

# PROJECT-LEVEL EVENT REPORT

The individual event reports are available separately as part of D 3.3.2.

<b>Type of the events:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D 3.3.2 – Training course to a wider audience <input type="checkbox"/> D 3.3.3 – Interactive workshop to a professional audience <input type="checkbox"/> D 5.3.4 – Final interactive workshop
<b>Partners:</b>	Municipality of Nyíregyháza City with County Rank, Municipality of Oradea, SRC BISTRA PTUJ, Regional Development Agency of the Pilsen Region, City of Valjevo, City of Varaždin, Municipality of Varna, Municipality of Weiz
<b>Name of the cities:</b>	Nyíregyháza, Oradea, Ptuj, Stříbro, Valjevo, Varaždin, Varna, Weiz
<b>Countries:</b>	Hungary, Romania, Slovenia, Czech Republic, Serbia, Croatia, Bulgaria, Austria
<b>No. of events:</b>	11
<b>No. of participants:</b>	352
<b>Agenda of the workshop and methods used:</b>	<p>As a universal constant, all partners thought it important to start the event with <b>providing at least a small amount of information concerning the project and other related topics</b> (project objectives; the role of the participants in urban mobility; other local projects in the field; state of the art; the benefits and concept of walkability; good practices in the topic; etc.).</p> <p>The target groups were varied – there were a few events with a <b>specific focus on one or two narrower target groups</b> (e.g. shop owners and companies; elementary/secondary school/university students), but most of the time, the partners tried to gather a <b>representative audience</b> with regard to the city.</p> <p><b>Interactive elements</b> were also on the agenda in several forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distributing <b>questionnaires</b> among the participants about their mobility habits and opinion regarding the city’s current situation;</li> <li>• <b>Group discussions</b> (e.g. small round tables) in the topic of urban walking;</li> <li>• <b>Walking</b> in the city (in one case, trying out nordic walking) and observing the traffic environment; and</li> <li>• <b>Interactive sessions</b> to identify local problems, ‘hot spots’ and possible solutions to motivate people to walk</li> </ul>

	<p>and cycle more.</p> <p>Most partners used this opportunity to distribute infographics about the project and/or gifts with the CityWalk logo.</p>
<p><b>Key findings and conclusions:</b></p>	<p>The surveys show that <b>people generally like walking</b> and those who chose walking as a basic transport mode are also more inclined to help improve the conditions for walking in the city.</p> <p>The identified problems and solutions/interventions can be structured into the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Pedestrian infrastructure</b> – narrow and uneven sidewalks, long waiting times at pedestrian crossings, architectural barriers for people with disabilities, more pedestrianized areas, better shading through trees, seating accommodations, clean public toilets, appropriate street lighting;</li> <li>• <b>Cycling</b> – more bicycle storage facilities, the possibility of renting bikes, separating the walking and cycling paths, extending the cycling infrastructure to the whole city, horizontal signalling;</li> <li>• <b>Public transport</b> – adjusting the ticket prizes, renovating and upgrading bus stops;</li> <li>• <b>Car traffic</b> – speed limits (30 km/h), physical barriers, parking lots outside the city centre, reducing parking spaces near schools; and</li> <li>• <b>Transport culture</b> – general education for more tolerance, specific trainings for the more thorough transmission of traffic information, participatory planning through public discussions/workshops.</li> </ul>

Methodology	
<b>What worked well?</b>	<p>The interactive nature of the awareness-raising workshops is a key success factor to reach any meaningful conclusion with the help of the participants. Fortunately, this <b>participative approach</b> was received well by the locals. Although most of them haven't worked professionally in urban mobility before, they were willing to brainstorm and offer ideas and possible solutions, reacting positively to the invitation. Most partner cities seized this opportunity to gather data through <b>questionnaires</b> from the participants and they used the input to fine-tune their local walkability strategies.</p>
<b>What could be improved?</b>	<p>The suggested improvements were the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>WIDER REACH</b> – The event must involve as many different demographic and other groups as possible (e.g. the elderly, relevant companies, etc.).</li> <li>• <b>REGULARITY</b> – Instead of only organizing them because of a specific project (like CityWalk), these events should be regularly reoccurring in the life of a municipality.</li> <li>• <b>DECISION-MAKERS</b> – It would be useful to invite more decision-makers and let them mingle with the citizens, for them to get a feel for the city's real situation.</li> <li>• <b>MEDIA INVOLVEMENT</b> – Involving the local media was sometimes hard because they don't always realize the importance of transnational projects and consider reporting about them only in the form of paid advertising.</li> <li>• <b>INTERACTIVE</b> – Even the lectures should be more interactive, based on a Q&amp;A method.</li> </ul>