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FOREWORD

Many scholars claim that the world is growing ever more complex, more diversified and rich, but also more fragmented and conflictual; adding new particular aspects to past collective experiences, in a way that new actors and interest are added to the stage of politics and also to the field of planning. It is a system too complex to overview and measure in its entirety, and not easily understood or transformable in its partiality, which brings new challenges and issues to the fore of today’s planning and policy debate; who acts on behalf of society?; how can we understand common action for creating public goods in a time of more diversified values and more fragmented structures?; what planning tools are the most appropriate for reaching proper and prudent action for change?; how is coordination facilitated in this complex web of responsibilities, needs and demands?

These are just a few essentially important questions that need to be uttered and addressed for shaping perspectives and sharpen lenses when one is trying to understand current reforms of the Swedish transport planning system, as well as the changes taking place in many other countries, such as Finland. These reforms are being undertaken in order to strengthen process qualities and further the production of effective and innovative solutions on transport related problems, for reaching the objectives of sustainable development. It is however the questions regarding proper planning tools and the need for efficient coordination, which are at the very heart of a three year research project at Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan that is being financed by the Swedish Transport Administration (STA).

One important instrument for reaching the procedural objectives is the new planning activity “Strategic Choice of Measures”; a collaborative planning study at the early stages of the planning process that is connecting top-down system-approach with bottom-up initiatives and needs through an unconditional and multimodal problem-defining and problem-solving deliberative process. The purpose of the project is to understand the “Strategic Choice of Measure” method’s institutional ability to provide with effective and innovative solutions on transport related problems (abbreviation REIL, in STA documents).

In order to understand a phenomenon one also needs perspectives and images of alternative conduct, which is why I suggested last fall to the group of Master students in Urban Planning that this research project was interested in a study on neighboring countries activities and policy measures on strategic transport planning. Having Finland in mind as the wished-for country of comparison, Laura Poskiparta approached me with ambition and interest, which set us off on a developing and creative journey in understanding Finnish circumstances and Swedish context. Laura’s excellent master’s thesis on a comparison of the Finnish emerging planning concept with the centrally dictated ‘informal’ Swedish planning method, gives us ample of interesting differences, leaving out the similarities for now, in forming and performing a planning process. Her carefully and creative molding of complex planning theory with empirical observations give us interesting analytical information on planning behavior and actors (mis)conductual processing in the Finnish pilot study. The findings show us, in my interpretation, the meaning of governance, and the importance of acknowledging planning as decision-making, and thus realizing the perpetual presence of ‘agency’ (power) and the questions; who gets to influence the activities and why? And these questions are followed by the inquiry on different conduct; how can these issues of participation and deliberation best be dealt with, through sectorial or spatial processes? The Finnish case provide us with observations on conduct performed in circumstances that deal with issues of transport problems in a more comprehensive spatial context than the Swedish counterpart.

I wish you a most interesting read!

John Odhage
Project manager REIL, and PhD-student Urban and Regional Planning, KTH
ABSTRACT


Experiences from the Swedish and the Finnish Contexts

In recent years, the development considerations within transport planning have started to examine needs from a more comprehensive perspective in order to shift the focus of planning away from favoring automobile travel. New approaches are emerging around the world to face the challenges we are confronted with, such as urbanization, dispersion of community structures, change in population structure, aging, climate change, and tightening budgets. Therefore, this thesis is aiming to gain more insight on new approaches in transport planning by comparing emerging systems in Sweden and in Finland. The comparison is focused on the renewed procedures at the early stages of transport planning; the methods to conduct multi-modal studies through collaborative decision-making processes in both countries. Thus, in this thesis the renewed preliminary transport planning in Finland and the Swedish method of Strategic Choice of Measures are compared based on implications from practice.

The main purpose is to learn from practice and therefore, the data for comparison is based on conducted test cases that aim to develop the emerging planning processes in both countries. In Sweden, the preliminary version of the new planning method, developed by the Swedish Transport Administration, was tested with six cases during 2011. KTH was commissioned to conduct a study to examine the collaborative planning of involved actors in each of these cases, and the cases together. Thus, in the Swedish context, the data for comparison will be collected from the earlier study conducted by a KTH researcher John Odhage. In the Finnish context, a case study will be carried out for the data collection. The chosen case consists of a pilot study initiated in Finland in 2012 for the purpose of collecting ideas for the development of a renewed preliminary planning process. In general, both countries approaches aim at creating efficient procedures that would contribute to cost-efficiency and sustainable development as well as fulfilling other aims of the transport policy of each country.

The focus of the comparison is on the critical aspects of multi-modal studies and three features of a collaborative process; the choice of actors, the problem formulation, and the process management. The comparison is carried out based on theoretical implications and the experiences from practice are scrutinized against the ideal approach of each country. It has become apparent that three clearly distinctive differences between the approaches can be pointed out: the role of the transport administration, the creation of a steering committee, and creation of a concept for process guidance. In addition, the four-step principle is the multi-modal tool used in both countries approaches to generate alternative measures to transport related issues. The basic idea of the principle is in the first place to influence land use, transport demand, and choice of travel mode, and secondly to examine if the use of existing transport system can be optimized prior to construction. However, based on the experiences from practice, it seems that in both countries processes the focus of generating alternative measures is leaning more against minor or large new investments. Thus, the search for complementary measures to achieve considerable cost-savings and more importantly, sustainable development, is perceived challenging.
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Gemensamma dialoger i strategiska multimodala studier – ett nytt vertyp för att undersöka effektiva lösningar inom transportplanering

Erfarenheter från Sverige och Finland


Nyckelord: transport planering, multimodala planering, beslutsfattande i gemensam process, dialog, kostnadseffektivitet, hållbar utveckling
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................ 6
List of abbreviations ....................................................................................................... 7
1 Introduction ...................................................................................................................... 8
   1.1 Background ............................................................................................................. 9
   1.2 Aim and research questions ................................................................................ 11
   1.3 Delimitations ....................................................................................................... 12
   1.4 Disposition ........................................................................................................... 13
2 Current planning practices in both countries ................................................................. 14
   2.1 Transport and land use planning in Sweden ......................................................... 14
   2.2 Transport and land use planning in Finland ......................................................... 16
   2.3 New planning system in Sweden ......................................................................... 19
   2.4 Renewed transport planning in Finland ............................................................. 23
3 Theoretical Framework ................................................................................................. 30
4 Research Methodology ................................................................................................. 40
   4.1 Case Study ........................................................................................................... 41
   4.2 Empirical data ..................................................................................................... 43
5 Experiences from the Swedish context ......................................................................... 45
6 Case study evidence from Finland .............................................................................. 50
   6.1 The development corridor between the cities of Turku and Tampere ............... 50
   6.2 Experiences from the Finnish context ................................................................. 52
   6.3 Reflection ............................................................................................................ 62
7 Comparing the approaches ......................................................................................... 65
   7.1 Starting points for the comparison ..................................................................... 65
   7.2 Participation – selection and inclusion of relevant stakeholders ....................... 66
   7.3 Process management and objective formulation .............................................. 68
   7.4 Application of the four-step principle ............................................................... 71
   7.5 Relevance of the processes .............................................................................. 72
8 Final discussion ............................................................................................................ 74
References ....................................................................................................................... 78
Appendix of the interview structure ............................................................................ 82
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my very great appreciation to my supervisor John Odhage, firstly for giving me the opportunity to write this thesis and secondly to his constructive and enthusiastic guidance as well as useful critiques of this research work. I would also like to thank him for his assistance and encouragement in keeping my progress in schedule.

I wish to thank several people in Finland who have so willingly given their time to meet me and help me to get started with data collection. All your enthusiastic help in familiarizing me to the topic has been very much appreciated. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to all the interviewees in Finland, thank you for expressing your interest to my research and giving your time for the interviews. All your help has been extremely valuable and essential for conducting the research.

I would like to thank few of my friends and fellow students. Firstly, Mariangelina Evliati for reading my work and giving suggestions for improvements. Secondly, Anna Lindberg for helping me with correcting the translation to Swedish. Both of your help has been greatly appreciated.
List of abbreviations

**Finland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELY Centre</td>
<td>Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Finnish Transport Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sweden**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEEC</td>
<td>Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCM</td>
<td>Strategic Choice of Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Swedish Road Administration (former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>Swedish Transport Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction

There is an increasing awareness on the impacts of climate change emphasizing also new requirements for transportation and its development. Accordingly, the European Commission has adopted a White paper on the future of transport policy, the general objective being to dramatically reduce the dependence on imported oil and cut carbon emissions in transport by 60% by 2050 (European Union, EU 2011). Such emission reduction targets are challenging and many preconditions are needed in order to achieve them. However, infrastructure takes many years to plan, build and equip and thus action cannot be delayed because the choices we make today will determine transport in 2050 (EU 2011). Some of the means include the reduction of the need for transport by better integrating the land use and transport system planning as well as a shift away from private cars towards the use of more sustainable modes of transport (EU 2011).

In recent years transport planning has become more multi-modal and comprehensive in order to shift the focus away from automobile dependency, referring to transport and land use patterns that favor automobile travel (Litman 2012a). Consequently, the development of transport related planning has been highly discussed and researched topic. For instance, an international study was conducted in Finland to discover emerging themes in transport system development. The report presents new perspectives, structures, and practices in transport and urban planning policies and revealed that small-scale reorganizations have been planned, or are already underway, in several European countries (VTT 2011). Also, models for administration, management, partnership and organization in the transport sector are in a state of transition all around Europe. The Netherlands, the Nordic countries and the UK seem to have taken the lead in transport reform (Ibid.). However changes are also happening beyond Europe.

In Australia, for instance, the planning culture in transport is shifting its focus towards more efficient use of the existing transport network and long-term planning, highlighting not only economic values but also environmental values and safety. The customer-oriented approach has been adopted as one of the core principles of Australia’s transport policy and similar themes involving users in the design of transport products and services are emerging also in Europe (VTT 2011). However, there are so far only few concrete experiences of user-driven planning and, according to the report, experiences in other reforms vary as well. Consequently, more evidence and experience on the performance of many policy instruments is needed (May 2005).

The concluding thought of the study is that “international cooperation and getting to know what other countries are experiencing and planning could be a very fruitful way of learning from the experiences of other parties” (VTT 2011:11). In line with that thought, this thesis aims to gain more insight on new approaches in transport planning by comparing emerging systems in Sweden and in Finland. The chosen focus for this study is procedures at the early planning stages: the methods to conduct multi-modal studies in both countries. Sweden and Finland both share similar goals in their National Transport Policies, the leading idea being that it is no longer effective to solve transport related problems with traditional procedures and means. According to both countries’ policies, in order to find more cost-effective solutions, there is a need for clear strategic visions and more feasible ways to connect strategies to economic planning. Even though the starting points are very similar, the ways to approach the issues have differences; yet they are both based on the realization that transport policy can be seen as a tool to reach other goals in the society, e.g. sustainable growth. All in
all, both approaches aim to create efficient procedures that contribute to resource management and sustainable development.

1.1 Background

Transport planning decisions are becoming increasingly complex which simultaneously increases the need for more comprehensive analysis of transport issues. Transport planning decisions have tremendous economic, social and environmental impacts and thus poor planning can cause significant harm by reducing transport system efficiency and equity (Litman 2012b). Current planning practices often tend to favor traditional solutions and easy-to-measure impacts and respectively overlook and undervalue many options and impacts (Ibid.). These are often technical distortions that many times result from outdated perspectives, assumptions and technologies, justifying automobile-oriented planning. Decision makers thereby reach conclusions that might change if they had more comprehensive and accurate information (Ibid.). In recent years, however, transport planning has started to consider a wider range of options and impacts in line with the notion of multi-modalism, referring to a transport system that offers users effectively integrated and diverse transport options in order to provide a high degree of accessibility, even for non-drivers (Litman 2012a:12). In other words, a paradigm shift is emerging from vehicle-based and mobility-based analysis to accessibility-based analysis (Litman 2012b). To demonstrate the difference between the conventional planning and the multi-modal transport system planning, some distinctive features are presented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Automobile Dependency</th>
<th>Multi-modal Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle ownership</td>
<td>High per capita motor vehicle ownership</td>
<td>Medium per capita motor vehicle ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle travel</td>
<td>High per capita motor vehicle mileage</td>
<td>Medium to low vehicle mileage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use density</td>
<td>Low. Common destinations are dispersed</td>
<td>Medium. Destinations are clustered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use mix</td>
<td>Single-use development patterns</td>
<td>More mixed-use development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land for transport</td>
<td>Large amounts of land devoted to roads and parking</td>
<td>Medium amounts devoted to roads and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road design</td>
<td>Emphasizes automobile traffic</td>
<td>Supports multiple modes and users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street scale</td>
<td>Large scale streets and blocks</td>
<td>Small to medium streets and blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic speeds</td>
<td>Maximum traffic speeds</td>
<td>Lower traffic speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>Mainly in private malls</td>
<td>Mainly on public streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Large scale, for high speed traffic</td>
<td>Medium scale, for lower-speed traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Generous supply, free</td>
<td>Moderate supply, some pricing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site design</td>
<td>Parking paramount, in front of buildings</td>
<td>Parking sometimes behind buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Practices</td>
<td>Non-drivers are a small minority with little political influence</td>
<td>Planning places are high value on modal diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social expectations</td>
<td>Non-drivers are stigmatized and their needs given little consideration</td>
<td>Non-drivers are not stigmatized and their needs are considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Comparison between the features of conventional planning favoring automobile movement and the more comprehensive multi-modal transport system planning (adapted from Litman 2012a).

Conventional planning often assumes that transportation means mobility – improving transport requires increasing mobility – whereas accessibility-based planning recognizes that sometimes reducing travel is actually the most efficient solution (Litman 2012b). Accessibility-based analysis also expands the range of applicable solutions to transport related
issues enabling to have a more comprehensive and neutral perspective to transport planning. Accordingly, multi-modal transport planning considers a variety of transport improvement options including various modes, mobility management strategies as well as combinations of the various options. Still, often the problem is that there is no mechanism to coordinate decisions among different levels of government, jurisdictions and agencies. This often causes indirect effects to be overlooked in many planning decisions that affect transport. Especially land use and transport decisions are often poorly coordinated which can hinder the development of more comprehensive transport system plans (Ibid.). In addition, what makes the multi-modal planning complicated is that transport modes differ in various ways and thus, they are not perfect substitutes; “each is most appropriate for specific users and uses” (Litman 2012a:8).

In this thesis the concept of strategic multi-modal study refers to a process for addressing the complex challenges transport planning is faced with. More closely, the four-step principle is the multi-modal analysis tool utilized in both countries to analyze transport related issues. The four-step principle is based on an overall transport mode approach in a multi-modal sense, but in the first hand the principle seeks to handle shortcomings and problems within the road transport. However, the basic idea is that action outside the road transport can reduce the need of the particular road and consequently, reduce the need for action concerning the road in question. The principle is initially developed by the former Swedish Road Administration (SRA), i.e. Vägverket, to manage investment funds wherefrom it has evolved into a general planning principle (SRA 2002). According to the former SRA (2002), the four-step principle should be seen as a general approach to road transport analysis and not strictly as a model to be applied in some specific planning stage (Ibid.).

![Diagram of the four-step principle](image)

Figure 1. The four-step thinking (adapted and translated from SRA 2002).

Within the principle, the four steps involve measures that are to be analyzed in the order depicted in figure 1. In line with the figure, measures outside the road transport are examined in the first step (SRA 2002), i.e. examining if a problem can be dealt with influencing demand and choice of travel mode (Ristikartano et al. 2010). Consequently, in line with accessibility-based analysis, the primary intention of the four-step principle should be to reduce travel. However, after the first step measures the principle is widely used in analyzing the measures within road transport. Accordingly, in the second step, possibilities for enhancing the use of existing transport network and improving the use of transport services are considered. In the third step, the possibility of using small improvement measures is examined and only after their applicability is found to be inadequate, the process moves on to considering new road

---

**Analysing measures in different steps**

1. Influence land use, transport demand and choice of travel mode

2. Enhance the use of existing transport network by means to control traffic flows

3. Small investments that develop capacity and quality of existing routes

4. New investments

---

**Evaluating and prioritizing measures with different time frames**

1. Measures step 1
2. Measures step 2
3. Measures step 3
4. Measures step 4
projects and investments in the fourth step (Ristikartano et al. 2010). Once all the steps have been examined, an evaluation and prioritization of measures is conducted with different time frames and with regard to cost effectiveness and sustainability (SRA 2002). As depicted in the figure 1, the outcome can be a combination of measures from different steps meaning that measures should be seen as complementary instead of alternative (Ibid.).

The four-step principle was developed in Sweden already in 1997, but throughout the years its functionality has been highly criticized (SIKA 2005 in Ristikartano et al. 2010). It is seen that there is a lot of talk about the concept, but it has not been applied enough in practice. Hence, its use may incorrectly provide an image of informed certainty regarding impacts and the ability for reaching goals (Ristikartano et al. 2010). However, in the recently reformed planning system in Sweden, the application of the four-step principle has been extensively discussed and the new method of Strategic Choice of Measures (SCM), which will be discussed later in more detail, incorporates the analytical principles of the four-step approach. Also in Finland the principle has been introduced from the year 2000 onwards. According to Ristikartano et al. (2010) the four-step principle is an extensively cultivated concept in the current planning practice by the Finnish Transport Agency. In Finland, the four-step principle has been applied both as an approach for guiding planning and as a planning procedure, but in a wider context the implementation of the principle has been limited and mostly project-specific. This is due to the lack of overall understanding of what kind of solutions and options are ought to be examined in various planning situations. In addition, to evaluate the impacts concerning efficiency and effectiveness of the chosen measures, there is no procedure in which the effects of various measures in different steps could be assessed with same standards (Ristikartano et al. 2010).

It can be said that the four-step principle is still quite unfocused (Ristikartano et al. 2010) even though the range of possible policy interventions available for transport related issues is wide – including for instance land use, information technology, management, and pricing. Yet the difficulties in practice seem to appear from the application and assessment of different policies. For one, the lack of horizontal integration between sectors and their disciplines can be seen as a significant barrier for progress together with the influence from other levels of government (May 2005). But at the same time, the knowledge on the potential of some of the new instruments or how they would work in different situations is very limited. This in turn makes the assessment of different policy measures and their suitability to practice very difficult (May 2005).

1.2 Aim and research questions

There is a need for enhancing the knowledge on how different policy measures can be applied to practice. Therefore, the overall aim of this thesis is to increase the understanding of integrated transport and land use planning by examining possible differences and similarities in collaborative dialogue between the strategic multi-modal studies in Sweden and in Finland. These approaches to solve transport related issues in both countries have just recently been developed, or are still in progress, and therefore it is of interest to investigate how well the ideal models deriving from policies and theoretical considerations can be applied to practice and what are the possible problems and hindrances in the processes, raising from the practical experiences.

The study will be conducted by comparing the recently developed Strategic Choice of Measures method in Sweden to the renewed preliminary transport planning in Finland that is
still, however, in the middle of development. Both countries’ approaches are seeking collaborative dialogue between stakeholders and actors from different disciplines to find novel solutions for transport related issues. However, the prerequisites such as the administrative organization as well as the management in applying the ideal approaches to practice seem to differ. Therefore, the question to be applied for the comparison is:

- How can the administrative organization of transport and land use planning explain the differences between the Finnish and Swedish collaborative decision-making processes?

For the purpose of conducting the comparison and answering the question, information on the Swedish context is already available, but to provide data for the comparison from both countries, a case study will be conducted in Finland as a part of this thesis. The respective case study will focus on the critical aspects of the multi-modal studies as well as the collaborative processes, i.e. the choice of actors, the problem formulation, and the process management. The questions to guide the investigations are presented below, starting with a question proposed to the Finnish context:

- How can the process be characterized; is a formation of a method taking place?

The questions to be applied both in the Swedish and the Finnish contexts for the sake of comparison are:

- Which actors were involved and how were they chosen?
- How the processes were managed and the problems were formulated?
- What differences the collaborative processes have?

The overall aim of this thesis is to learn through comparison. Hence, practical experiences from both countries’ collaborative methods will be scrutinized to identify crucial aspects and conditions for the purpose of learning more about the processes. The intention is not to evaluate the superiority of either approach, rather, the purpose is to increase the knowledge of collaborative dialogue in the strategic multi-modal studies through comparing the newly developed approaches in Sweden and in Finland.

1.3 Delimitations

This study altogether concerns cases that have been conducted to test the emerging collaborative decision-making approaches in transport planning. The cases for the comparison are chosen because they have been carried out recently and they are among the first cases to introduce the new approaches, addressed in this thesis, to practice. In general, policies could be expected to work in a more efficient manner and therefore there is a need to learn more about their implementation to practice. Thus, the examined cases in two different countries, i.e. two different contexts, are likely to show distinct results that can contribute to increasing the conception of the new approaches in transport planning.

The geographical delimitation for the empirical part conducted for this thesis is Finland. When looking into the case, the research is delimited to how the problem of the issue is formulated, how the actors were chosen and involved, and how the process is taking place. The data for practical experiences compiled in the Swedish context is based on an existing study. The choice to use a secondary source is done in part due to the limitations of time available for the thesis work. The focus in examining both countries test cases is on how the collaborative processes are carried out in the respective situations, and not on the underlying
situations themselves. The time perspective of the study is roughly between 2011 – 2013. This is approximately the time when the processes and test cases are planned, initiated and carried out.

There has not been a possibility to observe the test case processes, instead the respective data is primarily based on interviews. This is the case in both countries’ contexts. In Finland, the interviews were conducted for the purpose of this thesis. In the Swedish context the data is also based on interviews, however analyzed by the researcher conducting the study and thus used as a secondary source in this thesis. There is no assessment on which country’s approach is better, instead the study will only compare activities in order to see how things can be done differently. The study will not consider the results of the processes nor assess how well they are corresponding to their purpose of fulfilling the transport policy aims. In order to do that, the processes in both countries should have proceeded much further to allow the collection of necessary data. However, the choice has been to include a case from the Finnish context that in some way is considered successful in its respective context.

