers, low safety standards along many roads turning into dangers for all road users.
Each one of these problems calls for specific sets of measures and interventions, according to different items:

- regulatory activities (issue of guidelines, handbooks, standards, parameters to meet the highest safety requirements),
- “fostering” measures (actions for supporting infrastructure management bodies in planning and designing pilot projects),
- direct interventions (several sets of initiatives, under the Central Administration’s responsibility, directly aimed at improving road safety, disseminating information among politicians and technicians, increasing control activities on the road)
- coordination activities among all involved partners.

The translation of such a complex program into real interventions requires actions focused both on citizens requirements and on places performances, in two directions: dangerous road systems and users. For the former, besides paying attention to typical problems of extra-urban roads special care is directed towards urban areas, where safety standards are judged as not fully appropriate, given the high rate of accidents.

For the latter, users are divided into two categories: the vulnerable ones, i.e. the disabled, and the so-called “risky” ones, i.e. the elderly, children, young drivers, alcoholics, and so on. For each kind of user, risk factors need to be individuated in order to set up the most suitable strategies.

Such a program requires the involvement of many bodies, both at national and at local level. For this reason, NPRS sets an important principle: any action or target must be the result of synergy and partnership among the different administrations.

Coordination is also the keyword for the set of measures that NPRS individuates to start implementing the actions outlined theoretically in the program. According to these directions, the most innovative tool is the package entitled “Projects and specific interventions to improve road safety” which deals with the promotion of activities for designing and/or supporting safe environments, thanks to specific grants from the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation. This package sets two goals: to allow and to promote the feasibility and the setup of innovative design proposals especially dedicated to reduce road accidents; the creation of a catalogue for the municipalities where appropriate and effective solutions as results of implemented test projects are reported.

The way to put into practice and to validate the above mentioned goals is represented by the so-called “Pilot Projects” proposed by road-owners and management bodies in partnership with local administrations.

However, NPRS individuates other domains of application that can be not only part of the Pilot Project tests, but that can be worthy of being supported by extra funding, as:

- professional training for road management and administration operators
- education and information at schools, so to start creating a “culture” on road problems
- upgrading of PUTs,
- promotion of safety-oriented local public transportation systems
- reorganization of enforcement management
- study of on-board safety devices

Moreover, special attention is paid to health problems thanks to the creation of a dedicated task for the in-depth study of accident traumas, alcohol and drug influence on drivers and for the setup of medical countermeasures.
The Pilot Projects experience

The Pilot Projects’ concept was, on one hand, to develop some tests on the most dangerous sites where to implement holistic designs to increase the overall safety level and, on the other hand, to partially contribute by fundings to the implementation of packages of solutions, whose costs administrations wouldn’t be able to afford in short times. Total budget for fundings was 11,878,508 Euros, about 198,000 Euros in average for each project.

The most appropriate procedure to start Pilot Projects process was supposed to be a competition among all the bodies that at different level, and according to different tasks, participate to roads management, addressing the call to municipalities, provinces and regions administrations, school and health authorities, practitioners, public transportation operators, pressure groups, services private companies ad so on. The success was great since about 200 design proposals have been presented at the call for competition deadline, in the beginning of March 2001, in spite of the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation’s decision to fund only the 60 best proposals, by December 2001.

The protocol for the competition was very strict, since participants had to present an in-depth study on the state of the art of the mobility and of the safety standards of the site worth to be re-designed, reporting data and information on the local economy and social structure, on the road system and the related mobility pattern, statistics on accidents (from 1991 to 1999, if available), as well as an analysis of the risk main causes. The scope of such request was twofold: the more dangerous was the site, the higher were the probabilities to be awarded, (design merits being equal among the different proposals); on this purpose, a special indicator was set, the so-called “Social Damage Index” (SDI), to be calculated by weighting the number of dead and injured people in proportion to the related social costs and adopting an extra weight parameter (=2) for fatalities data, so to highlight worse situations.

To do that, SDI was previously calculated for all the provinces and the capitals of the Italian regions, so to list provinces and cities with the highest/very high/medium SDI.

Other parameters had also to be taken into account as the motorization rates, severity indexes and related escalation in the last decade, etc.

Secondly, such an amount of data coming from across the nation could allow the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation to create a database, in which all the information on accidents could be collected and progressively updated.