1.4 Disposition

This thesis examines collaborative decision-making processes in two different contexts in Finland and in Sweden. Throughout the work, these two contexts are introduced, compared or examined. Until this point some background and starting points for the work have been presented. In addition, the aim and purpose of the thesis have been stated and explained. The second chapter describes the current planning practices and administrative responsibilities in both countries, first in Sweden then in Finland. From that, the chapter moves on to describing the emergence of the new preliminary transport planning practices in both countries leading to the description of the more specific process approaches. The third chapter consists of theoretical implications thus forming the framework for the analysis.

The fourth chapter explains the research methodology, including the case study approach together with the more detailed data gathering methods. The two chapters that follow set the stage for the comparison. The fifth chapter thus consists of a summary of the research conducted to analyze the Swedish test cases. This chapter first outlines the overall purpose of the study together with its aim and theoretical base. Then the part of the research, where the test cases are analyzed together, is summarized where. The sixth chapter, on the other hand, consists of an analysis of the case study conducted in Finland. The chapter starts with a brief description of the chosen case moving on to presenting the empirical data and the analysis of the case study. The last two chapters form the comparative analysis of the thesis. First, in chapter seven, the differences and similarities are compared and analyzed. Lastly, the chapter eight consists of a final discussion.
2 Current planning practices in both countries

In this chapter, the current planning practices in both countries are presented, the focus being on the transport and land use planning. The presentation starts from the national level, moving towards the municipal responsibilities. First the overall transport planning and land use planning in Sweden and in Finland are briefly presented laying the ground for the administrative differences. Then, the new planning approaches currently emerging in both countries are presented, starting with the Swedish context and then moving on to the Finnish. Here, the development of the new approaches are first presented and next, a brief description of the main characteristics of each countries’ approach to the collaborative process is outlined.

2.1 Transport and land use planning in Sweden

To a great extent, the transport system in Sweden is a state responsibility. There are also other actors responsible for infrastructure, for instance, about a third of the public road network is municipal (Swedish National Audit Office 2012:32). There is also a large number of private roads, some with government grants. The railway system is almost entirely state-owned by the Swedish Transport Administration (STA) i.e. Trafikverket. Roads and railways are largely financed by the state budget and appropriation funding is the main regulation for infrastructure investments. More recently, the question of alternative ways to fund and organize the transport infrastructure have been actualized in Sweden as well as in other countries. The reasoning is the increasing need for investment in infrastructure, while the available public resources are scarce. (Swedish National Audit Office 2012:33.)

In Sweden, the Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications (MEEC) is responsible for issues concerning regional development, energy, transport, infrastructure, information technology and the business sector (Government Offices of Sweden 2013a). The policy area within transport and infrastructure includes railways, trams and undergrounds, roads and road traffic, bridges and ferries, shipping, waterways and ports, aviation, and transport and communication research (Government Offices of Sweden 2013b). The MEEC, together with the agencies operating under its authority are responsible for the implementation of the transport policy. In this regard, the key agencies are the Swedish Transport Administration (Trafikverket) and the Transport Analysis (Trafikanalys) that started their work in year 2010 replacing the former agencies of Banverket, Vägverket and Statens institut för kommunikationsanalys (SIKA) (Swedish Transport Administration, STA 2012a).

The STA is responsible for long-term planning for the transport system on road, railway, sea and flight, as well as for building, operating and maintaining state owned roads and railways. The STA also promotes accessibility in public passenger transport (STA 2012a). The Transport Analysis’ main task is to support the Government by providing it with a knowledge base in the form of reviews of decisions, and evaluations and analyzes of their impact and implementation according the transport policy (Swedish National Audit Office 2012).

The planning of the state infrastructure in Sweden is divided into two parts. An economical long-term planning and spatial planning where the individual measures or projects are planned in more detail (Swedish National Audit Office 2012). The long-term plan results in a National Transport System Plan comprising all transport modes that is carried out under the administration of the Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications. The plan specifies the development and economic framework for the national transport system and
infrastructure, together with economic definitions for each county (Government Offices of Sweden 2013c). The STA prepares the National Transport System Plan based on directives and conditions from the government. The work is carried out in cooperation with concerned authorities in each county as well as other stakeholders and ultimately the government confirms the plan (STA 2012b). In the current planning system, the STA is responsible for the implementation of the National Transport System Plan as well as the county plans for the regional transport system, based on a yearly funding by the government. Prior to the implementation needs, the proposed projects are planned in more detail regulated in the Roads Act (1971:948) and the Act on construction of railways (1995:1649).

**Regional and municipal level planning**

In recent years, regional interests in infrastructure planning have increasingly come into focus and the government welcomes the regional stakeholders' views permeate planning measures in a higher degree than before (Swedish National Audit Office 2012). Also, the government estimates that co-financing from external stakeholders – municipalities, counties and enterprises – could be a way to bring effective solutions to the transport system. Yet, the government highlights that the local administrations should not feel compelled to contribute to national investment and thus, as a general rule, the initiatives for co-financing should come from the co-financing parties (Swedish National Audit Office 2012:35).

At county level, plans for regional transport infrastructure are established by the county councils, regional governments or municipal cooperation bodies, but the economic framework is set by the government, and the planning work is supported by the STA and other regional and local actors. The county plans may also include investments and improvements that the STA is responsible for by the statute of the National Transport System Plan (STA 2012b).

In Sweden, the land use development is mainly a municipal concern and formally, the regional level planning is not very strong with regards to spatial planning (Nordregio 2004). At a national level, there are steering documents and guidelines but the interpretations and decisions mainly take place at the municipal level. The regional land use planning in Sweden can therefore be said to be voluntary, but a formalized regional planning takes place in the county of Stockholm and in the Gothenburg region (Boverket 2009). On the regional level Sweden is divided into 21 counties (map 1) where the county administrative boards (Länsstyrelser) are regional bodies for the central Government. They oversee that national interests are taken into account in planning, such as the national regional development policy and transport policy, and that laws are implemented and governmental directives followed (Nordregio 2004). The STA has six regional offices, each consisting of the counties in the area (map 1) that are responsible for the regional activities (STA 2012c).

In the Swedish system, the municipalities have a ‘planning monopoly’ and the Planning and Building Act (Plan- och Bygglagen, PBL) is the legal framework for the comprehensive and detailed planning. Every municipality is required to have a comprehensive plan that shows the intent of usage for all land and water areas within the borders of the municipality. Since the comprehensive plan is not legally binding, the purpose of it is to serve as a support and a guide for municipal land use. In Sweden, the detailed plans are the legally binding plans, and they should not deviate to any greater extent from the comprehensive plan. Since municipalities in Sweden are responsible for planning and implementing also the infrastructure, the comprehensive plan thus forms an important basis for planning of traffic, transport and infrastructure. In addition, the STA thus seeks to participate in the early stages of municipal planning (STA 2012d).
Map 1. Sweden’s 21 counties and the 6 regional areas of the Transport Administration.

2.2 Transport and land use planning in Finland

In Finland, the transport system is also mostly a state responsibility. About one fourth of the public road network consists of municipal roads whereas the private roads cover over half of the overall road network (FTA). The infrastructure management is funded from the state budget whereas larger investments are decided separately by the Parliament in connection with the budget process. In Finland, the Ministry of Transport and Communications (MTC) is responsible for the sectors of transport policy and communications policy. The responsibilities within the transport sector include transport systems and networks, transport of people and goods, traffic safety, and issues relating to climate and the environment (Ministry of Transport and Communications, MTC 2013). In general, the Ministries in Finland prepare acts, decrees and decisions that are made in Parliament, at Presidential sessions of the Government and by the Government itself (MTC 2013). Ministries also issue
ministerial decisions and regulations as well as guidelines and instructions on their implementation. In the field of transport and communications a significant number of statutes are drafted in the European Union and the MTC is responsible to do the preparatory work at national level on issues addressed by the EU (MTC 2013).

One of the MTC’s main responsibilities in Finland is to provide strategic performance guidance in its administrative sector, comprising guiding and supervising of the operation of agencies through setting annual performance targets, monitoring their achievements and use of appropriations. Within its administrative sector, the MTC also deals with the budget (MTC 2013). The Finnish Transport Agency (FTA) is one of the agencies operating under the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Finnish Transport Agency, FTA 2011a). The FTA controls the development and use of the nationwide transport system. The FTA is responsible for the condition and development of railways and waterways whereas the condition and development of the road network is divided regionally which is discussed in more detail below. In addition, the FTA is responsible for the traffic management on roads, waterways and railways including passenger information on the railway stations whereas planning, maintenance and building are procured from service providers – consultants and constructors (Ibid.).

Regional and municipal level planning

Finland is divided into six counties for the purpose of central government administration that act as joint regional authorities without elected officials (Nordregio 2004). Thus, within these six counties, Finland is divided into 19 regions - 18 in the mainland Finland and the Åland Islands (map 2). In Finland, the municipalities and the state are jointly responsible for regional development. The municipalities within the 18 regions in the mainland Finland form Regional Councils that serve as authorities for regional development (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities 2013a). Every municipality in Finland must be a member of a Regional Council since they function as statutory joint municipal authority (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities 2013b). Furthermore, the regional implementation and development tasks of the state administration are managed by the Centres for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment (ELY Centre). There are 15 regional ELY Centres in Finland (map 2) and their tasks are the promotion of regional competitiveness, well-being and sustainable development, as well as controlling climate change (ELY Centre 2013).

At a regional level, the ELY Centers are in charge of the condition and development of the road network, as well as ensuring the availability of public transport services in their own regions (ELY Centre 2013). One third of the transport funds are used by the ELY Centres, monitored by the FTA by means of operational performance agreements. The FTA, however, draws up plans to develop and maintain the operation of transport network, but the planning of the road projects is the ELY Centres’ responsibility. The FTA is responsible for the ELY Centres operations control in the traffic and infrastructure sector, but the Ministry of Employment and the Economy exercises the general administrative control over the ELY Centres (FTA 2011a). The main functions of the Regional Councils, on the other hand, are regional development and regional land use planning governed by the Land Use and Building Act (132/1999). A regional land use planning sets out the principles of land use and community structure, including infrastructure, and designates areas reserved as necessary for regional development (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities 2013c). At the regional level, the transport system work is therefore part of the regional land use planning, and is done by cooperation with different actors, such as the ELY Centres, Regional Councils,
local authorities and the FTA (ELY Centre 2012a). In Finland, only the Helsinki metropolitan region is obligated by law (829/2009) to formulate a joint transport system plan.

In principle, the land use planning system in Finland is hierarchic – higher level planning steers plans at lower levels. Therefore when a plan has legal power, it is binding for all actors (Nordregio 2004). The land use planning system consists of three levels: regional land use plans, the local master plan, and the local detailed plans. Every four years the Government defines land use goals that are thus implemented mainly through regional plans (Ministry of the Environment 2011a). The Regional Councils draw up plans and programs together with central and local government authorities as well as with enterprises and associations operating in the region (Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities 2013a). These plans and programs, including the regional land use plans, have mandatory legal consequences meaning that local and national government authorities must take them into account in their own operative and other action (Ibid.).

Map 2. Counties, regions and regional ELY Centres in Finland (based on information from 2011).

In Finland, municipalities draft their own local land use plans, that include infrastructure, and these plans must be approved by a local government i.e. a municipal council (Ministry of the Environment 2011b). Even though the regional land use plans are legally binding they do
leave scope for the municipalities to resolve local issues such as land use and infrastructure. To ensure the contribution of appropriate guidelines for the local plans, the regional land use plans are reassessed and upgraded regularly according to the changing conditions (Ministry of the Environment 2011c).

2.3 New planning system in Sweden

In Sweden, the objectives and economic framework for planning the transport system for the period 2014-2025 were recently defined by the Government. In addition to this, in 2012 the government made a proposal for revised regulations for the strategic and physical planning of infrastructure, i.e. a new planning system that, among many things, aims to shorten the time needed for planning and make the processes more efficient. It also included changes to better link the economic planning with the planning of infrastructure in the budget process (Government Offices of Sweden 2013c). The two most significant changes are to replace the Governmental mandatory admissibility test by a simplified procedure and to implement a rolling three plus three-year schedule for the plans under detailed consideration in connection to budget decisions. This would enable annual changes to be made to the budget allocation, decided by the Government, when new information is received or when a project gets delayed. Thus the long-term plans are monitored by an annual decision on the measure to be performed depending on the allocated budget and current planning mode (Ibid.).

To better influence and link the economic planning to the physical planning, in accordance with the new planning system objectives, a new model for strategic planning in the preliminary stage has been developed by the Swedish Transport Administration, the Strategic Choice of Measures. The Government states that the four-step principle should be an important starting point for the management and development of the transport system (Sveriges Riksdag 2012:91). Thus, the search of alternative measures in the new method for preliminary transport planning is done in accordance with the four-step principle. Following this, the Government has adopted directives for the new method for preliminary transport planning to be applied in the process for deciding on a new National Plan for 2014-2025 (Government Offices of Sweden 2013c).

A Strategic Choice of Measures (SCM) study aims to provide the transport system with effective solutions that will contribute to the further development of a sustainable society (STA 2012e). The study is a preparatory step for the selection of measures at an early stage of planning (Ibid.) and the idea is that through an open-ended study in collaboration and in dialogue with relevant stakeholders solutions for measures will be found that influence and develop the transport system in a more efficient and sustainable way than the system has succeeded so far (Odhage 2012). It is said that a clear place has not existed in the current planning system to analyze the shortcomings and problems to unconditionally seek alternative solutions for the development of the transport system (STA 2012e:9). The SCM study aims to fill this procedural planning shortage and is expected to secure cost-effective solutions that consider all modes of transport as well as all types of measures (Odhage 2012).

The method for the SCM is linked to planning activities of several different actors, including municipal land use planning, and thus it creates opportunities for the coordination of continuing planning processes and implemented plans as well as for possible co-financing (STA 2012e:11). The accomplished measures may be implemented in the near future in the context of already scheduled activities, for instance in the municipal planning or other actors planning, or be prioritized within the national or the county transport plan (Ibid.). Planning for
the development of the national transport system is also associated with planning for a common transport system for the European Union and thus the related overall modal corridor studies can correspond to the SCM studies (STA 2012e:15).

Application of the method, including the form of documentation recommended, is expected to gradually become a requirement for the proposed measures to be taken in national or regional transport plan with an allocation of funding (STA 2012e:11). The intention is that, after 2013, all the physical measures included in the upcoming national transport plan and regional transportation plans will be analyzed with the method of strategic choice of measures, with possible exceptions made for projects where planning is already in action (STA 2012e:15).

Connections to other fields and levels of planning

The planning activity of SCM is located somewhere between regional and national system analyses and the implementation planning of infrastructure measures (Odhage 2012). The desire is that the application of the method will facilitate collaboration and coordination with other forms of planning at regional and local levels (STA 2012e). Thus, the reached solution may involve actions outside the transport system or concern reinforcing other means of transport to relieve congestion from infrastructure problems (STA 2012e:11).

The SCM studies can be accomplished through several situations. It can be generated by regional development programs and strategies, as well as regional public transport programs, but the study can also work vice versa, a larger SCM studies may provide a basis for such programs and strategies (STA 2012e:15). At local level, the SCM studies can be associated with transport strategy for the city in which case the most recent comprehensive plan of a municipality is always an important basis for the study. Therefore, a SCM study done on a general level can provide a basis for regional as well as local municipal plans (STA 2012e:15). In addition, assessment of environmental impacts is included in several contexts in transport planning, notably in connection with the SCM studies (STA 2012e:15).

Responsibilities

In relation to the SCM, important public actors in the transport sector are the municipalities, regional planning organs, regional public transport authorities, county councils and the STA nationally and regionally (STA 2012e). Accordingly, the initiative for a study can come from any of these actors or, even from an actor outside these public organizations. However, in accordance with the Government’s proposition (2011/12:118), the municipal comprehensive planning has to give meaningful starting points for the planning of roads and railroads (Sveriges Riksdag 2011:97) and therefore the basis for the preparatory study should in the first place come from municipal physical planning (SR 2011:90).

The process of the strategic choice of measures study also clarifies which parties can be considered to be responsible for measure implementation and hence the actors that can reasonably be involved in financing. How far this can be concretized in the study, according to the STA’s guidebook for the method, depends on the situation (STA 2012e:11). The process of a SCM study should be funded by the actors responsible for the relevant transport or jointly with the parties that in general have interests in this context (STA 2012e:24).

From process to project

The SCM method was developed by the Swedish Transportation Administration during 2011, and before its establishment, a preliminary version of the method was tested with six cases.
around Sweden. These test cases were very different in their character and hence, it can be said that they demonstrate the multiple situations in which the method is intended to be applied for. These particular pilot cases are utilized in this thesis for the comparison. To facilitate reading and to provide a better understanding of the comparison, there will be a brief description of the method for SCM study. However, since the application of the test phase, i.e. the pilot cases, the STA has gradually developed the description of the method. Here, the description of the method is based on the final handbook that is intended to function as an aid for those who will use the working method and its results (STA 2012e).

In general terms, the study of strategic choice of measures can be conducted in different situations as: a stretch or small link in the transport network, a transport network such as in an urban area, or in a node or intersection in the transport system. Following this, the study will focus on how a particular function or quality can be achieved as a whole or in part (STA 2012e). After initiation, the method follows a process that is divided into four stages (STA 2012e). The four stages in the ideal planning process are presented in the schematic diagram below. The choice of a measure is the process of analyzing and evaluating the needs and objectives in a problem context in accordance with the four-step principle. Planning in accordance with the method of strategic choice of measures is to ensure that the efforts and investments made are the most suitable and effective to deal with the transport problem at hand, however, under the condition that the method is applied properly and accordingly (Ibid.).

![Figure 2. The process of the method (adapted from STA 2012e:20).](image)

**Strategic multimodal studies**

Here, the process of the strategic choice of measures will be briefly described in accordance with the handbook published by the STA in 2012. Accordingly, the method of strategic choice of measures should be an open and transparent process that can be useful even if it is not completed. That is, it cannot be predicted how the process will unfold and therefore it can sometimes be sufficient to only carry out one or two or three stages of the stages (STA 2012e). The method describes a process logic in which four stages lay the foundation for a fifth stage, a decision or position for selection of measures. The five stages will be presented in order to clarify the aspects the STA highlights as essential for successful implementation of the method.

**Initiate**

The work method begins with a phase of *initiation* in which several parties may agree to jointly conduct and fund a strategic choice of measures study (STA 2012e). In many ways, the STA is responsible for initiating a strategic choice of measures study. However, a study should only be started if it is estimated that there are available measures that are beneficial for society and that also contribute to the achievement of the transport policy objectives and a sustainable development (Ibid.).
The initiator must decide which stakeholders are relevant to carry out the study. However, the method clearly indicates that the several stakeholders should take part in the study to ensure a broad enough competence to deal with the issue comprehensively in accordance with the four-step principle. The work should therefore be characterized by a critical yet creative approach (STA 2012e). In relation to a process manager, the handbook merely states that one may be needed in more complex cases without further elaboration on the requirement. It is also stated that it may be necessary to organize the work with a working group, a steering committee and/or possibly a reference group (STA 2012e). However, none of these are mandatory according to the handbook.

In the initiation stage, it is determined whether it is necessary to coordinate the study with other planning activities, e.g. a local comprehensive plan. Moreover previous planning, such as policy documents, strategies and goals, from different levels create important starting points for the SCM study (STA 2012e). Therefore the linkage to regional and municipal plans as well as different types of existing strategies may need to be clarified (Ibid.). The initiation stage is the basis for how the study will be organized and also a first delimitation of the extent of the problem area. This stage sets the framework for the study and thus the overall purpose of the work must be explicit for it to be useful in the proceeding study. Whilst, the specified targets for action are formulated in the conclusion of the next stage – understand the situation.

Understand the situation

The next stage – understand the situation – is to study more closely the needs, deficiencies and problems in the light of overall objectives and qualities sought for the transport system. In this stage the dialogue can also include other interests, i.e. not just the actors who are involved in the initiation, and thus an analysis over the relevant interests is to be conducted. More than one meeting for dialogue may be required depending on the complexity of the case. In this stage, the current conditions and circumstances need to be studied and described briefly to help form a clear picture of problems and goals. This is needed before possible measures can be generated in interaction with various actors, however, both problems and goals may need to be adjusted later in the process (STA 2012e).

It is crucial that through dialogue, the involved actors will develop a mutual understanding of the desired features, weaknesses and different needs over the issue at hand to develop a description of the overall problem together (STA 2012e). The expression of the problem should therefore be based on the current status and condition descriptions that are linked to the transport policy objectives. Delimitation of the issue must however be made for the study not to become too extensive. This includes delimitation of both the content and the geographical scope and an identification of which parts of the transport network are included in the study and which potential impacts and consequences are most important to be considered (STA 2012e). In the end of this stage, the preparation process is documented to relevant parts (Ibid.).

Explore possible solutions

In the next stage, a set of possible solutions will be explored. These alternative measures and combinations of measures are sought based on the methodological considerations of the four-step principle. This is performed preferably in a workshop form with all interested parties participating (STA 2012e). The overall transport policies and strategies for different transport modes, based on regional or national systems analysis, should provide a guidance of the ambitions of different transport modes. The generation of options and the assessment and
comparison of the alternatives should include the following points that can be implemented in parallel:

- A variety of possible types of measures are generated in accordance with the four-step principle and taking into account all traffic and transport modes, in order to meet needs, address the deficiencies and to achieve the objectives.
- Assess which measures or combinations of measures best lead to achieve the requirements for performance.
- Assess which of the remaining possible measures meet the other requirements.
- Choose the possible measures that have the potential to achieve the purpose and contribute to sustainable development in an efficient manner. These measures are further analyzed in terms of costs, relevant effects and consequences in relation to the zero option or reference alternative, fulfillment of the objectives for the measures and contributions to overall objectives, cost efficiency and balance between costs and benefits.
- A comparative evaluation is presented, discussed and documented.

Form direction and recommend measures

At the fourth stage – form direction and recommend measures – a comprehensive direction is formed based on the best options generated at the earlier stage. A draft of the recommended actions is developed including the estimates of costs, effects and consequences. The STA’s method for comprehensive impact assessment can provide a systematic support for this work.

Decision on further management

The process ends at the fifth stage – decision on further management – where the actor responsible for the implementation takes a position over the decision on further processing. The decision should be added to the report of the SCM study. The decision thereby allows the proposal to proceed to the “measure bank”\(^1\) database where it can be referred to and eventually to be included in further plans or programs.

2.4 Renewed transport planning in Finland

In Finland, the Government adopted a Transport Policy report to the Parliament in December 2012, outlining the National Transport Policy for the years 2012 – 2022 (MTC 2012a). The Government report recognizes that there is a need for more courage to question the current actions and procedures, and enthusiasm to create new solutions for the national transport system. The new Transport Policy therefore intends to address these perspectives and strategic aims. The priority areas in the policy include concepts as cross-administrative approach, transport system perspective, service level and user-based approach (MTC 2011). In other words, the policy is focused on creating a service-oriented transport system where the political decision-making is focused on defining the levels of service, provided with public funds. With public and market-based services complementing each other, the procurements would be based on a service level or a solution, instead of products and services (Ibid.). Thus, the transport policy solutions could offer companies new business opportunities and provide

---

\(^{1}\) “Measure bank” is a database with proposition to measures / project including documentation that is filled with the results of a strategic choice of measures study (FTA 2012e:9).
additional benefits for regions in order to support sustainable growth, employment and competitiveness (MTC 2012a:21).

To solve transport problems by contributing to sustainable growth, the Transport Policy encourages reconciliation of land use, housing and transport to promote implementation of objectives of both general public policy and transport policy. However, in Finland there is no official guide for strategic planning in accordance with the transport administration and policy. In fact, it is said that procedures regarding the aims of transport policy in general are not clear; especially the ambiguity of the aims as well as their reciprocal priorities, and even contradictions, have been a central problem in their application (Ristikartano et al. 2010). In Sweden, the definition of problems and alternative solutions is related to the aims of the transport policy and accordingly, the planning forms a well-defined process including the aims, defined by the Government (Ibid.). However, the recent Transport Policy adopted by the Finnish Government is taking steps to new direction in forwarding its aims to practical ideas and innovation (MTC 2012b).

In 2010, a five-year development program of ‘Transport Revolution’ was launched aiming at developing a new mind-set for urban and transport planning and policies as well as policy implementation (VTT 2011). The central idea of the program is to reform the whole operational mechanism of transport planning, i.e. to create an operating culture and model for a new generation of user-based urban and transport planning (MTC 2011). The key points of the development program for the new mind-set are already integrated in the current Transport Policy (MTC 2012b). Thus, it is said that the Transport Policy is now clearer than ever before (Ibid.) but still, the work is at an early stage and it remains to be seen how well the ideas can be transferred into practical projects, reforms, and measures (VTT 2011). Nevertheless, to create preconditions for this kind of development and change, there must be new cooperation between land use and transport planning (MTC 2012b). Therefore, the overall aim in Finland is to create a holistic model for strategic planning that would implement the new-mind set into the planning practice. The strategic approach emphasizes an overall examination of land use, housing, transport, service, and business that would work interactively between the state, municipalities, people and businesses combining different processes and tools for planning (MTC 2012a). The abbreviation for the model is called the MALPE approach in accordance with the Finnish language.

Another precondition for change is, in accordance with the Transport Revolution, that the focus of planning must be transferred to the brainstorming and preparatory phases of planning (MTC 2011). Therefore, in terms of creating a service oriented transport system, the renewing of the transport planning is focused on the preliminary planning phase which, in this context, has been understood as a planning in the transport system level where the overall aim is the functionality, safety and cost efficiency of the whole transport network (MTC 2012a). The idea is to reform the dialogue practices in the preliminary planning phase so that decisions can be made based on a more comprehensive dialogue and knowledge base; in that way alternative measures are sought in a collaborative manner in accordance with the MALPE approach. The search of alternative means is in line with the four-step principle; the definition of minor improvement measures is prioritized as complementary to large new investments in order to reach the most cost-efficient decisions (FTA 2013b).

---

2 MALPE; maankäyttö (M) = land use, asuminen (A) = housing, liikenne (L) = transport, palvelut (P) = services, and elinkeino (E) = business.
To support and concretize the development work of the new approaches and operating methods, several experimental projects in regional and local levels have been initiated during 2012 (MTC 2012a). These experiments, or pilot studies, also lay the ground for the development of an instruction of the service level based transport planning (FTA 2013b). The intention is to start more pilot studies during 2013 to further study and examine the questions generated by the first set of pilot studies. Since this instruction, or handbook, is currently in the making, the process presented in this chapter is based on preparatory ideas of the ideal process (FTA 2012; 2013a; 2013b).

Connections to other fields and levels of planning

The FTA sees that the plans formulated in the regional level provide a good procedure for prioritizing the maintenance and development functions through cooperation between different actors (FTA 2012). However, in order to better meet the current challenges in the regional planning and programming, the agreement and planning procedures between the central and the regional governments need to be developed. This, however, requires bringing the transport system perspective to planning and increasing the importance of preliminary planning phase to provide for comprehensive use of alternative means that function as starting points for solutions (FTA 2012). Therefore, the preliminary planning phase would at some degree replace the current road planning process; before making a decision to start planning a feasibility study phase is conducted at the same approximate planning level as the regional land use plan and the local comprehensive plan (FTA 2010).

In contrast to the current feasibility study phase, the renewed preliminary planning would, as in the Swedish method, be carried out in a collaborative manner between different stakeholders and interests. The collaboration is to be carried out in accordance with the MALPE approach (FTA 2012). However, this also requires that the dialogues taking place within land use planning and transport planning become more integrated than in the current planning practice (Ibid.). The MALPE approach is linked to the preliminary planning phase, from the initiation to the end, in order to reach comprehensive use of alternative solutions. In the beginning of a preliminary planning phase, the MALPE concept is particularly relevant in setting the preconditions for choosing the relevant stakeholders and interests to participate in the process (FTA 2013a). Therefore, the MALPE approach highlights one of the key elements of the renewed preliminary planning phase with respect to participation; the need to include, not only municipal actors, but also the relevant representatives from the business and service sectors (Ibid.).

Responsibilities

In Finland, it has not been decided how, or who would have the mandate, to initiate a collaborative preliminary transport planning process. However, in relation to transport planning, the important public actors are the Finnish Transport Agency acting as the responsible organization at the state level and the ELY Centres as the regional-level authorities. In the collaborative processes, especially the importance of the ELY Centres’ involvement is highlighted (MTC 2012). ELY Centres are not only responsible for the road network but more importantly also for the availability and level of public transport services including the physical prerequisites such as highway bus stops and shelters (ELY Centre 2013). Other important public actors are the Regional Councils, with a more broad expertise on transport and land use planning, and naturally the municipalities. In relation to renewing the planning procedures, the FTA is currently working on unifying different planning procedures within different transport modes as well as starting the work of outlining an instruction for preliminary planning in accordance with the service level approach.
From process to project

There will also be a brief description of the Finnish preliminary transport planning phase, in accordance with the presentation of the Swedish SCM method, to facilitate reading and to provide for a better understanding of the comparison. However, since the instruction of the method is in the making, the process presented and utilized here is based on initial ideas of the ideal process. Therefore, the description is in part based on interpretation and does not necessarily go in line with the final method. Regardless, the idea of the instruction is to function as an aid for those who will use the working method and its results, as in the Swedish context.

In the renewed preliminary planning the service level ideology functions as the basis for planning; planning produces alternative solutions with broad set of means, aiming to ensure the defined service level for each purpose. The definition of means, on the other hand, is in line with the four-step principle where measures are sought in a complementary manner, as in the Swedish method. The steps determined by the FTA, containing measures that are directly in control of the state administration, and their relation to different implementation timeframes are depicted in the Figure 3 (FTA 2013a). In accordance with the Transport Policy, the intention is that the starting points for the functionality and service levels for transport and travel are received through national and regional transport system work. Thus, the desire is that the service level objectives would be defined in advance by the state administration, firstly for the main roads nationwide but possibly also for the regional network. Therefore, to function as an actual basis for the preliminary planning, the service level objectives exist before a process is started. However, the work of determining the service level, as well as how it would be best carried out, is in the making and therefore in the pilot studies the service level objectives have been decided in each case separately.

In contrast to the conventional transport planning, the renewed preliminary planning phase needs to be sufficiently informal and the process must be kept as an open, interactive and flexible planning phase. That is, the working methods need to be transformed into a workshop form. Thus, by reforming the meeting practices a common understanding and commitment to the process is sought. According to the FTA (2012), the cooperation needs to begin already with the preparation of the mandate. In this respect, the emphasis of the dialogue is on the overall examination of land use, housing, transport, service, and business, i.e. the MALPE approach. The aim is to make various stakeholders, in particular the municipal authorities, to plan and develop land use solutions in a renewed way and to commit to the considerations for transport solutions in a collaborative manner (FTA 2012).

According to FTA (2012), the overall intention of the renewed preliminary planning is to provide principles and alternative paths including financing and timelines for further planning. The emphasis in the preliminary planning phase is therefore in the examination of travel chains, accompanied by the examination of the service level that are achieved through collaborative process of determining alternative solutions. In other words, preliminary planning is a decision-making tool that produces a concept for solving the need for movement. Once a decision has been made over the measures the project proceeds to the actor specific planning. However, if the desired service level cannot be achieved within the framework of costs, the process returns to the examination of travel chains to search for other alternative ways to achieve the desired result or optionally the objectives that need to be reformed (FTA 2012).
Strategic multimodal studies

The ideal preliminary planning process, or as it has currently been presented, has been depicted in the thematic figure below (Figure 4) where the process moves on in stages. The description of the process is based on an interpretation of the figure with some support from additional sources from the FTA. In the preliminary planning, first of all, it is important to identify ‘why to plan’, meaning what decisions are being made on the basis of the particular preliminary planning process. Therefore, before starting a process it is important to identify when a decision is made based on data and when value-based choices need to be made.

![Figure 3. Solutions based on the four-step principle (adapted and translated from FTA 2013a).](image)

In relation to prioritizing, it is also acknowledged in the figure 4 that during the process ‘the prioritizing’ moves from factual models to making value choices of what to prioritize. That is, when defining objectives, choices need to simultaneously be made. In addition, the service level is never constant, e.g. throughout a development corridor objectives need to be defined for different types of sections such as nodes and stretches. In line with this thought, the stages in the process have been divided into four categories; prioritizing needs, prioritizing objectives, prioritizing measures, and finally to prioritizing the path for progress. These stages will be further elaborated below.

Prioritizing needs

The first stage of the process sets the basis for how the process will be organized and functions as a first delimitation of the extent of the problem area which is very much in line with the Swedish method. The importance of collaborative dialogue emerges already in this stage and here, the MALPE concept sets the conditions of which stakeholders and interests need to be included or invited to participate. In Finland, this stage includes determining preconditions and needs for planning in relation to the service level objectives. That is, the service level objectives set for a particular case are clarified. According to the FTA, the
seminar and workshop needs to start already at the stage of examining and setting the objectives. Therefore, in the organization of the task the prioritizing of needs is done through collaborative process of scrutinizing the present situation, needs and expectations of different parties in relation to the service level objectives.

In accordance with the FTA, there needs to be a steering committee that also takes part in the collaborative dialogue and decision-making of the expert level. In the steering committee, all the actors who must engage with the measures and action need to be participating. In addition, what is required is a small and functioning taskforce to make preparations and to collect ideas i.e. to function as a facilitator. Information portals, on the other hand, are needed to expand the collection and distribution of information. Thus, when planning is done in accordance with the need, the most reliable data is received from the users, traffic contractors, businesses, entrepreneurs, land use planners, municipalities and so on. Therefore, according to the FTA, their comments are important throughout and after the planning process.

Figure 4. New process for preliminary planning in Finland (adapted and translated from FTA 2013b.)

Prioritizing objectives

The next stage is very much linked to the prioritizing of needs. Once the needs have been determined through a collaborative process the process moves on to creating a common objective. Hence, prioritizing is needed. Here the service level objectives that function as a base for planning are analyzed and in reflection to the needs, the common objective for planning is formulated. That is, value-based choices need to be made in a collaborative manner through prioritizing of different actors’ objectives and needs; this goes in line with the Swedish method as it states that delimitations of issues must be made. Based on a common understanding of the issue, a common goal for planning can be reached. Here, the collaborative dialogues between the participating actors and the steering committee in seminar and workshop forms are crucial.
Prioritizing measures

Next, there is the phase where the content is produced. Here the alternative means and solutions are generated in accordance with the four-step principle ideology. Therefore, according to the FTA, the collaborative dialogue enables to search for solutions that benefit many parties simultaneously. Also, the participation of different parties in a collaborative dialogue diversifies the available means for planning. The primary focus is on minor measures (figure 3) to ensure that the adequate service level will remain, not only to fulfill the current needs but also the future needs. The prioritization of measures also needs to be done together collaboratively in order to identify the most effective and efficient measures.

Additionally, to compare the ideas and alternative means, there needs to be reliable evaluation methods to comprehensively scrutinize the impacts of each alternative. However, evaluation becomes more complicated when the process in question consists of complex transport system level issues. Therefore, it has been said that the idea of what is needed to make a change in the preliminary planning exists but how to carry it out in practice is still in development; a reliable evaluation method being one of them.

Prioritizing the path for progress

Lastly, based on the chosen measures at the previous stage, a decision on further action is made i.e. prioritizing of the path for progress. According to the FTA, it is possible for the implementation to move on in stages when sufficiently diverse measures are being utilized. In addition, the process needs to be seen as continuous. It is meant that there needs to be constant monitoring of the possible implementation and the status of the solutions, whether the service level has been reached or whether there is need for changes and re-evaluation. However, in Finland, there is no clear image of how to move from process to implementation, i.e. how to make the decision on implementation and funding. In the Transport Policy, it is expressed that a budget procedure where investment and operating expenditure are not separated, has been a key problem in developing the transport system in Finland (MTC 2012a:9). In addition, in recent years the roles and funding responsibilities of the state and municipalities in maintaining and developing transport routes have partly become blurred. Thus, in line with the Transport Policy, a more clear-cut division of responsibilities would promote comprehensive planning of the transport system and urban structure (MTC 2012a:9).

In the near future, reformations for the allocation of transport funding will be executed so that planning would better coincide with it. From 2016 onwards, the focus of funding for transport infrastructure will be redirected from transport network investment to minor basic infrastructure management investment programs and maintenance activities (MTC 2012a:18). This reformation would thus support the implementation of measures generated through the inclusive preliminary transport planning process. Accordingly, within the allocation of financial resources, the FTA’s priorities for the transport system future and associated implementation will emphasize day-to-day traffic capabilities of the infrastructure, minor development schemes, and increased funding for public transport (FTA 2011b). In addition, the new development projects and plans included in the ten-year development program will be re-evaluated in order to find a solution that is optimally cost-effective and user-centered (Ibid.). This re-evaluation will take place through a collaborative process.
3 Theoretical Framework

Both countries’ renewed transport planning procedures for the preliminary stages of planning are seeking to find new approaches to transport related issues through dialogue in accordance with each country’s transport policy objectives. In both countries, the objectives to be achieved through the new preliminary transport planning procedures are more or less consistent with each other, that is, to reach economically efficient solutions that concurrently contribute to sustainable growth. In Sweden the method is considered as a link between the aims created by the government and the implementation of action by agencies and other regional and local actors. In Finland on the other hand, the process itself does not carry the link, rather it will be created through the publicly defined service levels for the nationwide transport network. However, in both countries the intention is to achieve the overall objectives of the transport policies through collaborative work of a variety of community actors where a state level administration functions as a process leader; through these processes it will be possible to generate and propose options that best solve a transport related issue. In this chapter the theoretical approaches to analyze the composition of these processes are presented in order to later compare them for the purpose of learning.

Setting the scene

The approaches used in both countries are expressions of the contemporary literature on communicative or collaborative planning that strongly emphasize the role of language and modes of communication in shaping the process. As in the policy-making of many countries, these approaches are seeking alternative ways as a confrontation to the traditional top-down decision-making. Put simply they are more inclusive of interest and more open to new options and opportunities (Innes & Booher 2010). Healey (2009) argues that this prevalence is located in the large discussion of recent social discussion searching for “productive ways of understanding the complex interactions of structuring dynamics and agency effort” (2009:444). Today, complex and wicked3 problems reflect the challenges we need to address in the rapidly changing surroundings, but on the contrary, the government structures are typically poorly set to deal with them (Innes & Booher 2010). This can therefore result in an inappropriate or ineffective governmental action, or even paralysis (Ibid.). Following from this, the new ways of approaching transport related issues can be seen as governmental level calls to avoid ineffective action by encouraging the use of more inclusive and innovative means.

Even though major infrastructure projects require a large piece of state budget they still are appealing in many ways, for instance, as boosting the economy, by creating and sustaining employment, benefitting the users through a higher-quality services and by possibly improving the environment. However Flyvbjerg (2009) argues that in relation to the claimed efficiencies of infrastructure delivery, a big “if” (p:345) exists, meaning that if done wrong, infrastructure investment can weaken the economy instead of improving it. This occurs if the estimations of costs in relation to benefits do not meet with the reality. It could be said that avoiding these kinds of pitfalls is one part of reaching more efficient decisions through more inclusive processes where issues can be examined with a more comprehensive basis. Also the

3 The term “wicked” problem has originally been proposed by H.W.Rittel and M.M.Webber within social planning referring to a problem that is difficult to define because they are socially complex, involving changing behavior, they have many interdependencies and they often lead to unforeseen consequences (Australian Government 2007).
concept of searching alternative means includes the notion of elaborating on the need of major infrastructure investments while also reflecting the sustainability goal of decreasing use of private transport. These thoughts are supported by Innes & Booher’s (2010) argument that instead of traditional policy making, collaborative dialogues and collaborative policy making are more likely to generate feasible and legitimate decisions, especially “for the many wicked problems we face” (p.7). Attitudes and understandings have are evolving and many governmental and non-governmental agents increasingly see the value in dialogue (Ibid.) as it is apparent in the context of the emerging transport planning practices.

In their work, Innes & Booher (2010) emphasize the importance of institutional change, stating that “our norms for government do not match with the reality” (Ibid.:8). They believe that collaborative efforts are gradually transforming traditional institutional structures and norms, i.e. the dominance of instrumental rationality. Thus, they see collaborative rationality as an alternative to the traditional linear model emphasizing expert knowledge and reasoning based upon argumentation (Ibid.). Collaborative approaches to planning are also supported by Healey (2009) as she states that “urban development dynamics are too complex to be grasped through work in any single discipline” (p.444) whereas more versatile knowledge can provide ‘inspirational insights’ (Ibid.). Globalization fragments and creates more sources of power and consequently not even the most powerful actors, e.g. public agencies, corporations or individuals, can produce wanted results if working alone (Innes & Booher 2003). Therefore it is suggested that collaborative dialogues can be viewed as a way to establish new networks among players and increase the distribution of knowledge among them (Innes & Booher 2010; Healey 2009). One aim behind the collaborative approaches in the new transport planning processes is the wider intention to increase coordination between different levels and types of administrations. However, even though it is clear that the value in dialogue has been acknowledged, it can be argued that creating new networks is not the sole purpose for these processes, instead both countries’ approaches clearly aim at reaching efficient decisions as well as sustainable development. In addition, even though it is stated that collaborative efforts are gradually changing the dominance of instrumental rationality, within transport planning in such, these efforts are just recently becoming to emerge, not only in Sweden and in Finland, but also in other parts of the world.

It is to be acknowledged that the approaches in both countries are new in kind and at odds with the contemporary norms and practices of decision-making institutions, i.e. the conventional culture of planning practice. It is also worthy of mentioning that no simple formula exist for implementing collaborative dialogues in particular times and places (Innes & Booher 2010) even when an instructive method is concerned. Healey (2007:182 in Healey 2009) even state that spatial strategy making is “a messy, back-and-forth process, with multiple layers of contestation and struggle”. She also writes that when different disciplines and practice cultures encounter each other in practice and in a collaborative manner, it can also bring difficulties (Healey 2009). Therefore, in line with these arguments, how can the preliminary transport planning procedures be translated into decisions and actual measures that become implemented?

**Application of theory**

One interesting view to the collaborative processes in both countries’ renewed transport planning approaches is Innes & Booher’s (2010) new theory of collaborative rationality. It is in part suitable for the base of the analysis and beside the theoretical implications Innes & Booher’s (2010) work relies heavily on research from case studies. Their basic argument is that collaborative processes that are designed and managed to generate collaborative
rationality are likely to produce individual and collective learning, yet it very much matters how the collaborative process unfolds, but that collaboratively rational processes do have the potential to lead to changes in the larger system resulting in more effective and adaptive institutions (Innes & Booher 2010:9-10). One of the most important perspectives on how collaborative dialogue can be rational and how to develop a normative concept for collaborative dialogue come from the Frankfurt School of critical theorists, particularly the work of Jürgen Habermas (Innes & Booher 2003;2010). The focus of Habermas’ work is on communicative action and rationality and in his view: “communications themselves are ways of acting in the world” (Forester 1989 in Innes & Booher 2010). In their work, Innes & Booher (2003;2010) base their thoughts on Habermas’ (1981) ideas; especially the conditions for discourse, speech and emancipatory knowledge.

Habermasian theory of communicative action focuses on planning as a practice in the face of communicative power, vis-à-vis to Foucault’s power analysis stressing the discoursive power in itself and power as relational (Pløger 2000). According to Flyvbjerg (1991 in Pløger 2000) power will always be present in every human act and interaction. Therefore, both of these sides deal with power but explained by Pløger (2000) “the Habermasian side deals with power pragmatically” and on the contrary the “Foucaultian side sees power as the fundamental problem in every form of social action”. In the Frankfurt School, knowledge is seen as emancipatory, requiring to overcome past power relations and unacknowledged assumptions that distort knowledge (Innes & Booher 2010). Emancipatory knowledge comes through a dialectical process and if managed well, participants can challenge each other’s assumptions and force self-reflection in accordance with the requirements of emancipatory knowledge (Ibid.). Emancipatory knowers engage in praxis that makes it possible, according to Innes & Booher (2010:24), “to look beyond the distortions introduced by abstract knowledge”. Here Habermas’ ‘ideal speech’ situations come to play as they help to “supersede abstract knowledge and institutionalized cognitive power by appealing for a counterproductive, democratic force based on real-life knowledge and practices”(Pløger 2000:222).