The protocol asked the participants to outline, among various practical information, the proposals objectives at short, mid and long terms, to describe the design contents also by drawings and maps (if necessary), to indicate how results would be monitored, to highlight how partnership among the involved bodies would work, to add a Gantt-chart describing the design and the building phases (according to deadlines set by the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation) and eventually a detailed list of costs.
Interventions to be dealt with in the proposals could envisage all the main fields that contribute to make roads safe environments: improvements on road links and intersections design (not only in terms of crossings safety standards, but also in terms of appropriate lighting systems, paving management, signs systems, etc.) vulnerable users safeguards, alignment readability and perception, enforcement, educational and training programs, telematics monitoring, on-board safety devices, first aid and emergency services, awareness and so on. Moreover, for what strictly concerns the road design practice in urban areas, the call for competition listed a series of measures to be tested, very innovative at least for the Italian situation, including:

- traffic calming and 30km/h zones implementation,
- creation of continuous pedestrian paths and cycle tracks,
- improvements on squares so to synergically manage safety and urban activities and to regain outdoor areas for citizens,
- sidewalks enlargements
- raised intersections
- creation of pedestrians-dedicated “islands” using spaces from carriageways and parking areas
- promotion of collective modes of transport

Finally, special attention was requested to pay to some particular dangerous spots, very recurring in the national road network, as for instance long, straight links, links with tunnels, extra-urban roads entering urban areas, etc.

First outcomes

In December 2001, the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation released the list of the 60 awarded Pilot Projects. Unfortunately projects strictly tackling pedestrian problems are a few, but very relevant, as further described, because many proposers focused on interventions directed to improve overall traffic conditions, with special regards to driving problems. Worth to be mentioned are also the funded projects especially dedicated to educational or training activities, a step ahead towards the awareness of safety matters at national level.

All the funded projects are currently underway, some of them with slight delays because of bureaucracy problems. Anyway, timetables have been up to now respected, working drawings and related documents prepared by the local bodies have been approved by the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation, and in some cases buildings phases are on.

Two case studies on pedestrian safety: the Pilot Projects in Genoa and Bologna.

As just above mentioned, Pilot Projects totally focused on pedestrian safety are only two, even if they can be considered very important and very complex. Both the design proposals concern safe home-school path systems, but they are very different for size and for implementation process and they can be considered as complementary, being Genoa’s project extended to the whole city area and the Bologna’s one on a district where a cluster of schools is located, so the latter can be seen as a detailed follow-up of the former approach.
Moreover, it is quite curious that two cities very different for morphology, for economic structure, for location, for climate conditions, but not only, developed the same kind of project.

Genoa is located in North-Eastern Italy, and it is one of the most important ports of the Mediterranean Sea, the biggest in Italy. Very good weather conditions are typical of the area. The historical centre of the city is a maze of narrow streets, the so-called “carrugi”, surrounded by the commercial harbor, by shipyards and other industrial areas towards the sea, and by more modern districts, climbing up to the hills. A hilly city characterized by steep slopes, stairs and alleys. Traffic congestion (Genoa’s municipality is the only administration in Italy testing road pricing in the city center area), high motorization and accidents rates are the circumstances that promoted the Pilot Project called “A new path for Genoa's schools; road safety and strategies”.

Bologna is one of the biggest cities of North-Western Italy, located in the region called Emilia Romagna, in the Po Plain; climate is characterized by very hot summers and cold winters with fogs. Po Plain is also affected by a low air circulation and by frequent thermal inversion phenomena.

Bologna maybe can be considered the most socially-advanced city in Italy because of its high quality public facilities and services. Its historical core is rich of residences, offices and commercial activities and it is surrounded by large semi-central residential areas. Main architectural features of this city are the “portici”: a porches network, 30 km long, which allows walking and strolling also in adverse weather conditions. Also bicycles, thanks to the flat area, are very popular modes of transport. This city is also famous for its University, one of the most ancient of Italy, and for its Fair center, all year round open.

Bologna is one of the leader cities for what concerns mobility pattern. Anyway, problems such as parking and traffic jam, especially in the city centre, are present. Other problems come from commuters: one Bologna inhabitant out of three goes daily to the city center, while two inhabitants out of ten go daily to suburban areas. Shifts are mainly due to work and study scopes. In this case, one of the highest motorization rate in Italy and an unaffordable accidents rate are the circumstances that pushed the local municipality to present the Pilot Project called “For a city at children’ size. Safe home-schools paths: education, participation, interventions and monitoring activities”.

“A new path for Genoa's schools; road safety and strategies” is a very ambitious plan because of three factors: the involvement of all the city's public schools as target and of a large panel of public bodies, as promoters; the synergy among the Project goals and what set by the Local PUT and by the Mobility Management Plan; the holistic approach to the safety problems, so to have a set of common measures to implement across the city.