Innes & Booher (2003) have developed their DIAD (diversity, interdependence, authentic dialogue) theory of collaborative rationality to help explore what collaborative policy making can accomplish and under what conditions. Drawing from Habermas, Innes & Booher (2010:35) contend that for a collaborative process to be collaboratively rational three conditions are critical; full diversity of interests among participants, interdependence of the participants, and face to face authentic dialogue. Within the authentic dialogue, the process must meet four speech conditions: communication must be comprehensible, statements must be true, speakers must be sincere, and each must have legitimacy for making one’s statements (Ibid.). These conditions are therefore based on moral principles on “how to communicate democratically”(Pløger 2000:223) i.e. they constitute the discourse ethic of Habermas. In a communicatively rational process there should be an arena for conversation among ‘equals’ in a normative sense with equal argumentative rights and opportunities (Pløger 2000). In these arenas, participants must question assumptions and take nothing for granted and only the force of a better argument can persuade the participants, not power (Innes & Booher 2010). In other words, all claims are evaluated through commonly accepted principles, i.e. the speech conditions, which lead to a power-equalizing communicative practice (Pløger 2000).

Four key results typically emerge from an authentic dialogue if the three conditions set for the process are met: reciprocity, relationships, learning and creativity (Innes & Booher 2010). These can then lead to a second order results as Innes & Booher (2010) state that “both theory and practice demonstrate that if [full diversity of] players engage around a meaningful shared
The task under [the conditions set for the process], the dialogue can produce innovations that lead to an adaptive policy system in a context of complexity and uncertainty” (p.35-36). As stated earlier, it can be said that adaptations to the system are also needed, since both countries approaches are new, yet changing the ways of working takes time and are not always received with pleasure. However, the purpose of these approaches is to reach economically efficient and sustainable solutions, an argument containing the assumption that measures also get implemented, at least to some degree. Therefore, the aims of the approaches in relation to theories of collaborative planning will be discussed following the structure provided by the DIAD theory of collaborative rationality depicted in the figure (Innes & Booher 2010). Special focus is put on the design management, actor involvement and formulation of a common goal.

**Figure 5.** The DIAD (diversity, interdependence, authentic dialogue) theory of collaborative rationality (Innes & Booher 2003;2010).

### Participation

Firstly, the condition of diversity implies that for a process to be collaboratively rational there must be many values, interests, perspectives, skills, and types and sources of knowledge included. According to Innes & Booher (2010), this condition is consistent with Habermas’ idea in the requirement to include all perspectives. It is therefore needed for the development of robust ideas and for the system to build a capacity to adapt over time. In other words, not only agents who have power but also those with needed information or those affected by the process outcomes (Innes & Booher 2010). This condition goes in line with both of the ideal preliminary transport planning approaches in Sweden and in Finland. However, the second condition of interdependence is ambiguous. It contains that reciprocal relationships between agents must develop through inclusive dialogue which develops an understanding of their interdependence as agents come to recognize that in order to achieve their own interests, the interests of other agents must also be met. This condition in relation to the transport planning processes could be said to be case-dependent, since in both countries approaches’, the participating players come from different levels of administrations, i.e. state, region, and municipality, as well as different sectors of public administration, but also representatives from business sectors and possibly views from the public. With such diverse group
composition, a lot of time is required to reach the level of interdependence referred by Innes & Booher (2012). It can be argued that in practice, the resource of time is limited thus possibly preventing the process to obtain such levels of interdependence.

Innes & Booher (2010:92) state that according to their awareness the most successful cases of inclusionary decision-making have included most or all relevant stakeholders. They continue that “a collaboratively rational process has to engage all those who have pertinent knowledge and a stake in the issue” (Ibid.). However, this idea, or assumption, that all relevant stakeholders can be included has been criticized by many and consequently, the preliminary transport planning approaches are confronted with the same questions. Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger (1998:1980) state that little has been said on how the selection of most or all relevant stakeholders could be achieved, or even how all these stakeholders can be identified, and by whom. In Sweden, the choice of actors is most likely made by the STA whereas in Finland the responsible organ is most likely the ELY Centre, however both represent the state administration. In other words, the process initiator decides.

In relation to the notion of including all the relevant stakeholders, Connelly & Richardson (2004) argue that there exists a necessary distinction between ‘ideal’ and ‘practical’ consensus. In an ideal consensus building process, all interest and stakeholders are fully and unproblematically involved, but Connelly & Richardson (2004:9) state that in practice, consensus is normally developed and located within more restricted groups. That is, practical consensus building requires a limited selection of stakeholders that are either identified or invited to participate that is the case also in the preliminary transport planning processes in both countries. So conversely, this rather contains “a choice of who to exclude” (Ibid.:9) than who to include. The identification of appropriate stakeholders is a difficult task even when manipulation is not intended, and in accordance with Connelly & Richardson (2004), the selection of participants cannot be assumed to be entirely under the control of process initiators because the involvement of different stakeholders cannot be taken for granted. In the processes applied in Sweden and Finland, there is also a possibility that intended participants consider, rationally, that the potential benefits of involvement are not worth the effort (Rydin & Pennington 2000 in Connelly and Richardson 2004) thereby leading the process further away from the ideal.

In relation to pursuing participation Healey (2009) states that those who argue for undertaking a transformative spatial strategy making i.e. a collaborative process, need to be prepared to justify why “going on as usual” (p.445) is not sufficient and why there is a need for undertaking a new kind of effort. Accordingly, Innes & Booher (2010) state that a compelling incentive structure to encourage the necessary actors to participate as well as stay in the process is important. But, in line with Connelly & Richardson (2004) difficulties with involving all relevant stakeholders are inevitable, however, often they get resolved through supplements that is a process of consultation to involve wider population. Yet, this is unlikely to be satisfactory concerning ideal since problems with legitimacy arise as consensus building is intended to be ‘open and democratic but in practice is set up to be, or becomes, restricted and exclusive’ (O’Riordan & Ward 1997 in Connelly & Richardson 2004:9). However, in finding out needs of the public, the supplements may have to be sufficient and the only way of collecting such data. Nevertheless, in preliminary planning phases the collection of background data is an important work process and in practice this work has to be conducted through ways that do not entirely fulfill the ideal.
Dialogue

The third condition in the DIAD theory is authentic dialogue that requires that the agents within dialogue must engage with each other on a shared task. According to Innes and Booher (2010) this closely adheres to Habermas’ ideal speech conditions, as it must be mutually assured that the claims of the participative agents are legitimate, accurate, comprehensible, and sincere. Deliberations must therefore be inclusive of all major interests and knowledge, not be dominated by those in power outside the process and all agents must have equal access to relevant information as well as equal possibilities to speak and be listened to. In other words, the group needs to be able to challenge assumptions and question the status quo (Innes & Booher 2003). Deliberations also must take a natural course within the group relying on the knowledge on participants’ everyday life and not merely on scientific expertise. Knowledge is constructed together in pragmatic style through interaction and joint learning where the interactions among participants are the most important points of inquiry for understanding system behavior (Innes & Booher 2010:37). It is not an easy task for a collaborative dialogue to be authentic and Innes & Booher (2010:37) consequently contend that, “many examples of processes that are called ‘collaboration’ fail to meet the conditions of authentic dialogue”.

The results of an authentic dialogue include that a reciprocal relationship between agents forms, and that is the force that leads to the search for options with mutual and joint gains (Innes & Booher 2003;2010). Also new relationships and social capital are built among participants through which an understanding of their counterparts and what the issues mean to others is gained. This means that they are likely to respect one another’s views even while continuing to disagree (Innes & Booher 2003). One of the results is that both single loop and double loop learning emerge from collaboratively rational dialogue; this way agents come to discover both new means to achieve their interest as well as to reexamine and reframe their previously held interests (Argyris 1993 in Innes & Booher 2010). Lastly, a result of creativity emerges implying that participants begin to let their imaginations work to challenge the status quo and find new ideas; it requires courage to put forward “the half-baked ideas that can start everyone thinking” (Innes & Booher 2003:46). Accordingly, it can be said that all these results are equivalent to the needs for the preliminary transport processes to come close to the ideal.

The praxis of the process, in accordance with Innes & Booher (2010), is the authentic dialogue that is needed for an effective collaboration that will lead to a collaboratively rational outcome. Accordingly, in both countries approaches, the dialogue starts from the very beginning of organizing the task. However, Innes & Booher (2010) state that “creating such dialogue is an art form” since it is more than just following a handbook and ultimately, each dialogue must be created anew in each situation (Innes & Booher 2010:97). This fact can thereby become the stumbling block of a process. What is required as a prerequisite for an authentic dialogue is managers, facilitators, and participants, but according to Innes & Booher (2010) an effective dialogue also depends on participants learning to how to communicate productively. It is not just a talk, the techniques do not come naturally to many of us nor do they emerge naturally in large groups (Ibid.). As stated earlier, authentic dialogue also requires that Habermas’ ideal speech conditions are met to a substantial degree. However, whether meeting the conditions is possible has aroused doubt among commentators, although based on their research, experience, and observation, Innes & Booher (2010) claim that well run processes do come very close in achieving the conditions. So what is a well ran process and to what extent can these requirements be fulfilled in the preliminary transport planning approaches under study?
When a process starts, it is common that participants come to the discussion with their own objectives and expectations of maximizing their own interests. However, a collaborative process is grounded in the requirement of forming a common objective and both approaches highlight this stage in their process description. Thus, what is needed to proceed with the processes is a shared understanding of the issue and interest, high quality information as well as an effort to meet the needs of each interest. Healey’s (1996) argument supports this as she writes that inclusionary effort is more than just identifying what is going on and what the issues are, “it involves opening up issues, to explore what they mean to different people, and whether they are really about what they seem to be or about something else” (p.245). Shared understanding therefore requires learning to understand each other’s viewpoints. The goal of collaboratively rational dialogue is to find workable actions that all or most participants can support, thus creativity is often necessary (Innes & Booher 2010). Creativity also plays a crucial role in the preliminary transport planning approaches where an overall goal needs to be outlined but it also comes apparent in the later stages when alternative measures need to be generated, or even innovated, in a collaborative manner. Nevertheless, the goal is not to choose who or what is right, nor what is true or best and according to Innes & Booher (2010) “participants do not have to agree on reasons, goals, or values” (p.100).

Before the process can go on, in both countries approaches it is highlighted that a common understanding must be formed. This also requires selection and framing of the issue. In other words, exclusion of issues is required (Connelly & Richardson 2004). Even when the processes move on, selection of measures is required in accordance with the four-step principle. In each situation it means that the group of participants decide. It seems like a matter that Innes & Booher (2003;2010) do not take a stance for, but according to Healey (2009), any strategy involves a selective focus and the heart of a strategy “lies in the way that it frames ideas”(p:449). Healey continues that creating the frame and identifying critical action, or what Innes & Booher (2010) would call shared understanding of the issue and interest, are both actions of simplification and selectivity (Healey 2009). Since frames arise through process of collective ‘sense making’ (Forester 1989 in Healey 2009) and coherence seeking among the issues and understandings, it achieves a potential transformative power in part by changing how key actors think (Healey 2009). But, since the transformative frames are so powerful, making strategic judgments about them is “perhaps the most ethically challenging task” (Ibid.:451). Arriving to a strategic frame or a shared understanding is in accordance to Healey (2009;451) “an intellectually challenging, politically risky and morally demanding task”. Thereby, because of the selective nature of collective sense making process, it also needs an ethical awareness of what is left out and pushed to the background (Ibid.). Therefore it can be argued that an ethical awareness of making selection should follow throughout the process in both countries’ approaches.

Innes & Booher (2010) in relation to framing the issue under discussion seem to follow the Habermasian notion that the arenas for dialogue need to strive for debate and allow conflict so that consensus is reached through a process of argumentation, that reflects to the formation of shared understandings (Connelly & Richardson 2004). Therefore, for the participants to collectively come to agree on the ‘best’, i.e. most rational solution, different viewpoints and forms of knowledge must be equally valued (Connelly & Richardson 2004) in accordance with Habermasian speech conditions. Therefore diverse stakeholders, including contrarian and disadvantage actors, assure that difficult questions get answered which is necessary to help reach robust agreements (Innes & Booher 2010). But, to come to the point in dialogue that joint commitment to collective action forms, as argued by Innes & Booher (2010), is much dependent on how the process is managed. That is why authentic dialogue requires a skilled facilitator or chair that keeps things focused and moves towards an agreement, which
in this case reflects the choice of best alternatives for a transport related issue. Nevertheless, authenticity of the dialogue and accordingly the value of the outcomes depend on whether “the chair was controlling or genuinely facilitative” (Innes & Booher 2010:97). That said, in accordance with Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger (1998), the facilitator or a steering group can be seen having a potentially powerful position.

In accordance with Pløger (2000:226) one must always ask how to regulate power, even with communicative theory and he quotes Flyvbjerg and Richardson (1998:72-73 in Pløger 2000) who argue that ‘power is needed to limit power’. They refer to fact, as explained by Pløger (2000), that in part agreements have to be forced since “conflicts and interests will always be involved in politics-laden communication” (p:226). In this regard one can argue that the facilitator (Innes & Booher 2010) has the ‘power to limit power’ and the power to force agreement. Hence, Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger (1998:1985) justly pose their question: “how can the neutrality and independence of the facilitator be agreed and checked?”. Following from this, one should wonder who should be responsible for the inclusive process in the case of the preliminary transport planning methods in both countries and what about their neutrality; can it even be guaranteed? In both countries, the control comes from a top-down perspective, however, solutions are intended to be sought from the bottom-up perspective. The transport policy gives the overall goals and funding and the overall process management lies in the hands of state administration, although in Finland, the facilitator is a consultant whereas the process leader is a state administration. Therefore it seems that the process control, i.e. the force that keep things moving towards an agreement, comes from the top-down perspective. This quality is, however, contradictory with the conditions for collaboratively rational process.

The fact that the control comes from the top and there is an urge to achieve efficient solutions, as defined by the governments, poses a possibility for the process to start compromising the ideal. The consensus building can therefore turn towards consensus making when participants start to compromise to reach agreement. In such cases the status quo may become the natural outcome (Blowers 1980 in Connelly & Richardson 2004) or it may get directed towards the interest of those forcing the agenda, in this case the state representatives. In this regard, values will most likely get ignored and as Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger state; “there is a danger (if not inevitability) that seeking consensus will silence rather than give voice (1998:1979)”. In this regard, the actors who are silenced are most likely the least represented or the most disadvantaged participants.

Can collaborative dialogue really make a difference?

The issues raised in this theoretical framework have followed the new DIAD theory of collaborative rationality (Innes & Booher 2010). However, in the light of collaborative processes in the transport planning, inconsistencies with the theory have been scrutinized. Regardless of the inclusive aim, the processes can be seen to have a rather strong top-down control featuring them. Consequently, this can also have an impact on the actors desire to participate. Therefore, the involvement of a variation of stakeholders can be exacerbated by the lack of trust in state institutions associated with the sense that participation is unlikely to affect policy (Connelly & Richardson 2004). In this case these feelings apply to especially those who in the conventional procedures have not been participating in the decision-making, e.g. business sector or even some public representatives who are not working with planning as such. So what is collaborative planning in general seeking to achieve? Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger (1998:1984) are questioning whether it is more important to achieve an arena for discussion or develop useful strategies and plans. They continue that the evaluation of the
outcome does not seem to be an important question within collaborative planning, referring to the fact that participants will most likely want to know how the process will lead to policy outcomes or decisions.

In both countries’ approaches it is emphasized that monitoring of the results is required to ensure that the outcome is fulfilling the aim. However, the step between coming to an agreement on the ‘best’ measures and the decision to implement them has its troubles which can also reflect to the individual motivation to participate, in line with the thought that participants want to know in advance if a process leads to implementation. In other words, there is a gap between these two stages. Resources, in the sense of funding for implementation, are unknown in the phase of preliminary planning. The decision to act comes after. Thus, there is a conflict between the resources of individual time-use and directly identifiable actor/stakeholder benefits. According to theory, collaborative rationality can lead to second and third order results that Innes & Booher (2010) call “adaptations to the system” (p:38) because these adaptations transcend the agreements and the process itself; participants therefore start to develop shared meanings (Ibid.). However, planning practice is not typically inclusionary and it does not emphasize “knowledgeable reasoning and argumentation” (Healey 1997:219 in Ploger 2000). Instead, it emphasizes technical and legal reasoning based on political objectives favoring “rule-bound behavior, hierarchical and structured bureaucracy” (Ploger 2000:224). Nevertheless, inclusionary planning has emerged to challenge governance in favor of forms of “collaborative governance” (Healey 2009:199-200 in Ploger 2000).

Innes & Booher (2003) acknowledge that collaborative dialogues do not have a legal status of decisions even if the collaboration is entirely among governmental entities. In other words, the immediate power of collaborative dialogue is at the margin and according to Ploger (2000), political regimes can protect systemic power through, for instance, legal rights that go beyond the level of participation, management, and debate. So, the participants within a preliminary transport planning process must use their resources to their best ability to come to an agreement on a package of measures that still may not be enough in the face of systemic power. Innes & Booher (2010) do argue though, that if a problem is tackled from many perspectives through a shared understanding, with diverse knowledge and constant challenges to assumptions and different viewpoints and in the end something gets agreed on, then “the result is likely to be robust and feasible” (p:101). But whether this can create the power that leads to implementation is to be decided by those in power outside the process.

Drawing from Innes & Booher (2010), for a collaborative process to make difference there must be a change of structure. In this they share Giddens’ (1984) view that structure provides norms and constraints on the action of agents, but that the actions of those agents alters structure – ‘structure and agency interact and evolve’ (Giddens 1984 in Innes & Booher 2010). Therefore, the affects to structure change norms and practices as well as organizations and expectations. But structure changes slowly, although effective collaborative dialogues tend to speed the process (Ibid.). Therefore, collaborative dialogues generate ‘network power’ (Booher & Innes 2002 in Innes & Booher 2010) as the participants get to know and understand other stakeholders and issues, they become more powerful themselves. Hence, each becomes empowered by the others once common heuristics and shared purposes develop – “[power] flows through the network” (Ibid.:109). Hence, the power of the collaborative processes within preliminary transport planning is to generate ‘network power’ through the collaboratively agreed solution; this in turn has the power to gradually change the structure. In terms of institutional change, Innes & Booher (2003;2010) contend that agreements are only a small part of the purpose and the consequences of collaborative policymaking. The changes
are more fundamental, typically long-lasting and more pervasive than agreements. Therefore, Innes & Booher (2003:55) state that “they can start changes in the direction of social, economic, and political life”. This, however, also needs the society to reward experimentation, risk taking and new ideas, and it needs to give up on the idea that anyone knows the answer (Ibid.). Only through this kind of process the complex system can be made into an intelligent, adaptive one (Innes & Booher 2003:55).

**Analysis ground**

The success factors as well as hindrances for collaborative processes have been outlined above through theoretical implications. For substantial parts, the theoretical framework is similar to the one used in the research conducted in the Swedish context. This should provide better grounds for comparison. The focus of the analysis of the case study conducted in Finland is on the management of the process, on the problem handling and formulation of a common aim as well as on the actor participation. In the Finnish context, it is also of interest to consider whether a formation of a method is taking place.

Few of the main aspects in line with the theoretical implications are summarized. This will lay the ground for the comparison of the two countries’ approaches to solve transport related issues in a collaborative manner. Through the comparison the attempt is to point out differences in the praxis of the processes in relation to the implications from the ideal procedures. For a functional application of both countries’ approaches the four aspects below should be present and represent the starting points for the collaborative processes. These aspects above all are:

- There is a good balance between including relevant interests in the process and the selection of perspectives and needs is based on an idea of reaching a common agreement on action.
- The prerequisites to carry out a collaborative dialogue include learning to understand each other’s viewpoints, shared understanding of the problem at stake, a common overall goal and equal access to information.
- The role of the process leader and/or a steering group is to support the process with their knowledge, assure equal opportunities for all to speak and be heard, and lead the dialogue towards a shared understanding of a common task.
- The generation of measures is based on finding the rational option at the strategic level, which means that the overall political objectives are harmonized with the local needs.
4 Research Methodology

This study aims at creating a wider understanding on collaborative decision-making processes in practice within transport and land use planning. The purpose is to examine the performance of communicative dialogue in practice within transport and land use planning in order to identify and explain differences in the application of the ideal models to practice and thus learn from one another. Johansson (2003) argues that in practice oriented fields of research, the case study method has a social importance and that case studies combine other research strategies. While according to Yin (2009) “the case study is a preferred research method when the focus of a study is on a contemporary phenomenon within real-life context and when ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions are being posed” (p.2). In this thesis, the desire is to understand a complex social phenomenon and hence the case study method has been chosen for the overall method. Even though the case study method can be seen as a distinct research method (Yin 2012) and not necessarily equivalent to qualitative research design, in this thesis, the case study is based on qualitative data. The approach is to obtain a descriptive view of individual experiences and development ideas of new preliminary transport planning approaches.

Another choice made was to conduct a comparative study for the purpose of learning from different contexts. Thus, the study also follows an explorative claim. As the intention is to learn from the practice, the data for comparison is based on test cases that have been conducted in both countries aiming to develop the emerging planning processes. In this thesis, cases will only be chosen in Finland. In the Swedish context, the data for comparison will be collected from a secondary source. In Sweden, the preliminary version of the new planning method was tested through six cases across the country during 2011. KTH was commissioned to conduct a study to examine the collaborative planning of involved actors in each of these cases, and the cases together. In this study, the ideal planning process and the conducted SCM test cases were analyzed through a theoretical approach based on learnings of communicative planning and consensus, on process guided management principals, and on the rational planning process (Odhage 2012:7).

The design and data collection of the Finnish case is in part guided by the existing study conducted in the Swedish context by KTH researcher John Odhage. Also other background information on the new planning approaches in Finland and in Sweden will be used to guide the design and data collection. The theoretical approach for this thesis has been chosen based on the implications from the study of Odhage (2012). Both countries are introducing more collaborative means to renew the preliminary level planning and as a precondition for a collaborative process is a dialogue that is conducted in an inclusive manner. Thus in this thesis the performance of inclusive dialogue functions as an indicator on how the collaboration in practice has functioned. The theory framework will be used for the purpose of analyzing the case studies in Finland and later for the comparative analysis of the practical implications from processes in both countries. Even though the compiling of data in both countries is done based on test cases, the use of secondary source in the Swedish context may distort the comparison and its analysis. In other words, the respective data is based on someone else’s interpretation of the issue and thus the starting points for the comparison are different. In other words, the author will inevitably familiarize herself to the Finnish context more deeply.
4.1 Case Study

According to Yin (2009): “A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p.18). Also, the case study inquiry relies on multiple sources of evidence (Ibid.). An in-depth focus of a case will thereby produce wide range of topics to be covered (Yin 2012) in relation to the complex dynamics with which the case intersects (Groat & Wang 2002). According to Flyvbjerg (2006), in the study of human affairs, predictive theories and universals cannot be found and therefore concrete, context-dependent knowledge is more valuable. And to produce context-dependent knowledge, the case study method is especially well suited (Ibid.). The value of a case study is therefore in learning, as stressed by Flyvbjerg (2006), “proof is hard to come by in social science because of the absence of ‘hard’ theory, whereas learning is certainly possible”(p.224). These conditions fit well with the position of the study in this thesis. The case study method favors the collection of data in natural settings (Yin 2012:5) and adequately this study is seeking implications from practice.

According to Yin (2012), even thought the case study is a distinctive form of empirical inquiry, many research investigators disdain the strategy and it is often viewed as less desired form of inquiry. He continues that the greatest concern seems to be over the lack of rigor of case study research (Yin 2012). It is claimed that the process of preparing case studies takes long, the study results in massive amount of documents and hence, the analysis and presentation of case study data requires more skill (Schell 1992). Thus, it can be said that the case study methodology is subject to more researcher bias than other research strategies (Ibid.) allowing more room for the researcher’s subjective and arbitrary judgment (Flyvbjerg 2006). However, Flyvbjerg (2006) argues that the case study contains no greater bias toward verification of the researcher’s preconceived notion than other methods of inquiry.

Case study methodology is often questioned for not having the basis for scientific generalization, but Flyvbjerg (2006) argues that this is one of the misunderstandings of case study methodology. He states that the strategic choice of case may greatly add to the generalizability, concluding that one can often generalize on the basis of a single case (Ibid.). Therefore, for this study, I have conducted an ‘information oriented’ (Flyvbjerg 2006:230) or ‘purposeful’ (Johansson 2003:8) selection of cases. According to Johansson (2003), selection can be purposeful when the case is, for instance: “information-rich, critical, revelatory, unique, or extreme”(p.8). According to Flyvbjerg, cases should be selected based on expectations about their information content to maximize the utility of information (Flyvbjerg 2006:230). He further specifies this according to the purpose of the study. As I want to learn what differences and similarities two distinct methods, but at the same time two newly developed methods, in different contexts entail, the ‘extreme/deviant case’ could be suitable type of selection for the study. In accordance with Flyvbjerg (2006), extreme cases are to “obtain information on unusual cases, which can be especially problematic or especially good in a more closely defined sense”(p.230).

When it comes to the comparison, multiple cases were under study to scrutinize the method in the Swedish context. However, according to Yin (2012), “the conduct of a multiple-case study can require extensive resources and time beyond the means of a single student or independent research investigator”(p.53). Therefore, in this thesis an embedded single-case design will be applied that refers to a single-case study that involves more than one unit of analysis where attention is also given to a subunit or subunits (Yin 2012:50). Thereby, the
embedded design can add more opportunities for extensive analysis, and in this case for comparison, by enhancing the insights into the single case (Yin 2012:52-53).

**The choice of case**

The unit of analysis for this thesis was chosen from a set of pilot studies initiated in Finland during 2012. The purpose of these pilot studies were to test the ideas of the Transport Revolution mentioned earlier, as well as to support the outlining of a new preliminary transport planning procedure. The pilot studies have been very different in their character and scale, yet all of them have been focusing on finding alternative measures, hereby excluding large new investments (FTA 2013a). For this thesis, the most suitable pilot study has been chosen; the development corridor study between the cities of Turku and Tampere.

Map 3. The location of the pilot study and the chosen cases within the area (close-up map adapted from Ramboll 2012).

From the corridor (map 3), two municipalities have been chosen as sub-units. The examination area of the pilot case consists of a highway and a railway line between the cities of Turku and Tampere (map 3). The examination, however, aimed at considering all transport modes as well as the development of the infrastructure. With respect to the Transport Revolution project, this particular pilot generally aimed at reforming and developing the planning processes of transport development corridors.
As the formulation of the study simultaneously functions as a pilot for the Transport Revolution program, it includes the application of the MALPE approach into practice. That is, taking into account land use, housing, transport, service and businesses in the examination throughout the entire transport corridor. The pilot study intends to determine a goal-directed condition for the transport corridor between the cities of Turku and Tampere, the time span being till 2035. In addition, the pilot study seeks to find efficient measures for reaching the goals as well as to determine a midterm action to reach effective actions for the transport corridor. As the FTA’s intention is to reform and develop preliminary transport planning to include more collaboration between sectors, the pilot study process required participative dialogues between multiple stakeholders and actors, defined in accordance with the MALPE approach. These dialogues are in a special focus in this thesis.

To research the dialogues in the chosen case study, two subunits were chosen from the pilot study based on their level of participation. These are two municipalities located along the transport corridor; Aura and Loimaa (map 3). The pilot study extends over three different regions, but these municipalities were purposefully chosen from the same region, the Southwest Finland. Both of the municipalities are small in population, but regardless they have been very active in the pilot study by having multiple representatives participating in the process.

4.2 Empirical data

Interviews

According to Yin (2012), interviews are an important source of case study information because most case studies are about human affairs or behavioral events. Rowley (2012:262) also writes that interviews are useful when “the research objectives center on understanding experiences, opinions, attitudes, or predictions”. Hence, interviews also play an essential role in the data collection of this thesis. The interviews could be described as focused interviews (Merton, Fiske & Kendall 1990 in Yin 2012) in which a person is interviewed for a short period of time – approximately for an hour – and the interviews remain open-ended but are still following a certain set of questions (Yin 2012).

The choice of actors was made based on the participating agents in the pilot study. The Transport Agency was the initiator of the study but since the ELY Centres function as regional managers of the state administration, they operate as the driving party of the pilot study. Regional and municipal perspectives and interests are also represented. The MALPE concept was guiding the choice of actors to the pilot study and therefore the business and service sector are also involved, however in the form of municipal representatives.

The interviews were divided into three categories (see appendix). The first interview was conducted to gain knowledge of the overall development of the renewed transport planning in Finland, which is a state responsibility. Since all the pilot studies conducted were initiated by the state, a representative from the Finnish Transport Agency was interviewed. The second and third categories focused on the chosen case. In order to get as many different perspectives as possible, the selected actors were organized in accordance with the MALPE concept and composition of the steering group; the state and the regional councils. Thus, the steering group interviews included the pilot study representative of the state, i.e. the ELY Centre, and the Regional Council, both in the Southwest Finland region. The interviews with the municipal participators were chosen based on the MALPE concept - technical, land use and
business representatives – and the municipalities own emphasis on participants. All together eight interviews were conducted.

The interviews in this thesis were semi-structured and conducted in an individual manner. I started the interviews by giving a background of my study and describing my aim. I also gave a brief overview of the subjects that I wished the interview to cover. I had prepared a structured template for the interview questions, but depending on the information given by the interviewees some questions were changed or excluded. All the interviews were recorded and printed in their entirety. The collection of the oral data was placed between the time frame: 27th of February and 14th of March 2013. The pilot study had not finished by the time of the interviews i.e. the collaborative dialogue had not been fully carried out.

Interviews are the main source of data from the practice in this thesis, but the use of them in the analysis can produce some distortions for the results. Since it is my first time conducting interviews, they are susceptible for interview bias. Also, there is a possibility for minor misinterpretations of the information received. However, the interviews are conducted in the author’s native language that, on the other hand, can diminish the risk for misinterpretation. For presenting the data, there are ethical and informational reasons to seek anonymity of the respondents. Within the text, the intention is that the respondents will not be referred to with their stakeholder affiliation. However, since the sample of informants is small, practical problems and difficulties do emerge in the attempt to conceal the anonymity of who is giving the information. However, the report does not refer to any names, and only the members of the steering group can be distinguished in the analytical report of cases. Others are anonymous to both the name of the respondent and the task.

Material

One of the key features of case study is its incorporation of multiple sources of evidence (Groat & Wang 2002). Whilst, Johansson (2003:11) writes that the essence of case study methodology is triangulation that is the combination of different levels of techniques, methods, strategies, or theories. Therefore, in addition to the oral material a number of written sources were used. For the background knowledge of the overall issue previous research was explored. Understanding of the prerequisites for the methods in each country is relevant for the study. To get a coherent understanding and base for interpretation, relevant official documents, reports and policies that touch upon the new planning systems in both countries are utilized. Also documents from governmental bodies in both Sweden and Finland have been used. These sources have been chosen from an information-oriented perspective intending to find documents that are relevant in relation to the research problem.

For the understanding of the collaborative process in Sweden, the handbook for the SCM study (Åtgärdsstuder – nytt steg i planering av transportlösningar, Handledning) has been used as a source of information. Since in Finland the handbook, or instruction, is in the making the understanding of the collaborative process has been compiled through multiple sources of information, e.g. relevant memorandums and presentations supported by the interview with the FTA. For the practical implications from the Swedish test cases the relevant parts of the study conducted by the KTH researcher John Odhage have been used (Åtgärdsvalsstudie – en ny planeringsaktivitet för bättre lösningar på transportrelaterade problem). In general, the material collected and utilized in this thesis has been available in Swedish, Finnish and in a few cases translated into English. The materials in Swedish and Finnish that are referenced have been translated for the thesis and thus are the author’s interpretations of the texts.
5 Experiences from the Swedish context

As a part of developing a new planning system for transport, the STA has developed a method for Strategic Choice of Measures (SCM) and in relation to this development, six test cases have been implemented in 2011 in order to examine, evaluate and suggest improvements for the method. In this regard, KTH were commissioned to conduct a study for examining the processes of each test case, as well as the cases together. More precisely, the evaluation aimed at capturing and describing the participation of different actors and especially the process leaders’ experiences and thoughts concerning the development of the method’s process qualities, as well as its applicability, and the participants thoughts about how the method suited its purpose (Odhage 2012:12). As a contribution to the development of the method, some recommendations as a conclusion have also been outlined (Ibid.).

The purpose of the evaluation was to function as a basis for finding opportunities for further improvements for the method’s process and thus, in line with the implications from the evaluation, the fine tuning of the method described earlier in chapter 2.3 is expected to include considerations based on the recommendations made. In this chapter, the evaluation study will be presented for the purpose of background for the comparison. First the composition of the study will be described then moving on to presenting the experiences of the test cases reflected from theoretical implications. The recommendations outlined based on the case experiences are not presented as they are not directly of relevance for this thesis.

Outline of the evaluative study

In the work of Odhage (2012), the main focus of the evaluation was the process itself, i.e. on the collaborative process in accordance with the method where the generation of measures is carried out according to the four-step principle. In his work, Odhage (2012:12) problematized the method by questioning; how does the method contribute to achieving collaboration? As well as; what steering effects does the normative procedure have on the actors, i.e. what expectations can the STA have on the method’s applicability when used by the actors? The analysis of the ideal process proposed by the STA was therefore done in relation to the test cases conducted in 2011. The analytical framework was based on communicative planning and consensus, on process guided management principals, and on the rational planning process (Odhage 2012).

The empirical material used in the evaluation consisted of oral and written sources. The written sources used were mainly notes and draft reports, yet the collection of the experience-based data formed the main part of the material (Odhage 2012). Four or five actors in each test case were interviewed giving a total of almost 30 actors. The actors were chosen with the idea to include as many different perspectives as possible, e.g. representatives of the state, municipality, region or county, public traffic sector and the civil sector such as firms and non-profit organizations (Ibid.).

One of the test cases concerned a Public Transport Hub development of Karlskrona Norra addressing urban and regional development of a growing Karlskrona municipality together with increased regional accessibility, including conditions for a new train station. Another case focused on solutions to decrease the greenhouse gas emissions of the national airport by reducing car trips and strengthening the public transport flows in the transport corridor Stockholm-Arlanda-Uppsala. In the area Västkuststråket, i.e. West Coast Corridor, between Malmö and Gothenburg, the test case focus was on an overall long-term strategic transport
plan for the area including all transport modes in relation to land use planning. The test case in Pajala and its vicinity addressed an increased need for iron ore transport from a new mining site in Pajala in relation to the urban development problems of that municipality. Two cases out of the six were left out from the study. At the time of the interviews, these cases the SCM processes of these two cases had just begun, so they had not come as far in the application of the method as the other four. These cases were the stretch in Oxelösund and Eskilstuna/Västerås where needs for person and goods transport were examined and a case in Dalarna region where the deficiencies for the infrastructure were examined due to the expansion of tourism in the area. (Odhage 2012.)

The combined experiences from test cases

The purpose of the strategic choice of measures study is that it will lead to cost-effective solutions and enable sustainable development. However, Odhage (2012) argues that an important distinction should be made between the fine line of an objective that includes that cost-effective solutions are secured by the method and an objective that involves a proper application of the method that will thus result in cost-effective and sustainable solutions being selected. That is, the purpose of the method and its process is not to make the decision itself. Therefore Odhage (2012) states, “its effectiveness cannot depart from whether its result ensures, results in, or achieves these objectives”4 (p.87). Fundamentally, the process is a preparation for decision-makers to have options to choose between options that give a true and fair view of the different alternatives consequences on development (Ibid.). While the STA assumes positive benefits and consequences for an application of the method, according to Odhage (2012), this assumption is based on expectations that do not take into account the limiting conditions that are coupled with the rational planning process. To understand the limitations and where the discrepancies from ideal appeared in the four test cases, Odhage (2012) outlines four points grounded in a theoretical understanding of the restricted rational process. These are:

- Consider that a SCM study is a preparation process for decision-makers to make informed and wise decisions by selecting from the alternatives provided by the process.
- For a workable and clear control, the process should be based on an overall societal objective that is harmonized against case particular needs and goals.
- For a good process and a well-balanced study resources need to be allocated.
- Different interests and concentrations of power will try to rationalize the rational study. Conflicts and different needs should be highlighted, described and analyzed to prevent manipulation. (Odhage 2012:88.)

In addition to these points, Odhage (2012:87) points out the processes availability to the resources time, means, and competencies. The resource of competences refers to knowledge and ability to make decisions. Accordingly, the method seems to assume that there will be enough time to run the process in its varied preparations and work stages including searching of stakeholders, investigating needs, providing creative workshops opportunities, and far-reaching evaluation to mention just a few. However, as noted by Odhage (2012), even an infinite resource to time is unlikely to solve all the problems posed by the limiting conditions coupled with the rational planning process listed above. In practice, there is also a possibility

---

4 My translation. Swedish: Det är viktigt att göra denna distinktion eftersom metodiken och dess process varken är, kan eller bör utgöra själva ätgårdsvalet, således kan inte dess ändamålsenlighet utgå från huruvida dess resultat säkrar, resulterar i eller uppnår dessa målsättningar.
for structural and procedural shortcomings that can cause the method to not meet its requirements. These shortcomings were empirically examined in the test cases based on three aspects that are stated as necessary for a well-functioning process, in line with the theoretical implications applied in this thesis. The three aspects were: the presence of normative steering as a guarantee of an inclusive, consensus-driven investigation of an issue; the joint ownership of a process; and application of general objectives (Odhage 2012:88). Departing from this, the three aspects were problematized in the empirical findings of the test cases in relation to detected levels of participation, organizational behavior of the process and the application of the four-step principle (Ibid.).

**Participation**

In terms of participation, it was suggested that there were an ambiguity in the three concepts of *actors, stakeholders* and *competencies* in the test cases. In the method, no distinction between the characters of these concepts had been made resulting in different participative approaches in the studied test cases as well as various ways of organizing the implementation of a SCM study. Based on the interviews, collaboration seemed to be perceived as tantamount to a presence of various decision-making and technical skills, which were applied entirely arbitrary, and optionally in the different processes (Odhage 2012:89). Therefore, Odhage (2012) states that it can be criticized that the requirements of the method for collaboration and stakeholder involvement were not met in the examined test cases. Odhage’s (2012) interpretation of what the interviewees perceive as important for a well-functioning process is contrary to the ideal. The interviewees wanted to reach a good discussion and a functioning group, i.e. not argumentation, and they felt that involved actors should strive for change in the same direction, not opposite, and the preferences among the actors should not be too disparate.

It is questionable whether the above stated features, perceived important by the interviewees, are appropriate and in line with the method. More likely they led to consensus building based on efficiency and the path of least resistance and using this for anticipating actions and making the process more or less predictable. Thus, Odhage (2012) argues that here the confusion emerged between reaching an agreement on consensus for action as a result of collaboration between various perspectives and needs, and on the other hand, to organize collaboration as a result of a consensus-like agreement based on a joint perception of the problem, which is basically to organize consensus. However, Odhage (2012) also gives a complementary explanation for a narrow participative composition of the processes, that is, the limit of time, requiring a tight and predictable behavior to manage the process efficiently.

In relation to the above, theory implies that a process to work effective and to reach consensus on policy options requires a clear normative steering. This will according to Odhage (2012) bring the study to focus on its proper task: to investigate important perspectives, objectives and needs. However, in line with theory, reaching a rational agreement, the process should strive for analyzing conflicting needs and objectives and welcome debate. When conflict is not emphasized, responsible practitioners must, partly follow the overall objectives more strictly and relate them with the need driven special interest objectives, and partly empower a greater variety and amount of interests to take part in the process (Odhage 2012). However, different measures do not only include positive side effects and accordingly Odhage (2012) points out that in the test cases there was very little reflection on winners and losers, instead there seemed to be tacit agreement between the present actors of which development approach is to be prioritized. To allow to reach a genuine consensus, Odhage (2012:90) argues that the STA should *either* start acting in accordance with its assumed holistic
community building perspectives, or the task needs to be organized based on the awareness of overcoming conflicts on an equal basis, and that resources and mandate need to be allocated more evenly.

**Organization**

Regarding the organization, Odhage (2012:91) states that in the test cases the process element of “initiate” was an overlooked activity. As it seems, the initiators had not reflected on its importance to any great extent. However, he points out that it is in this stage where the study’s conditions are prescribed, the framework set up, and the core of interaction is formed. In other words, the basis for the problem articulation and objectives for the study is formed which goes in line with the foundation of conducting a successful process-oriented approach (Ibid.). Some of the characteristics for the organization of the test cases collaborative processes are outlined.

A starting point for a process-oriented approach is a common mission or a common objective. Furthermore there should be shared resources, shared decision-making and joint ownership of the process. The test cases were organized so that they aim towards setting problems and goals within the inclusive collaborative context being one of the main tasks of the SCM study (Odhage 2012). However, a general problem for sector-wide processes, apparent also in the test cases, is the lack of an actor who can take an overall responsibility for the issue under consideration. According to Odhage (2012) the requirements for process-oriented approach were not well fulfilled in the test cases:

- None of the cases had an external steering group that would consist of the identified core actors to which the process manager reports;
- There was no common guiding principle for the actors included in the test cases;
- There was not any possibility of a common collective decision-making or a joint ownership of the result;
- There was in some cases internal steering groups and in one of the test cases there was an actor common agreement to implement a study, to fund its parts with solidarity and to push for a continuation of the process after its completion;
- The arrangements for implementation and management within the different test cases were unclear and those details were not expected to be of major importance for the involved actors. (Odhage 2012:91.)

These test cases were conducted for nearly a year. However, Odhage (2012) criticizes that without knowing that, one could be tempted to think that these test cases had only carried out the first step of the study, i.e. initiation. However, this view may underestimate an extensive collaboration that has taken place in the studies. Odhage (2012) makes a point by stating that perhaps in the two test cases that were not described in the evaluation the issues of initialization has been dealt more thoroughly because in those there were external actors’ more closely involved in steering and funding, so things needed to be settled and organized before the investigation process could begin. However, nothing at the point of evaluation was known about the outcomes for any of these processes. But for the sake of speculation, Odhage (2012) states that some studies will be completed earlier than others, but whether the resulting measures are the most appropriate are of course unclear.

**Four-step principle**

Four-step principle is an expression of rational planning, referring to an unconditional search for appropriate action. An unbiased application of the four-step principle should not only
result in description of stages towards realization of new infrastructure but also in proposals for action that are actual alternatives to transport development measures (Odhage 2012:93). According to Odhage (2012), the latter was very unusual in the examined test cases. In relation to the process-oriented approach the structure of the test cases, as presented, did not allow the collaborative processes to reach their full rational potential (Ibid.).

To explain the above argument, Odhage (2012) gives an example concerning the “soft” measures on the steps one and two; the issues of behavioral effects and efficiency that could as well be termed as transport decreasing measures. It appears, based on the interviews that in a context in which the main issue is transport related, the “soft” measures are especially hard to deal with. In that, it is noted that the process is driven by an organization whose main task is to maintain and develop the operation of the transport system in the country (Odhage 2012:93). Accordingly, it can be interpreted that structural difficulties may come forth in delivering a collaborative process to generate alternatives for development; the issues and actions are quite well spread, and therefore one actor alone cannot claim they control the “soft” measures concerned (Odhage 2012:94). Thus, Odhage (2012) states that it seems that for the four-step principle to achieve its purpose, it needs to be used in contexts other than those exclusively focused on transport (Ibid.).

As a conclusion, Odhage (2012) discusses about the process relevance and credibility for the participants, building his arguments on the former three aspects. It is implied that several of the interviewees mentioned the method as a kind of trick from the state to mix up the cards, meaning that state is trying to avoid dealing with local infrastructural problems (Odhage 2012). Few considerations are presented on how this could be prevented and why is it altogether important to narrow down such suspicions. Odhage (2012) states that the raison d'être of the method is not grounded in its ‘purpose’ per se, but rather in its ability to be “applied in an uniformly and accordingly manner to reach its purpose”5 (p:94). The study aims to improve decision-making so that the objective of an economic and sustainable transport system is achieved, however, achieved only if the method is applied in a right way (Ibid.). Therefore, in relation to the presented deviations from the ideal, “it is thus a question of correct behavior, i.e. a value of doing the right way, not only doing the right thing”6 (Odhage 2012:94). The relevance of the process to its users is important to strengthen its applicability and thus make it more likely that the correct problem is solved with the most effective measure in order to contribute to sustainable development (Ibid.).