The Bologna Pilot Project, as mentioned above, can be considered as a detailed design of the Genoa’s one, since it is focused on just one area of a residential district, where a cluster of schools is located in a park called “Lunetta Gamberini”. The project main goal is the same as the Genoa’s one: to make safer home-school journeys for children.
A new path for Genoa's schools; road safety and strategies

The Genoa's Pilot Project is, as said, a very ambitious plan because of the city-wide involvement and because of the will to solve a top priority: safety, since in the last decade 28% of fatalities involved young people aged between 18 and 29, 25% involved elderly over 64.

The Project involves users from 50 schools (from kindergartens to high schools), 4 public libraries and some other public centers and it is the result of a common work, developed by Liguria Region and Province of Genoa administrations, the Municipality, the Councillorships for Sport, for Communications, for Education and the Districts authorities, the local municipality Police and two private companies (3M and Studio Walden). Schools have been selected for two main reasons: they are the symbols of the community's social values and they are the best places to start participation processes and to involve all kind of vulnerable users.

The aim of the Project is to create a city system of safe home-school pedestrian paths and to upgrade the surrounding outdoor areas, in decay (especially in social housing compounds), so to improve life conditions for citizens, to offer more playgrounds for children and places to gather for teenagers, and eventually to rehabilitate buildings. The urban landscape, indeed, is made of narrow sidewalks paved by asphalt, invaded by cars and by traffic signs, so to have on one hand a kind of pollution in terms of visual perception and on the other hand a feeling of monotony.

The Project concept is based on the revision of the streets role: no more just carriageways, but symbols thanks to elements apt to be easily recognized by the citizens: green, public lighting, less poles and traffic signs, more urban furniture for comfort and ease of pedestrians, redesign of school entrances, traffic calming to increase safety (in some cases very difficult to implement because the hilly morphology), monitoring for security; use of appropriate paving materials.

To turn the project's concept into design, sets of standard measures have been studied: they can be implemented in every urban context, picking up, case by case, the most suitable ones. These are: Speed limit in residential areas at 30 km/h; creation of raised crossings as well as of continuous, protected pedestrian paths and cycle tracks along local streets with high pedestrian flows; change in the alignment of the carriageways, enlargement of narrow sidewalks and removal of architectural barriers. Special care has been taken to design some unusual safety devices as the re-shape of the “school gate” (i.e. to set back the school entrance from the sidewalks so to have a wider safe area, a kind of buffer between the school building and the street) or the creation of green fences and railings along the sidewalks, as filters between sidewalks and carriageways.

Environmental benefits from the increase of vegetation are also expected, not only in terms of pollution reduction; indeed, lines of trees, little groves, bushes will allow the creation of biotopes to attract birds, butterflies, lightning bugs, etc.

It is clear that all these interventions are aimed at allowing children to use urban spaces in perfect autonomy; indeed, in this way, paths are safe both under the physical and the psychological points of view, an “exercise” where children can develop their perceptive attitude and their feeling for the environment.

Paths selections have been run by direct surveys on children's way home, observing “on the spot” where they had more difficulties in crossing a street or what they considered “dangerous”; during these campaigns, visual conditions, traffic signs locations, driveways, loading/unloading bays, barriers, etc. have been also surveyed and reported on maps.
Designers provided also children with simulated paths, so to achieve extra information. Such paths will be kept in use for educational courses on road safety for children.

The Pilot Project is also integrated in all the regulatory and legal mobility tools, currently in force; in particular, it will rely on mobility management programs for what concerns technical support for monitoring and for processing all the related data, as well as to promote, as "side-measure", the use of collective modes of transport (mainly car sharing and car pooling) for trips to far destinations. The increase of pedestrian modes of transport will be part of the upgrading of the local PUT.

The Pilot Project’s esteemed cost is 774,685 Euro and the 34% has been funded by the Ministry of Infrastructure. Currently, after some revisions, the building phase is going to start.

Figure 1. Set of interventions on an area of the 1st district (schools in yellow area)
“For a city at children’ size. Safe home-schools paths: education, participation, interventions and monitoring activities” in Bologna

The main promoters of the Project have been the Province administration, the Municipality and the Councillorships for Mobility, for Social Services and Education, for Security, the Provincial Educational Superintendence, the District authority, the Municipality Police, the dwellers associations and, of course, the personnel, the pupils and the relatives of the three kindergartens and the two junior schools of the Lunetta Gamberini Park.

Two features of the project must be stressed: first, interventions stem from the need to drastically reduce the accidents rate and to increase safety standards; second, the promoters believed that a design process aimed at re-shaping and upgrading such an urban context should be supported by other measures apt to make the main users (children from 3 to 13 years old) aware of the risks linked to the road. This requirement explains the dwellers and children’s strong involvement into the Project, according to different steps: public surveys by questionnaires and meetings, educational courses between pupils and teachers and “lessons” where schoolchildren explain to their parents the traffic dangers, consultancies with the citizens during the design phases, children as designers of an innovative traffic signs system.