The inclusion and full use of the socio-economic approach, e.g. four-step principle, in the studies is also of a great importance. Thus, the inclusion of interests cannot be reduced to a detail that can be delimited arbitrarily under pressure or for convenience, nor can it be only evaluative in monetary terms. There must be preconditions to investigate, describe, and present a genuine alternative to a defined problem, that is, each study needs to ensure a properly transparent problem description and the search for alternatives needs to be deep, wide, alternative, and creative. However, the examined test cases appeared to use the four-step principle to justify already stated demands for measures of infrastructure character (Odhage 2012:95). That is, none of the test cases appeared to be producing real options to solve the problem. Therefore, to apply the four-step principle approach on an unbiased manner, it is necessary to have a broad inclusion of interests. Thus, for the SCM study to be credible, it needs to be inclusive and rigorous as well as properly applied (Ibid.).

---

5 My translation. Swedish: “tillämpad på ett följdendligt och uniform sätt för att nå sitt ändamål”.

6 Case study evidence from Finland

In this chapter, the empirical data collected from the chosen case in Finland will be discussed starting with a brief description of the development corridor between the cities of Turku and Tampere for the understanding of the overall setting. The selected municipalities along the corridor, Aura and Loimaa, will also be part of the description. From that, the chapter moves on to describing the collaborative process that has been carried out in the pilot study. Thus, the review is not only intending to describe the empirics of the process, instead it is also a critical analysis based on the theoretical analysis ground and the functionality of the process with respect to its purpose as contribution to the outlining of a new preliminary planning procedure. The pilot study is described through a common form yet emphasizing different parts and stages, through the knowledge gained from the respective case.

6.1 The development corridor between the cities of Turku and Tampere

The term development corridor, i.e. transport corridor, refers to a geographic area, or a stretch, between two nodes that link multiple areas through the main links of a highway and a railroad where people and freight are moved. The study area consists of a highway and a railroad connection together with the municipalities along them. The highway (Road 9) between Turku and Tampere is about 160 kilometers long, and it is a significant connection towards the inland and part of the E63 Europe road as well as part of the EU’s suggestion of a comprehensive transport network (Ramboll 2012). The road has been planned and built in the beginning of 1960s according to the planning principles of the time and no major improvements have been made for the road since. In addition, the ports in Turku and Naantali, connected to the railroad network, are located in a close vicinity to each other and thus constitute a major transport and travel hub to the region (ELY Centre 2012b). The development corridor extends to three regional areas (map 3, page 22; Southwest Finland, Tavastia Proper, Pirkanmaa) and there are almost 1 million inhabitants in its hinterland. The population growth of the Pirkanmaa region is substantially rapid, and the population is also growing in the Southwest Finland in the nearby area of Turku. In the mid-section of the corridor, the population development is however declining and about 37 % of the current population is dispersedly located. (Ramboll 2012.)

Transport projects are often justified by the fact that they contribute to the region’s economy and thus a start-up of major projects can often be seen as increased economic activity. On the other hand, in some cases these effects have been overestimated. In the case of the Turku-Tampere development corridor, the intention is in part to better assess in advance, or even enhance the effects the transport system development could have on the land use and economy of the area. (ELY Centre 2012b.) Additionally, since the examination standards are regional and over regional, the study requires a new kind of interaction and treatment of the objectives between the municipal and other authorities (ELY Centre 2012b). The pilot study for the development corridor between the cities of Turku and Tampere started in April 2012 and it will be completed in June or July 2013.

The selected municipalities are located in the mid-section of the development corridor in the Southwest Finland region. Aura is a municipality of approximately 4 000 people located 32 km from the city of Turku. Currently there is no functioning train station in the municipality even though the rails pass through the city. The highway has been renewed from Turku to Aura and thereby the municipality has a smooth connection to Turku. However, there are
three intersections to the municipality that join directly to the highway. Consequently, these crossings create major safety risks to people traveling to and from Aura and no pedestrian crossings exist. Therefore it can be said that the highway forms a barrier to the municipality that can only be accessed and crossed with a vehicle.

Map 4. Location of the case units, Aura and Loimaa, along the transport corridor (adapted from Ramboll 2012).

After the municipality of Aura, the condition of the road becomes weaker. The second municipality, Loimaa, is relatively big with almost 17 000 inhabitants. In 2009, the small municipalities of Alastaro and Mellilä were merged to the city of Loimaa. Since the area of the municipality is relatively large, there are multiple level intersections across the road and railroad, including intersections for agricultural purposes. The city is part of the Southwest Finland region, located on the regional border. There is a functioning railway station in Loimaa and about 54 % of the population lives in the central area of the city, in a close vicinity to the railway station (Statistics Finland 2011). About 2,5 % of the work travels within the region are to Loimaa (Ramboll 2012).
6.2 Experiences from the Finnish context

Organization of the pilot study

The pilot study has been initiated as a part of the Transport Revolution project mentioned earlier and therefore the focus of the pilot is in the development of the service level concept together with the method construction. The Finnish Transport Agency coordinates the pilot study but the ELY Centre of Southwest Finland has the role of a leader in the management of the project. The project has a steering group that is comprised of representatives from the ELY Centres and Regional Councils of the study area as well as representatives from the FTA. The steering group started their work with a preparative phase before the start of the actual pilot study and thus their involvement throughout the process was presumable without separate invitation. The group consists of all together five members from the ELY Centre of Southwest Finland region, one member from the ELY Centre of Pirkanmaa region, one member from the ELY Centre of Uusimaa region, two members from the FTA, two members from the Regional Council of Southwest Finland, and one member from both Regional Councils of Tavastia Proper and Pirkanmaa. By the time of the interviews, the steering group has had about five meetings during the process.

In addition to the steering group, a consultant has been chosen to handle the actual planning work. For that, the ELY Centre of Southwest Finland, with support from the FTA, has composed the bidding competition\(^7\). In addition, the ELY Centre has determined the objectives for the planning process, i.e. the project goals, with assistance from the FTA. These objectives set the overall framework for the project that needed to be included already in the tender. The setting of the overall objectives for the pilot study, formulation of two scenarios for the transport corridor as well as designing the seminar work method were part of the tender, i.e. part of the consultant work. Thus there was flexibility with the design of the work method. The chosen consultant also had the role of a facilitator, however, with guidance and support from the steering group. The consultant was not participating in the preparatory work conducted by the steering group.

The ELY Centre of Southwest Finland has invited the stakeholders to participate from the municipalities of the study area, i.e. the development corridor. This group of participants consists of about fourteen people from six different municipalities within the three regions:

- Southwest Finland: Aura, Loimaa and Turku
- Tavastia Proper: Humppila
- Pirkanmaa: Urjala and Valkeakoski

From Humppila three people were participating (the mayor, the administrative director, and the technical director), from Urjala the mayor was participating, from Valkeakoski one person from the Enterprise Service Centre of the Valkeakoski region was participating, and from Turku the zoning plan engineer was participating. The collection of oral data took place in Aura and Loimaa. From Aura, three people were participating (the mayor, the area architect, and the technical director) and from the city of Loimaa three people (the town planner, the town planner architect and the development director) and a person outside the municipal administration, from the Enterprise Service Centre of the Loimaa region (the managing director). According to the interviews, the actors from Aura and Loimaa have not established any internal working groups due to the small number of the municipal employees. All

\(^7\) In Finland, all the state and local authorities’ purchases are to be put out to tender in accordance with the Public Procurement Act 348/2007 (Finlex 2007).
together about twenty-seven people were participating in the pilot study process not including the consultant representation.

Resources

The pilot study began in April 2012 but the preparative work for the study has been conducted during 2011 including several separate surveys. The purpose was to gather more up-to-date data on the transport corridor in its entirety that also serves as data that extends over three regional areas. To this extent, sufficient data has not been available before. In the transport system planning, a lot of time is required for collecting background data and here, the desire was to be able to start the pilot study based on existing and reliable data. The consultant was also entitled to collect more data based on the need they estimated. The surveys conducted for the whole study area were:

- Land use survey including entrepreneur interviews
- Rail track usage survey
- Public transport service level survey
- Property impact evaluation survey

Summaries of the surveys have in part been distributed to the municipal participants. In addition, as a part of the preparatory work for the pilot study, a joint seminar has been held with the municipalities in 2011 over the subject before the actual pilot study process started and before the involvement of a consultant. In short, there were one seminar before the start of the pilot study, two seminars during the process and there will be one more seminar organized in June 2013 where the cooperation models will be further developed, measures will be chosen and their path of progress will be determined. The ELY Centre has not allocated any additional resources for the study. It is financed within the budget for the Transport Revolution pilot studies, provided by the FTA. Other actors contribute to the process with their time.

Expectations of the pilot study

Based on the interviews, the expectations of the study lie in the perception of the problem or the need for the transport corridor. The steering group in itself already encompasses multiple perspectives to look at the issue. It could be said that the FTA certainly has the strongest expectations in the development of the process whereas the ELY Centre perhaps has a more road-oriented perception of the problem and the Regional Councils, on the other hand, have a strong regional land use viewpoint towards the issue. When it comes to municipalities, it seems that many of them tend to focus on their own problems within municipal borders and therefore the expectations for the pilot study go parallel with that line of thought.

It was acknowledged by all the participants that the process outcomes are not guaranteed to receive funding in a larger scale but still, as expressed by a participant, the expectation of a direct benefit for a municipality is very much on top. This perhaps reflects the reality that minor measures are not considered as rewarding as larger infrastructure projects. It was noted by one of the participants that problems are not directed to a single municipality anymore; on the contrary, they are more regional or areal. However it can be interpreted that all the municipal representatives do not yet share this perception. Still, there was also realism in the expectations of the pilot study leading to implementation. There are many plans taking place simultaneously and even some of the smallest improvement measures proposed long ago are getting postponed year after year. Clearly the strained conditions of the public finances are apparent to the participants. However, it was noted by a participant that if development needs
are based on good reasoning, solutions are more likely to be funded. Therefore, it could be said that the participants shared an expectation of this pilot study to give the transport corridor and its urgent problems more visibility.

Choosing the relevant participants

The group that forms this pilot study represents a variety of public functions that is in part due to the large size of the examination area. The FTA has an important role to play as responsible for maintaining or developing the service level of the nationwide transport network. The role of the FTA in this pilot study is to instruct the service level based planning. In Finland, the responsibility over the road development has been distributed regionally between the ELY Centres who are accountable of the development and condition of the state roads. Since in this case the study area extends over regional borders the process requires the attention of three different ELY Centres, out of which one has the leading role. It could be said that both of the state agencies have an important role in the process that includes the responsibility to ensure economically efficient and sustainable transport system development. Thus, the important task is to develop the transport system accordingly and to propose priorities for the state investments.

The Regional Councils, on the other hand, have a more comprehensive responsibility in terms of outlining the regional land use plans, but they also bear a legal responsibility to lead planning work of a regional transport system. The train connection in the pilot study is, however, a state responsibility and more precisely, the responsibility of the FTA. Since the role of the ELY Centre is more focused on road structure responsibilities, according to the project manager, it is important to get a representative from the FTA with railroad competence to participate. In terms of bus transport within the study area, one of the ELY Centre’s responsibilities at a regional level is also to ensure the availability and level of public transport.

The MALPE concept was guiding the choice of actors for the pilot study process including the composition of the steering group. For the competences of participants, definitions have not been set, however, the intention was to get as diverse group composition as possible. The participation within the ELY Centre was intended to cover all its tree administrative sectors; economy (E), transport (L), and environment (Y). The emphasis of the steering group participation is on the transport sector, as it is presumable, but also a representative from the environment sector is participating. Even though the economy sector was invited, or further even persuaded to participate, they felt that the subject of the pilot study was too unfamiliar to them and thus no representative from this sector took part in the process. According to the project manager, in some other pilot studies the economy sector of the ELY Centre has been interested to participate. From the Regional Councils the representatives from both land use and transport were encouraged to participate. In terms of municipal representation, the MALPE concept guided the choice of actors in the sense that the transport, land use, and business sectors from the municipal administrations were invited to participate as well as the mayors who can provide more comprehensive view of the overall administration in municipalities.

The process composition included mainly the public sector representatives, a fact mentioned by several participants. It was emphasized by several participants, that the business sector was stakeholder group that could have been better represented. At the same time several participants also felt that the time-use and interest of the business sector does not include projects with strategic level aims, rather they should be included when something more
concrete has been achieved. Since the study area is so large, the inclusion of the business sector was based on interviews conducted for the local entrepreneurs of the study area. However, the business representatives from the municipal administration have been invited to participate to enable the examination of the issues from this viewpoint. According to the project manager, the knowledge of these representatives over the municipal entrepreneurship has been very strong. However, it was expressed by one of the participants whether the business sector perspectives reach geographically far enough in relation to the overall examination of a transport corridor.

There were only few comments made in terms of resident inclusion, i.e. public participation. As a part of the pilot study there has been a resident workshop organized in the municipality of Aura. The project manager said that there were also farmers participating in the workshop, giving crucial knowledge of their needs. However, it was expressed by one of the participants that the resident participation may not be worth the resources in this kind of pilot study, supposedly referring to the size and strategic level aims of the pilot study, since residents usually lack appropriate knowledge and thereby have very unrealistic ideas.

When it comes to including all the relevant stakeholders, the project manager would have wished that the participation from the two harbors in the study area were bigger. The harbor representatives were interviewed but they could not be pursued to participate in the workshops. The project manager also highlighted the importance of getting the business sector to participate and that it was a hindrance not to get the economy sector of the ELY Centre to go aboard. It was also expressed by the project manager that in general the difficulty is to get people participate due to the fact that they have own meetings and work responsibilities. “The procedure seems to be that we can get an actor to participate if they are either very interested in, or alternatively worried about, what we are doing”, said the project manager (my translation).

In relation to municipal participation, it was expressed by one of the participants that it is a quite harsh demand to ask people to “volunteer” in a state project when municipalities are small and already focused on a huge workload. A view from another participant was that it felt like the consultant was over-represented and municipalities under-represented, a fact that can be related to the difficulties of getting people to participate. A notion from the Regional Council representative was that it is especially hard to get municipalities to participate when there is expectation for them to give something to the process, a notion that can in part also lead to an unbalanced process composition. Often the municipal representatives also start to look at issues from a very narrow perspective. Thus, as expressed by the Regional Council representative, it is good to have a strong representation of state and regional administrations who have a more overall perspective to issues. This especially applies to this particular corridor study since the issue at stake is broad and over-regional. On the contrary, in relation to lack of participants or purposely excluding them, the problem coming up is the forwarding of information and knowledge. As the Regional Council representative also brought up, the people external to the process do not know anything about it, since the pilot study is developing a new kind of approach to planning.

**Pilot study’s features and handling of the problem**

**Problem**

The pilot study consists of a substantially large area since the focus of the examination is not only on the infrastructure but also on the surrounding land use. Therefore, there are multiple
aspects to the issue. The road and rail tracks are both a state responsibility, however, changes made to them, especially the road, will affect the land use of the municipalities located along the corridor. Also, the harbor transport from Turku and Naantali is coupled with this pilot study. As mentioned above, the road has been planned and built in the 1960s and during the years only few measures have been implemented to improve the structure of the road. Thus, the main problem of the pilot study can be said to be the road and its weak safety standard.

There are multiple intersections throughout the road, some of which serve the municipalities local traffic. The road is relatively narrow and for the most part the road consists of one lane in each direction. There are also deficiencies in the road geometry and in the intersection arrangements. The mid-section of the transport corridor is characterized by its agricultural landscape and thereby also tractor transport uses the road locally. These are all factors that contribute to the low safety of the road. In terms of the single-track rail connection between Turku and Tampere there are also multiple level crossings over the tracks which relate to the safety and speed issues of the train transport, together with other deficiencies such as the low number of meeting places for trains. Increasing passenger capacity of the train transport is one major concern.

The development of the highway or the railway is not in the current budget list of the Government, although improvements for the transport corridor are badly needed. Yet the state budget is scarce, placing restrictions and challenges for the development of the study area, however, at the same time justifying the need to search for minor improvement measures.

**Working procedure**

According to theory, the praxis of collaboration is in the dialogue. However, in all of the pilot studies conducted in Finland the creation of the work procedure was part of a consultant work and thus the process does not completely follow the approach presented earlier in chapter 2.4. Therefore, the praxis of the pilot study under examination will be briefly discussed. The three seminars, carried out by the time of the interviews, used the workshop form. About thirteen people were participating from the municipalities and all in all, about twenty-seven people participated in the seminars plus the consultant. The ELY Centre representation in the steering group was high in order to have a member in each workshop group. Hence there were three workshop groups consisting of about five people each and the groups were divided into themes based on the MALPE concept. Materials over the discussion topics were delivered beforehand, produced together by the consultant and the ELY Centre, and the meetings were held in different municipalities so the participants also had to travel across the regional border.

Several participants said that the workshops functioned well and a variety in the groups had been sought so that participants from the same municipality were put to different groups. It was also expressed by several actors, that conversation flourished. According to the process manager, there have been individual absences, but other than that, the level of interest and presence has been very high. However, it seemed that in the last seminar the participation decreased, a notion that was also brought up by one of the municipal actors. Concerning this, the process manager stated that a better pacing in the workshops seems to be a necessary precondition to keep up the interest, i.e. the process stages should move on more evenly. Still, several actors said that the amount of workshops was sufficient. Even though each group had a representative from the ELY Centre it seems that they were not participating in the dialogue. It was expressed by one of the municipal participants that the ELY representative and the
consultant were not participating in the dialogue, rather they helped in case the conversation did not move on. Thus, it seems that they both had the role of a facilitator in the process.

Some critique was given about the consultant work, even though in general it seemed that their work was perceived very professional by the interviewees. Nevertheless, the consultant effort ended up being smaller than wished. The project manager had an impression that the consultant was busy with other work and thus their input for this project was not as high as it was initially hoped for. However, the consultant had acknowledged their lack of time as well. This fact can explain some of the other comments made in the interviews. For one, it was seen that the consultant should have done more preparatory work for the workshops so that the process would not end up being just an “empty-paper” approach. Also, one of the municipal participants expressed that in one of the workshops it felt that the consultant was trying to push the conversation to a certain direction decided by them beforehand. So perhaps the consultant’s busy schedule made them to force the agenda instead of having a neutral stand required for a well-functioning dialogue.

Common understanding of the issue

One of the prerequisites for authentic dialogue, in accordance with theory, is a common understanding of the issue, which in such requires selection and framing. This should take place through a collective process that would thus enable transformation of how one thinks, leading the group towards a common understanding. In the pilot study, the steering group had handled problems, but according to the project manager, during the seminars problems were just presented. Naturally, the problem definition was also part of the consultant’s work. Therefore, it could be argued that one of the crucial stages of collective learning was missing from the process. Several participants, however, said that the problem has been understood uniformly in the sense that the road and its surroundings must be developed, where the issue of safety is of main focus in the regions. According to the process manager, the limits for the development possibilities set by the scarcity of state funding were also understood. Furthermore he mentioned that municipalities naturally share the view that big infrastructure investments always improve the economy, but that understanding has possibly taken place through the process that this may not always be the case.

So who is responsible for reaching a solution to the problem? In terms of infrastructure, it is a state responsibility, but with the current transport policy aiming to integrate transport planning with land use planning, some of the responsibility is being distributed to the municipalities as well. It can be argued that even though the nature of the problem is clear to the actors participating in the process, the comprehension of responsibilities necessarily is not. The issue is seen very strongly as a state responsibility. That is: ‘there is not much the municipalities can do’. So whose problems are on the line? Since the problems come as given for the participants without deeper reflection, it further highlights the division between state and municipal responsibilities. It could be said that the state owns the problem. This can mean that despite the inclusive process, the issue will remain being regarded as only a state problem especially when it comes to action. Therefore, in this case a true understanding of the many-sidedness of the issue might not have been reached. That is, the municipal responsibilities, in terms of local planning for instance, are not being distinguished as partial prerequisites for overall development of the transport corridor.

In relation to the discussion above, it was expressed by the Regional Council representative that there could have been clearer emphasis on the framework for the development as well as on the common understanding of the current situation; but what is actually a realistic outlook?
It was also expressed by the Regional Council representative that municipalities very often have quite unrealistic aims for growth, which in some cases can be based on hopes, whereas in reality the population may even be declining. In this case, this type of thinking and data can distort the boundary between desires and realism. Since it seems that the problem was treated with overly quick pace, the risk is that deeper learning over the issue and limits to development have not been formed among all the participants.

Theory implies that the success of a collaborative process is very much dependent on the process management, especially highlighting the importance of a normative leader, i.e. a facilitator. In this case, the consultant had the role of a facilitator guided by the steering committee. However, it was expressed that the consultant seemed to need quite a lot of guidance, but on the other hand, it was also noted that the steering committee was not always sure what to expect from the consultant. In other words, the procedure was not instructed very strongly resulting in the steering committee having to interfere with the consultant’s work more than they may have anticipated, posing a so-called dual impression to the normative steering. Furthermore the consultant’s own busy schedule may have shifted their neutral position from facilitative to controlling, i.e. pushing the agenda to a wanted direction. However, the steering was not focused on one administration and thus on their perspective on things, instead the overall process was lead by a steering committee, i.e. a group of people from different administrations. Thus, it can be argued that the presence of a steering committee has also had a positive effect on the consultant’s facilitative role in terms of pursuing a holistic approach to the process management.

In the transport system planning, in line with the FTA, planning starts from the service level which in turn reflects the application of the transport policy. It was expressed by the Regional Council representative that there could have been more emphasis on the service level thinking, especially since the FTA was part of the steering group instructing the process. In the pilot studies, the purpose was in part to collect ideas for the formation of a preliminary planning method and therefore the consultant was given the freedom to form the work method. According to the Regional Council representative it felt that the objectives were set very high in the beginning, moving then downwards to more realistic aims, which can be seen as one way of looking at the issue. The reason for this approach can be in part explained by the requirement of the consultant to draw scenarios. Nevertheless, what may have come out of this is learning in the sense that objectives cannot be set so high in the beginning, as expressed by the Regional Council representative, especially when the aim here is to find minor measures and a stepwise approach to action instead of a single grand solution.

**Setting the objectives**

To form a common objective, learning and understanding of each other’s viewpoints and aims is important. Only through a common understanding the group can start to reach the common goal together. This stage is also part of the demanding task of selecting and framing the issue at stake and in which direction it will be directed. In the case of this pilot study, the emphasis of the process has clearly been put on setting the objectives. The overall objectives were determined before the objectives of each participative actor were known. This took place in the first seminar held before the actual start of the pilot study where the overall framework of the MTC and the FTA for the road and railroad development were clarified. In this seminar the land use objectives in relation to transport planning objectives were examined, in a workshop form. However, the creation of objectives for the transport corridor pilot study was part of the consultant work. The national land use objectives and transport policies as well as
local and regional objectives functioned as starting points for the objective formulation. Thus, the main objectives for the corridor are:

- to create conditions for the coordination of land use and transport,
- to develop the transport stretch as a link that forwards long-distance passenger and cargo transport by considering all the modes of transport and,
- to develop the conditions for local and national business in a system level together with ensuring cost efficient and accurate transport. (Ramboll 2012.)

Several participants stated that the consultant set the objectives beforehand but that during the seminars there was a possibility to bring out new views and the municipal objectives were combined with the initial objectives. However, it was also noted by one of the participants that it is hard to make collaboration work if one talks about own objectives. What he meant was that the problem was mostly understood from a micro level and that only some of the municipal participants were able to focus on the macro level, i.e. the issue on a more comprehensive level. This also reflects the conception of the Regional Council representative: the problem has probably been understood by everyone, but the goal possibly not. Also it is worth mentioning that when there is no knowledge about the resources, it is very hard to imagine in what scale measures are even possible to become implemented.

According to the Regional Council representative, the consultant was approaching the objective issue quite strongly based on the scenario thinking. This methodological approach is very different from the service level approach where the service level aimed at also defines the preconditions for objectives. It was mentioned that the MALPE approach together with the transport corridor creates a very broad framework. It becomes questionable how well the participants can absorb such a broad conception, let alone develop a common understanding. As noted by the Regional Council representative, the MALPE concept should be utilized sector by sector for it to be comprehensible. When connections or contradictions start to appear between the sectors the question becomes then how to prioritize between different needs to reach a common goal?

No inherent conflict seemed to take place during the process based on the interviews. It can be interpreted that the objectives in terms of the linear road and rail road were understood and shared by the participants but when the question turns to crossing roads, i.e. intersections, the understanding becomes more diverged. It was also mentioned that within the cooperation for improving the road, the city of Turku that can be seen as a rather strong actor in the sense of political power, has not been very actively involved with the issue. This can in part slow down the development. Nevertheless, in order to conduct selection and framing of an issue in a study that considers different measures to affect a problem, there must be awareness of the conflict inherent between participants, especially when one considers the objectives and prioritization of needs in relation to limited resources. Unless contradictions are exposed and heard, there is a probability that the solutions are not appropriate, robust and sustainable, i.e. collaboratively rational. In this case, the learning and possibly reframing of one’s own aims has not taken place, rather the actors’ understandings based on prior knowledge, may have strengthened. Therefore, reasoning over the conflicting objectives and means is crucial. One must however consider the possible effect the state - municipality division has on the opportunities for debate. In the theory chapter, it has been argued that here the preconditions for truly authentic dialogue are not being fulfilled in the sense that participants cannot be regarded as ‘equals’.
One example of conflicting goals, expressed by both the Regional Council Representative and the project manager in relation to the regional perspective of a commuter train development. In their official statements, municipalities support the idea of commuter train but during the process it came apparent that municipalities are not willing to develop the preconditions for such development. This was contradictory to the previous knowledge and proved, in line with the consultant’s research, that a commuter train may not after all be the most efficient solution. Hence, now the focus and resources can instead be put to improving the bus transport links that can be seen as a more realistic solution when considering demographic predictions. Even though some conflicting thoughts became apparent allowing more realistic options to be considered, the conflicting nature of the commuter train issue could be considered as minimal. The question is about a new investment, a very distant one when considering the possibilities for funding.

Generating measures

When asked about the stage of generating alternative measures the overall conception seemed to be that measures were rather discussed than alternatives generated. It was expressed by a municipal actor that the measures were so broad that finding alternative solutions all of a sudden could be quite challenging, while another view was that the solutions were more or less leaning on the old ideas, thus nothing very visionary seemed to take place. Also the process manager stated that perhaps nothing major came out in the workshops because the examination area was very broad, which was intentional. The rationale can also be that there are still so many – or too many as expressed by one of the participants – small safety improvements that have not been implemented. So it can be argued that before one can be encouraged to start discovering truly novel measures, the simple and basic safety measures should get fixed. It also came out that there had already been alternative measures on display when the instructions were brought to the workshops, perhaps having an affect on the possibilities for brainstorming.

In terms of conflicting measures, it was expressed by one of the participants that the Regional Council maintains the idea of commuter train whereas the consultant’s scenario examination made that seem like an impossible solution. Also it was said by a municipal actor that some alternatives were in contradiction with the regional land use plan. However, the regional land use plan guides the local planning and have an impact on development possibilities for municipalities along state infrastructure. So how can one abandon previously held views and routines during few workshops and start to look at issues with a fresh mind? Perhaps the scenario thinking led the dialogue to a wrong direction. It was expressed by one of the participants that one could have wished for more considerations on developing the existing railroad and highlights its potential to serve local transport as well. This thought would have therefore gone in line with the ideology of the four-step principle, however, even though the FTA highlights its importance, the principle was not mentioned by any of the interviewed participants.

At the time of the interviews, the stage of generating options was still work in progress. Since the safety issue is, and has been on the agenda for many years it can be assumed that the ELY Centre does have a quite good knowledge where the problem areas are. Hence, according to the project manager, there is already knowledge of the measures and their location but the question is their path for progress. The consultant’s broad expertise has become apparent through their good arguments on how the grading of the measures could be executed. But, according to the Regional Council representative, the point of bringing the local knowledge to
the process is that plans are not only made from the top-down perspective. In the beginning the municipalities’ wishes were focused on quite heavy measures according to the project manager, so through the process expectations and views have come to a more realistic level. On the contrary, the urge was also to find out what is taking place in the municipalities and what are their needs and aims, in other words; what is taking place throughout the whole development corridor.

When it comes to choosing the alternatives or package of measures, at the time of the interviews this particular stage in the process had not yet been conducted. However, it became apparent that for now, the decision of implementation is made by the ELY Centres in the framework of their budget. As mentioned earlier, according to the current Transport Policy, reformations for the transport funding will come into effect from 2016 onwards, allowing the allocation of funding to minor improvement measures, such as generated by the pilots cases. However, according to the project manager, small and more inexpensive measures such as small intersection improvements are already solved for this particular pilot case. But there is a considerable amount of bigger measures, such as passing lanes or rail tracks, which combined cost for implementation is high, most likely exceeding the budget framework of the ELY Centres. Therefore, in terms of these measures, the order of urgency must be considered and more importantly, the order of importance. The possible benefit of each of them should be scrutinized through the MALPE concept that on the other hand brings up other considerations between sustainable development and safety. How to stress the importance of improving the rail transport when on the other hand there is safety reasons to improve the road, where people’s lives are at stake? In addition, for the time being the land use supports the use of private transport, that easily end up giving the road infrastructure measures more importance.

Continuation of the pilot study

Since the character of the study as a pilot project, the decision-making process has not been determined. Judging by the interviews, it seemed that the municipal participants were not aware of a last seminar to be arranged; at least no one mentioned such. However, it was a commonly shared view by the participants that there should be continuation of some kind to keep up the progress. Even though concrete measures are not achieved in the near future, one important aspect of the study is that it has allowed an over-regional examination of the issue which hopefully will lead to the continuity of regional transport system plans, as expressed by a participant. Nevertheless, it was expressed by the project manager, that the study functions as a pilot in the sense that there is also a need to think about the process itself and not only the measures needed for developing the corridor.

What complicates the continuation of the process is the size of the development corridor, since it extends over three regions and thus the administrative responsibilities change. The pilot study has however generated valuable material for other regional level plans that are currently in the making. At the moment, according to the project manager, it seems that there will not necessarily be a decision as such, instead the other regional level plans and programs would be informed about the process outcomes. Hence, the representative from the Regional Council expressed similar thoughts. A natural place for the process outcomes would be in a regional transport system strategy that, at least in the Southwest Finland region, is being updated. Thus, it would be accepted in the regional board and in the municipal boards. But as said, the development corridor continues after the municipality of Loimaa, that borders the Southwest Finland region, and to reach concrete measures, possibly of a larger scale, there is a need for some kind of joint-action as well.
Even though the continuation of the pilot study was not clear to the participants from the municipalities, the expectations were mainly based on a continuation on behalf of the state administration. It was however expressed by two of the municipal actors that municipalities should also engage in making changes through local planning. It seems that in some cases, however, the engagement will only take place through the requirements set in the regional land use plans from which they will be transformed to the local plans. There is still a gap between these two planning levels that gives the municipalities leeway with local planning. For instance, there are still an extensive number of people who move to sparsely populated areas each year and municipalities let this go on by giving building permits. The project manager states that: “In reality, the fact is that a commuter train is a very distant possibility since there is a struggle to even keep up the bus transport because of the dispersed habitation” (my translation). The project manager also says that there are measures that could be implemented by the municipalities, such as auxiliary roads to get the local traffic off the main road, however the fact is that the small municipalities cannot afford to implement these kinds of measures alone.

Throughout the process, knowledge of the current state of the land use structure and its future has been gained, enabling to consider more detailed alternative measures as well as to scrutinize the issues consistently throughout the whole transport corridor, i.e. over the regional borders. However, in relation to the pilot studies conducted in Finland there are difficulties in implementation. As said, the allocation of funding does not yet support the generation of alternatives that are located in the second and third step. For now, when it comes to minor measures implemented regionally, ELY makes the decision in terms of the budget framework that has been issued to them. The idea is to find minor measures that are related to safety and condition of the roads and railroads, and these measures can get implemented rather fast. In other words, one does not wait for a whole stretch to be renovated. However, in order to get funding in a larger scale, i.e. to implement all the generated measures throughout the corridor as a package, the plans would need to be in a preliminary engineering planning level, which however takes time. According to the project manager, it would technically be possible to implement measures in stages, for instance one passing lane a year, but the present system does not support that. Therefore, when the final instruction for service level based planning has been outlined, the system to allocate funding will hopefully be clearer.

6.3 Reflection

Throughout the chapter, reflections have been made regarding the collaborative process of the examined pilot study based on the theoretical analysis ground. Next, the presented experiences and insights on the formation of a method will be further reflected on. The examined pilot study is set in a context where the state road and railroad run through many small municipalities. Therefore, one of the aims for the study is to create new conditions for coordination of land use and transport planning and in that the process focuses on consolidating the local and regional objectives with the national transport policies and land use objectives. In accordance with the four-step principle, to achieve cost efficient solutions and sustainable development, the measure on the first step is to influence land use in order to decrease the need for travel. Hence, the conditions in the examined pilot study include integrating the transport and land use planning more efficiently in the preliminary planning stages as well as creating new agreement procedures between the state and municipal administrations, simultaneously clarifying the distribution of responsibilities. However, as it has been indicated, in this pilot study this setting was not unproblematic.
For one, the purpose was to gain knowledge on the local needs and objectives to outline economically efficient solutions for the transport infrastructure, going in line with the land use. The process thus followed the transport policy guidelines by seeking minor measures with the most efficient benefits. However, due to the MALPE approach and the large size of the examination area, the issue comprises of many perspectives making their coordination challenging. What is actually meant by coordinating land use with transport planning? In this case, the transport infrastructure is a state responsibility whereas municipalities have a planning monopoly. Moreover, the municipalities are small and characterized by dispersedly located housing, so what kind of land use development in the name of sustainability is even realistic to be predicated? In relation to the organization of the process, it has been argued earlier that the treatment of the problem was left with little attention, which can in part be reflected to the weak understanding of objectives and the division of responsibilities in reaching them. Hence, it is unlikely that complete learning in terms of beginning to reexamine and reframe one’s previously held interests has taken place among all the participants.

Above all, it came apparent through the interviews that the process has contributed to reciprocal learning between the state and municipalities over needs and limits to action. The municipalities’ knowledge over the transport political guidelines and the MALPE approach have increased, a fact that cannot be overestimated when it comes to implementing policies. Municipalities have also felt that their needs have been heard, giving their perspectives also more value in relation to decision-making. Also the state and the regional representatives have gained valuable knowledge of the realistic needs and preconditions for development. However, out of the three regions located along the development corridor, participation seemed to have focused on the Southwest Finland region. As expressed by a municipal participant, this can be seen as an indicator of the level of importance over the issue at stake, within different regions. As mentioned, the road in question has not comprehensively been renovated after it has been constructed in the 1960s. One reason can be the fact in the Southwest Finland region, the political focus has been put on the two coastal highways: one is leading to Helsinki and other one towards north.

In relation to above, the municipal participants have expressed their contentment towards the pilot study as bringing more visibility to the corridor. However, it can be argued that in the Pirkanmaa region resources have been allocated move evenly around the city of Tampere and therefore the municipalities along the corridor do not feel as strong need to participate in comparison to the municipalities in the Southwest Finland region. In addition, it was criticized by few municipal actors that Turku has not understood the importance of the Turku - Tampere connection, i.e. the connection between the two biggest city areas in Finland after the metropolitan area of Helsinki. The unbalanced participation between regions may raise the issue of legitimacy of the decisions in accordance with collaborative decision-making. Furthermore, it is a hindrance in the sense of forwarding information and increasing understanding, which in part is needed to gain more political power behind the solutions. However, the state representation was quite high in the process, which does not necessarily fulfill the requirements for authentic dialogue, but on the other hand it gives the process outcomes a stronger mandate for further action.

In the beginning, a question was proposed for the Finnish context: is a formation of a method taking place? As stated earlier, the examined process did not follow the approach based on service level thinking presented in the Chapter 2.4. On the contrary, it was seeking to collect new ideas for the development of a method through the consultant’s work. In other words, the development work for the method is in part outsourced and hence not merely a responsibility of the state administration, i.e. a top-down approach. Nevertheless, it can at the same time be
argued that the flexibility given to the consultant work led to the service level thinking to not get enough emphasis. After all, the intention is to utilize the pilot study experiences to form an instruction for service level based transport system planning and the service level objective contains a strong state influence. However, by the time of the interviews, the pilot study process had not been fully completed. The analysis thus is lacking one inclusive planning stage; deciding the order of urgency of measures in relation to implementation.

Even though the process has not yet been completed, some pros and cons are already observable based on the interviews, indicating that a formation of a method was taking place at least concerning the pilot study in question. According to the project manager, it was successful to conduct pre-studies in the beginning of the project. Clearly, the adequate data for the process will ensure rational and well-informed decisions to be made. The project manager however recognized that the model for tender for the pilot study itself should have been done differently. Also, the representative from the FTA has acknowledged this and especially highlighted the proper phase for the objective setting to ensure that the attention of the process will be directed in line with the purpose. That is, the place for the objective setting stage must be reexamined according to the FTA representative; the starting points and objectives should possibly be set up in the beginning of the whole project, i.e. before even putting it out to tender. It was also expressed by the Regional Council representative, that the process’ nature as a pilot creates challenges, since similar processes have not been conducted before. Thus, during the process, the steering group had to take another look at the aims and what was expected from the consultant.

What could be criticized is the lack of discussion about the four-step principle within the interviews for the pilot study participants. The principle at least seems to play an important role in the process development as well as in the work of the FTA. One explanation can be that no questions were designated towards the principle. Moreover, according to the representative of the FTA, the challenge with transport system level planning is the complexity of the issues in terms of assessment. The development of assessment methods is in the making that is in a need of further examination, and possibly for this reason it has not been included in the workshops. It has also been acknowledged that inclusive methods need more consultant work, more time and new tools for forwarding information. It can be said that in this particular pilot study, the consultant was not prepared for such heavy workload with their own time management. This perhaps is an issue that needs further elaboration on the method development.

In terms of the MALPE approach, there were apparent difficulties in including all the relevant actors. Therefore, it could be argued that despite the effort, the MALPE concept did not get completely fulfilled and thus the process was more focused on transport and land use issues. As noted by the Regional Council representative, the MALPE concept can be seen as an easy term but applying it to practice is demanding – from whose perspective will the issue be examined and how can an agreement be found that satisfies everyone? However, considering that the inclusion of the service and business interests in planning is in its infancy, through practical experiences this discrepancy can hopefully be developed over time. Even with the present participant composition, the MALPE concept has succeeded in guiding the process to a considerable degree; selection of actors, workshop division and seeking objectives. It was stated by a municipal participant, “without this process the overall issue would not have been examined from so many angles” (my translation). Accordingly, another municipal participant noted that the process has given “old things new focus” (my translation), referring to the disregarded corridor and its discrepancies that will most likely bring the generated solutions closer to becoming implemented.
7 Comparing the approaches

In this chapter, the experiences from the two countries’ new approaches to solving transport related issues will be compared. In addition, the differences and similarities pointed out through the comparison will be analyzed. In the Swedish context the comparison is based on the test case experiences presented in the previous chapter while in the Finnish context the experiences from practice have been collected through a case study. In both countries these experiences are based on implications from practice: in Sweden, from cases that were testing the new approaches for the purpose of further developing the method and in Finland, to gather ideas for the outlining of a conclusive method. Some similarities and differences with the approaches have already been outlined throughout the work and the purpose of this chapter is to bring the material together. The fact that the method in Finland is still in the making poses challenges and restrictions to the comparison, though there are already many similarities with the approaches that can be pointed out. However, the collaborative approach examined in Finland is not as detailed as the Swedish method. In the beginning it was stated that even though there are a range of policy inventions available, the experiences and potential of some of them in practice is very limited. Thus this comparison and analysis of the differences is aiming to shed some light on that.

7.1 Starting points for the comparison

Both countries’ approaches aim at reaching cost-efficient solutions and strive to enhance sustainable development, in that, the purpose of both the approaches is to forward the aims of the transport policy into practice. Both approaches are directed for the preliminary stages of planning, to more or less strategic level planning, where alternative solutions for transport related issues are sought through inclusive dialogues. In both countries, the notion of four-step principle has an important bearing on the paradigm of the processes regarding the work to generate cost-efficient and sustainable solutions superseding the thought of considering new infrastructure investments as a single effective solution. It could also be said that both countries strive to shift the focus of decision-making through these approaches by providing an arena for discussion where the top-down perspective is encountered with the bottom-up view. Nevertheless, the processes are state initiatives and the actual decision for action comes after these preliminary planning phases. As stated by Odhage (2012), the process itself does not make the choice over measures instead the processes in both countries are ultimately preparations for decision-making.

The four test cases conducted in Sweden and the one case study conducted in Finland form the base for the comparison. It must be noted that all of these cases are very different in their character and so is their process composition. In addition, none of the test cases examined in the Swedish context are equivalent in their study context to the case study conducted in Finland. In line with the theoretical framework outlined in this thesis, aspects that are needed for a well-functioning collaborative process are: an authentic dialogue where actors engage with each other on a shared task; a process management and a skilled facilitator with neutral role to reach joint commitment to collective action; and a shared understanding of an issue and interest. One can note that the theoretical aspects used in the examination of the practical implications of the Swedish test cases are somewhat in line with the above; the presence of normative steering as a guarantee of an inclusive, consensus-driven investigation of an issue; the joint ownership of a process, and application of general objectives (Odhage 2012:88). The three upper aspects thus create the theoretical base for the comparison.
As the Swedish test cases are problematized in relation to three aspects – participation, organization of the process and applying of the four-step principle – the outline of the comparison will roughly follow the same structure. Through these aspects the practical experiences are compared and analyzed. One should bear in mind that at the time of the examination of the Swedish test cases, the ideal method was also a draft of the final method that was presented earlier. The Finnish pilot study does not follow a method outlined by a state administration the reflection of the organization of the process cannot in full be made to any ideal approach. However, some fundamental aspects are already present in the approach used in the pilot study, i.e. the overall management of the process and the choice of actors, making the comparison worthy of an effort.

7.2 Participation – selection and inclusion of relevant stakeholders

Theory implies that in collaborative rational process the diversity of actors is important and thus there must be many values, interests, perspectives, skills, and types and sources of knowledge included. So not only those who have power but also those with information or those affected by the process outcome, in other words, most or all the relevant stakeholders. In both countries’ new approaches to transport planning this kind of inclusion is crucial for achieving a successful process that corresponds to the ideal. Thus, in this section the practical experiences gained from the Swedish and Finnish processes regarding the selection of relevant stakeholders will be compared. Through the comparison, differences are analyzed based on theoretical implications and on the ideal approach of each country.

It was expressed by Odhage (2012) that in the Swedish method there exist no guidelines that would point out what is meant by an inclusive collaborative process in practice, meaning where the boundaries between actor, stakeholder and competence are and to what extent should they be involved. However, in the reformed handbook the participant involvement is elaborated on, being placed to the second stage of the method; understand the situation. Accordingly, one must consider what user groups or other interests are needed to participate; the interests must be mapped out to detect how different interests are affected, should they be involved, and how should the participation be carried out. In the handbook, there is an example over grouping of interests to primary, secondary and other interests, e.g. the STA and municipalities are primary whereas businesses and citizens are secondary. However, no clear requirements are set for the level of inclusion and thus one can argue that it is up to the process initiator(-s) awareness and investment towards the matter. In contrast, in the Finnish approach the MALPE concept is guiding the choice of actors meaning that someone should be included in the process from each sector. But it can be argued that the concept does leave room to maneuver as in each sector one can evidently come across actors, stakeholders and competences.