Safety needed to be really improved: about 10% of all the accidents from 1993 to 2000 occurred to pedestrians (8 fatalities and 236 injured persons - 3% of the total amount were under 15 but 43% were over 60 years old). Accidents occurred mainly along the street rather than at intersections; this means that in many cases accidents have been due to pedestrians misbehaviors. However, an important factor in the risk analysis has been highlighted by a survey on the road structure: all have a straight alignment, mainly double lanes and two ways, in some cases with no sidewalks. Moreover, from statistics on the total amount of accidents data came out that the safest intersections are the crossing points where neither traffic lights/policemen nor zebras are present!

Such an analysis induced the Municipality designers to study four “standard” interventions to be implemented on 24 sites of the area, i.e. all the crossing points and the main pedestrian paths of the Lunetta Gamberini area. These standard interventions are:

• protection of sidewalks
• protection of intersections
• protection of crossing points;
• safe accesses to the park

Each one of them is based on the implementation of the most suitable traffic calming devices for each site (humps close to crossing points or intersections, raised crossing points, pinch points, protections by chains or bollards along the sidewalks, etc.), usual safety devices as zebras and traffic signs (according to the National Highway Code), removal of architectural barriers, and above all some signs designed by children aimed at alerting drivers and at providing pupils with directions towards safe areas.

Citizens and technicians developed together the decision process about “where” and “how” to apply the standard interventions, with the aim of creating a network of safe pedestrian paths across the area. Indeed, the process started from two levels of information: a kind of list of dangerous, unsafe places filled in by the citizens, whose real unsuitability has been checked by the municipality technicians by several surveys; the analysis of the usual routes to school/home, run by questionnaires submitted to all the schoolchildren of the area.
School questionnaires have been a very useful tool to understand habits and behaviors of children and adults. About 55% of children go to school on foot and about 39% go by parents’ car; anyway they never go alone, because of two reasons, according to what parents state: “they are too young to do it”, “the area is not safe”. Anyway, some of them (31%) could allow their children to go alone, if safety conditions would improve. Children had also to draw on a little map their way to school and back, so to collect quantitative data on their shifts.

Figure 2. The six pedestrian paths (orange lines) and the cluster of schools (cyan area)

The result of all these data has been a series of dangerous spots, scattered on the area. The technicians’ task has been to link these sites creating six safe paths, from the Park, assumed as main destination, to some centroids, esteemed as common origins of children trips. They also took care to include in the new paths the most used ways to school, when possible; the aim was to create a new system of routes, but still easily recognizable by children, at this step much more aware of traffic dangers. All these paths will be equipped according to the foreseen “standard interventions”.

Figure 3. The standard interventions
Such an awareness induced children to create an own traffic signs system to be implemented in the most dangerous spots. Children designed a set of alerting signs in red and yellow using elements they are familiar with: “eyes” mean “Watch out, take care!!”, footprints mean “Go straight on!” These signs have been pre-tested on a site, before the Pilot Project experience, just to allow the Municipality technicians to check their feasibility, in terms of materials and colors and if they were worth to be included in the Pilot Project proposal.

The Pilot Project’s esteemed cost is 206,582 Euros and the 50% has been funded by the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transportation. Currently, because of some delay due to adverse weather conditions, the building phase has just started.

![Children traffic signs](image)

**Figure 4.** The model for the traffic sign system designed by the schoolchildren and the test site

**Conclusion**

The Pilot Projects, even if just started, represent an important step toward the increase of awareness to safety problems, at national level. They are also important because they demonstrate how relevant is the synergy between public administrators and end-users, also the less representative ones, as children and teenagers are normally considered. However, it is important to underline that both projects are aimed at giving autonomy not only to children, but to all the involved areas dwellers, so to create really livable conditions for all. Indeed, habits of aged people will be positively affected from these interventions, too.

Participation in both cases has been and will be a key element for the success of these two experiences, and it represents the efforts by the administrations to ensure equity in the processes about mobility governance. Both projects will be soon fully operative, according to different priorities: for what concerns Genoa, implementations will start from those districts where safety situations have been considered worse. In Bologna, on the contrary, first positive outcomes from the Pilot Project area are pushing the local Municipality to implement such a test in other districts of the city. DITS follows the monitoring activities linked to the implementation phases and the elaboration of data coming from the ex-ante and ex-post phases of the projects.
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