The concepts can be defined as follows: actor is an organization having a particularly clear responsibility in the field, given an equal role in the study and contribute to its implementation; competence is in part about technical skills and decision-making competences; whereas stakeholders are those in any way affected by, or affect the existing and changing conditions and are subject to use the results proposed by the process (Odhage 2012:89). In the Swedish approach it was argued that the ambiguity of these concepts in the process instruction draft led the choice of participants to be made almost arbitrarily. But at the same time, the interviewees perceived collaboration as tantamount to a presence of various decision-making and technical skills that is merely actors with competence. However, it is
questionable whether this setting creates the most suitable arena for an unbiased, creative and holistic investigation of an issue (Odhage 2012). Interpreted from Odhage (2012) this resulted in a rather restricted group composition in the test cases, consequently meaning that the group behavior is quite predictable which can lead to consensus making instead of consensus building, in line with theory. This was not however perceived as a problem in the interviewees’ opinion. But, Odhage (2012) argues that the process setting hereby came to be that “one should solve a given problem, not arrive with a bunch of new ones, who knows where we would end up then?”(p.90)⁸

In the Finnish context, it seemed that a fairly big effort was put into reaching diversity among participants. These efforts were however faced with the fact that despite invitation or even persuasion the individual interest to participate cannot be taken for granted. Especially when participation is equal to volunteering one’s time to the process, but also, the invited participants may consider that the potential benefits of involvement are not worth the effort. The choice of participants was made in relation to the MALPE concept. It seemed that the participation in the end was emphasized firstly on municipal actors and secondly on transport and land use competencies, while the lack of interest to participate from the business and service sectors can in part be explained by the unfamiliarity of taking part in planning dialogue. However, also conscious choices of exclusion were made by using supplements to involve wider population, especially in terms of including the private business and service sector. But what also stands out is the lack of participation of the two big cities at the end points of the corridor, which can very well be due to lack of interest to participate, but at the same time it is in those nodes where the political power lies.

In line with theory, for the studies and the processes in both countries to reach authentic dialogue and to achieve an agreement on policy options, a clear normative control or facilitator for the process is required. This is to keep the process focused on its task which in both countries is to scrutinize a variety of perspectives, objectives, and needs so that they are not just carried out from the study’s initial problem clarification without deeper investigation and which ultimately ensures a well-balanced outcome to be used as a support for policy makers (Odhage 2012). But theory implies that an inclusive process should strive for debate and allow conflict analysis, which stems from the notion of where to invest our limited resources. Thus, consensus is reached through a process of argumentation between contrarian interest and involving disadvantaged actors, building common understanding through learning. It seems that, in contrast to theory, no tense conflict took place in either of the countries’ processes.

In the Finnish context, the setting was roughly local actors confronting state actors and in line with the interviews, the municipalities are alike so there were no major conflicts between them. Thus the setting was rather to understand each other’s viewpoints and needs. But what may stand in a way of debate and addressing conflicting needs is the strong division of participants to state and municipal actors. As to the interviewees, the municipal representatives may feel that their position for negotiation is weak against the state that partly holds the resources. But, another observation is individual discussion skills. It was expressed in the interviews that different disciplines are used to different working methods, and as theory implies, a collaborative dialogue is also a learning process on how to communicate productively. The actors most likely do not have the knowledge to seek debate rather they might attempt to keep the discussion polite and civilized.

---

⁸ My translation. Swedish: Inställningen är att man ska lösa ett givet problem, inte komma dragandes med en bunt nya sådana, vem vet var vi hamnar då?
In the Swedish context, it can be argued that the disadvantage and contrarian views were excluded from the process thus not contributing to creating the preconditions for debate and revealing conflict, among other things. So one may wonder how the lack of conflict in the processes has affected the outcome? In line with Odhage (2012), if we want to overcome this “dark side of consensus” (p. 90), the role of a normative control becomes even more apparent. That is, following the overall objectives more restrictively and set these objectives against the local and regional needs and objectives. In the Finnish context, one can draw a conclusion based on the interviews that the process put a substantial effort into coordinating different objectives. However, Odhage (2012) clearly implies that in the Swedish context for that to take place, there should have been a greater variety and amount of interests taking part in the process.

It could be argued that even though an agreement is reached in a collaborative manner, with or without conflict, different measures do still carry some negative side effects. Odhage (2012) points out that in the Swedish context there were very little reflection on winners and losers, instead there seemed to be a tacit agreement over the prioritizing of development approaches between the present parties/actors. On the contrary, in the Finnish case the prioritizing is attempted to be made through the MALPE concept as well as fulfilling the service level objective. Another question is how should this be done? The complexity of needs and perspectives inevitably leads to making choices; from whose perspective will the problem be solved? Thus there will inevitably be those who benefit from the results more than others. The prioritizing is intended to take place through a collaborative process. This inevitably leads to the danger that the prioritization will benefit the participants present in the dialogue more than those being absent or excluded. Thus, it is likely that values get ignored.

Even though the MALPE concept can be criticized for its complexity isn’t that what these processes are actually about; finding the best solutions for complex issues? Thus it could be argued that in contrast to the Swedish context, the MALPE does assist in dividing the needs so that each will become scrutinized and thus enabling different needs to be juxtaposed for conducting the prioritization. Also, it can be checked that all five “sectors” have been covered. Whereas in the Swedish context, at least with the examined test case composition, the needs are scrutinized based on the participative actors’ individual, or in some cases perhaps collective perception on issues lead by an administration whose main responsibility is within transport. Thus, it can be argued that in the Swedish context the process can more easily result in excluding, or unconsciously disregarding certain stakeholder needs. This goes in line with Odhage’s (2012:90) argument that to allow a genuine consensus to be reached, the STA should either start acting in accordance with its assumed holistic community building perspectives, or the task needs to be organized based on the awareness of overcoming conflicts on an equal basis and resources and mandate need to be allocated more evenly.

7.3 Process management and objective formulation

What is needed for an effective collaboration according to theory is an authentic dialogue that is depicted as praxis of the process. However, authentic dialogue cannot be formed by only following a handbook; instead it requires managers, facilitators, and participants i.e. resources. Following from this, the resource of time and funding alone are not adequate, instead the resources of mandate and quorum are also required. Therefore, the importance of creating the preconditions for an authentic dialogue lies in the beginning of the process. In
line with Odhage (2012), it is in the initiation of a process where the temporary activities are created, providing the basis for a process-based approach. This section will thus compare how the processes were managed in each country, i.e. how the processes were organized. Focus in the comparison is also put on the initiation of the processes including the forming of a common objective. Through the comparison, differences are analyzed based on implications from theory and the ideal approaches in each country.

Based on the collected data it seemed that in the pilot study examined in Finland, the process focus was put on the organization of the task and forming the objectives for planning. Also a substantial effort was put to collecting background data through additional surveys. Thus it can be concluded that the initiation of the process has gotten a firm recognition. On the contrary, in the Swedish context it was argued that the process stage “initiate” was an overlooked activity in the four test cases. Though, the method is clear about this stage; in this stage the study’s conditions are dictated, its limits set up and the core of interaction formulated (Odhage 2012). In line with those expectations, in this stage the first limitation of a problem area is made with a mutual understanding of the problem. This seems to be consistent with the theoretical implications of requirements for an authentic dialogue. On the other hand, it has been argued that in the Finnish process not enough effort was put to collaboratively understand the problem along with current conditions, which can in turn reflect to the forming of an understanding over the goal in a profound manner.

In both approaches there has to be a common objective, a shared task. In other words, the participants need to see the same goals and agree on the steps to reach them (Odhage 2012). This can be said to be the second stage in both countries approaches and what is meant by a common objective is the inclusive process of forming an objective where the overall process goals are adjusted with local and regional needs. According to Odhage (2012) the requirements for process-oriented approach are not well fulfilled in the Swedish test cases and this can consequently affect the formation of a common objective that should take into account a variety of needs. In order to provide a better outline over the differences between the organization of the collaborative processes in both countries, the main characteristics are depicted in the table 1 (p.67).

In terms of the group composition depicted in the table, it is to be noted that the character of the participants is not fully apparent; here all the cases seem to be very inclusive. The level of diversity in both countries’ cases has however been discussed earlier, or more like the lack of diversity, and in relation to that discussion the table is giving rather contradictory information. In other words, the attending organizations depicted in the table are very similar in their function and interest, consequently giving slightly misleading information. This applies especially to two of the Swedish test cases on the second and fourth row, and to some extent to the Finnish pilot case on the fifth row.

What stands out from the table is the presence of a steering committee in the Finnish context. According to the initial outline for a collaborative process, a steering group is required. Thus, based on the implications from the evaluation of the four Swedish test cases, it can be argued that this quality can lead to many differences in the two countries’ processes. In line with theory, it can be argued that the Swedish test cases lack some structural requirements for a collaborative process, i.e. in the resources of managers and qualities of a facilitator. Therefore, since there is no group to steer the process, the responsibility is alone on the STA, an administration whose main concern is the transport. In other words, the steering is based on a perspective of one sector and thus the normative character of the steering force can be questioned. In the Finnish context, the steering group consists of different state and regional
administrations with different competencies, i.e. land use, transport and environment. It can be argued that this does create more balanced steering for the process than in the Swedish test cases. However, there still is a general problem apparent in both countries that is common for cross-sectoral processes; the lack of an actor who can take an overall responsibility over the issue under consideration (Odhage 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering committee</th>
<th>Group composition</th>
<th>Work method and meetings</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>Work preparation</th>
<th>Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S No</td>
<td>Eight people from four organizations, all administrators.</td>
<td>Working group form with three meetings and three meetings scheduled.</td>
<td>Small number of specialist skills.</td>
<td>The STA prepares and proposes priorities with the actors. There is also an internal working group of the STA preparing and compiling materials.</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S No</td>
<td>About fifteen people from thirteen organizations.</td>
<td>Workshop form with four meetings.</td>
<td>Many stakeholders and practitioners, but few technical skills. Different decision competences involved.</td>
<td>A consultant prepares, balances, suggests priorities and compiles the report. No work group is linked.</td>
<td>Not directly linked to this study but it is connected with number of other collaborative forums and project teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S No</td>
<td>Twenty-five people from six organizations.</td>
<td>Workshop form with three meetings.</td>
<td>Many technical competences and certain local decision competences involved.</td>
<td>Consultant together with the STA prepares, proposes priorities and compiles report.</td>
<td>Not mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S No interacting steering committee.</td>
<td>Fifteen people from ten organizations.</td>
<td>Reference group type form and they have met in few occasions.</td>
<td>Little technical and decision making competencies.</td>
<td>The work is prepared by an internal working group from the STA.</td>
<td>No agreements have been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Yes, with seven people from five different state and regional administrations.</td>
<td>About twenty-seven people from thirteen organizations.</td>
<td>Workshop form with three meetings and one scheduled.</td>
<td>Large number of special skills and different decision making competencies.</td>
<td>Work is prepared by the consultant with support from the steering group.</td>
<td>No agreements have been developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Differences between the characteristics in the organization of the collaborative processes in both countries (text over the Swedish test cases adapted from Odhage 2012).

The amount of meetings seems to be quite similar in both countries that, in accordance with the interviews, is likely to be adequate since the participants contribute to the processes with their time. Another view from the interviews in the Finnish context was that one could see some decrease in interest to participate in the third seminar. Even though the objective setting and initiation of the process is important, can it be that they dwelled in the objective setting stage for too long? However, we can only speculate since there can be other reasons why individuals cannot participate in a given time and place that are not related to motivation. What is not apparent in the table, is the participants’ relation to the context. Meaning, when the issue is more familiar to the participants, e.g. purely a municipal issue, the motivation to participate and engage with the process may also be higher. Though, in accordance with theory, if a process is properly managed and designed to correspond its purpose an engagement to the issue should form despite an earlier attachment to it.

Based on the table, it can be interpreted that the balance between decision-making competences and special skills is likely to be more consistent in the Finnish case. This can be
due to the guiding principle of the MALPE concept and in order to test its applicability in practice, efforts have been put to including a variety of actors. In the Swedish context, however, it seems (not apparent in the table) that majority of the participants are representing transport related planning, e.g. transport oriented organizations, representatives from administrations or public officials together with the STA – an aspect that was also pointed out by Odhage (2012). In line with theory, an unbalanced composition can direct the agreement towards those forcing the agenda. This will be discussed more through the application of the four-step principle. However, the last column indicates that a similarity seems to be that in both countries no written agreements have been formed over carrying out the process. Rather, the commitment possibly comes as part of the actors’ post.

7.4 Application of the four-step principle

In finding cost efficient solutions that also contribute to sustainable development one must consider all modes of transport and various types of actions that would in the first place affect the demand for travel or use the existing transport more efficiently. To search for such solutions, the four-step principle is utilized as a tool in both countries’ approaches. This section will compare how the four-step principle was applied in the processes and the interest is to analyze what are the preconditions of each process for searching measures that fall in the first two steps of the four-step principle, i.e. measures that contribute to sustainable development. Thus, the analysis is mainly done based on the implications from the previous section; the organization and management of the processes.

Even though the four-step principle is present in both countries approaches, it can be argued that in the Swedish context the principle as a tool for planning is more visible and thus it can be interpreted that its purpose is better known for the actors in contrast to the Finnish context. The primary purpose in accordance with the FTA is to search solutions that fall in the first three steps, but how well the principle is present in the process as a tool for planning is questionable. An unbiased application of the principle, which was described in more detail in chapter 1.1, should in particular result in proposals for action that are actual alternatives to transport development measures (Odhage 2012) i.e. alternatives to building infrastructure. It is however argued that in the Swedish test cases this was very unusual and accordingly, it can be stated that the measures generated in the Finnish pilot study are mostly focused on the third step, i.e. small investments.

It can be interpreted that the measures on the first two steps, the so-called “soft” measures, are tricky to achieve. In the Swedish context it was argued that since the main issue tends to be transport related, with a process driven in part by a transport oriented organization, the first step measures can hardly be dealt with. In the Finnish context, on the contrary, land use competencies as well as the regional land use representatives were invited and encouraged to participate which should allow for more broad set of measures to be scrutinized. However, based on the interviews it can be interpreted that land use related solutions are still more demanding to deal with. This can originate from the conventional mobility-based planning ideology and how that still has a big role in the current planning culture. In addition, a considerable hindrance that was apparent in the Finnish context to affect the demand of travel by land use is the low and dispersedly located population of the municipalities in question. In other words, this creates rather realistic restrictions to utilizing land use as a feasible measure.

In general it can be stated that in both countries’ test cases the measures that can be considered as true alternatives for action are rare. When considering this from the theoretical
viewpoint, this can in part be due to the lack of debate and conflict in the processes. It has been stated that the importance of conflict and debate for the process outcome is to allow the inclusive group to challenge assumption and thus, questions the status quo. It is to be noted that in the Finnish context there are many necessary safety measures to be implemented that in part may force the focus to the direction of small infrastructure investments and these measures can be seen as supporting the status quo instead of questioning it. However, based on the examined cases in both countries, it can be argued that the approaches are actually taking place in slightly different contexts. In Finland, the issue is approached from a rather regional perspective, i.e. what are the benefits for a region instead of what are the benefits for a single municipality. Thus it can be continued that in this context, the search for small investment measures in the third step is relevant, but in order to involve the “soft” measures that include the local responsibility, the scale of the issue in question should perhaps be reduced to make it more focused.

In Sweden, on the other hand, the process is handling the issue in a program that is directed and lead by the STA, a transport interest, and thus the process is based on their perspective on issues. In the Swedish context, Odhage (2012) poses a question: “So what could be considered necessary in order to establish a context in which [the step one and two] measures can actually be considered and may have a chance to influence the planning process even when the problem is considered to be initially transport related?"(p.93-94)”9. It can be argued that in the Finnish pilot case the context was perhaps right but other issues stand in the way of the full realization. In both countries, the municipalities have a planning monopoly, meaning that they are in charge of land use development, whereas the state is responsible for the major infrastructure development. However, in Finland the regional planning is more powerful in contrast to Sweden, which possibly allows the approach to have a more regional perspective. In addition, regional land use plans and transport system plans can be considered as a mean to implement or influence the local land use, however, still leaving considerable amount of planning responsibility to the municipalities. Still, in relation to the four-step principle, there are challenges equally in both countries in accordance with Odhage (2012:94); since issues and actions are dispersed among multiple levels and functions, no single actor can claim that they control most of the “soft” measures in the four-step principle, i.e. regulations and economic instruments, technical development, planning and influencing behavior. Thus, it requires a lot of effort to establish a process that is inclusive enough in order to create a context that is not exclusively focused on transport.

7.5 Relevance of the processes

In the beginning, it was stated that there is a need for learning and understanding how different policy measures can be applied to practice. Throughout this chapter the differences rising from practical experiences have been compared to depict possible problems that emerge when ideal models are applied to practice. Thus, the chapter has attempted to answer the questions posed in the beginning for the Swedish and Finnish contexts for the purpose of comparison. However, in the Swedish context there has also been a discussion over the relevance and credibility of the approach for the participants. It can be argued that the relevance and meaningfulness of the new approaches to their users bear a great importance in

9 My translation. Swedish: Så vad kan man tänka sig är nödvändigt för att få till stånd ett sammanhang där dessa åtgärder faktiskt kan övervägas och kan få en chans att influera samhällsbyggnadsprocessen även när problemet anses initialt vara transportrelaterat?
ensuring the appropriate application and organization of the inclusive processes. Thus, some reflections regarding the relevance and credibility of the processes are ultimately discussed.

It can be said that in the Finnish context, no strong distrust has been expressed towards the approach and its process. According to the FTA representative, based on all of the conducted pilot cases they have not been confronted with any contradictory thoughts about the development of such inclusive procedures. In the Swedish context, on the other hand, there have been some suspicions about the applicability of the process among the test case participants. However, both countries’ studies aim to improve decision-making to achieve important objectives in the society that is economic and sustainable transport system development. Hence, it is important to understand the causality to be able to reach these objectives in the first place. As it was noted by the FTA representative, there is a need to shift the planning culture away from the capacity-oriented thinking to more need-based planning and more importantly, to understand what that actually means. To pursue sustainable movement and to develop sustainable transport systems require that one put a stop to the increasing use of private transport. Thus it is important that these processes are also relevant to their users, and possibly even further, that they also become relevant for the external stakeholder groups such as citizens and the private sector.

With respect to the above, it is important that the socio-economic approach, represented by the four-step principle in this case, really comes into full use (Odhage 2012), not only in monetary terms but also in terms of inclusion of stakeholders that should be maximized in relation to its context and circumstances. Only through including all the relevant stakeholders representing all the measures considered on the four-step principle, a properly transparent collective perception of the problem and a search for alternative solutions in a creative, comprehensive and alternative manner can be ensured. One difference in perceptions towards the process can be due to the fact that in Finland, there is no draft of a method that could be handed to the participants that can signal more strongly that something is being tested. In other words, the cases in Finland are not so much about testing but instead about piloting ideas. It was expressed in the interviews that the process status as a pilot gives the corridor good meaning. That is, it makes it more visible as it almost becomes branded. This may in part explain the different perceptions in the countries over the process relevance and credibility.

Theory implies that one likely result of a collaborative process is individual and collective learning in many different aspects. Learning and increased understanding were also highlighted in the Finnish context. For the purpose of comparing, it is difficult to say whether learning has taken place in the Swedish context, but one could assume that it has, at least to some extent. One of the aspects of learning is that actors come to discover new means to achieve their interest but also that they start to reexamine and reframe their previously held interests. Since it was apparent that the application of four-step principle did not come to its full use in neither of the countries, it can be interpreted that perhaps reexamination or reframing of previously held interests did not take place either, at least in a collective view. However, in order to spread responsibilities, municipalities also need to engage with the changes, and thus deeper learning needs to take place, relating also to the understanding of the causality.
8 Final discussion

The context in which a collaborative decision-making process is organized can be a very decisive factor for the way the process is carried out. Still, it can be said that lessons can be learned from different settings. There is a need to improve the knowledge on how to carry out collaborative decision-making processes, in this case, processes where alternative solutions for transport planning are sought in an inclusive manner. A way to add to this knowledge is to look how others have carried out similar processes. Thus, comparison between cases in different situations and contexts can be seen as a constructive way to improve the knowledge and understanding on how to conduct collaborative decision-making processes in transport planning. It could be said that the overall aim of the approaches – the contribution to resource management and sustainable development – adds an important element to increasing the understanding of how to carry out the collaborative decision-making processes in practice.

The result of the empiric research has been presented, compared and analyzed to determine differences in the processes in Sweden and in Finland. In addition, reflection over the method development in Finland has been discussed earlier, based on the case evidence. The aim of the comparison, however, is to contribute to learning and understanding across the contexts. In other words, what can be learned from the differences? In addition, to provide an explanation for the differences, the desire is to answer the question: How can the administrative organization of transport and land use planning in each country explain the differences between the Finnish and Swedish collaborative decision-making processes? The analysis has shown that there are three clearly distinct differences between the examined processes. Therefore, in this final chapter, the investigation will be rounded up by a discussion that will highlight the most apparent differences; the role of the transport administration, the creation of a steering committee, and creation of a concept for process guidance. In the discussion, explanation to the differences are proposed by taking into account the differences in the administrative organization of transport and land use planning in Sweden and in Finland. Additionally, lessons that can be learned based on the detected differences stated above are proposed.

It can be noted that the first and second difference are related to each other: having a steering committee constituted for a process instead of having a single administration leading it. However, it should be pointed out that in the Swedish context the formation of a steering group was highlighted among the proposed suggestions to develop the method. In general, these suggestions were made based on the test case experiences in order to make the method more appropriate as an instrument to prepare decision. Among others, it was recommended that a steering group with core actors should be created and at the same time, the group could become the responsible one for a study. However, based on the final outline of the method, it seems that no remarkable changes have been made to the method description regarding a steering group. Rather, it seems that the issue has been handled by merely stating that it may be necessary to organize the work with such group, or optionally with a task force or a reference group, without further elaboration. Thus, it could be concluded that the handbook still leaves quite a lot of leeway for the initiator(-s) to decide. The comparison however supports the idea of creating a steering group/committee for a process and therefore it can be noted that the lack of such requirement in the Swedish context does play its part in explaining the differences in the process steering.

In part, the differences in the formation of process steering can however be explained by the administrative differences within the countries regarding transport and land use planning, that
in this case include the differences in the planning hierarchy as well. What is meant by this claim will be discussed next. In the examined pilot case in Finland, for instance, the project management comes from the ELY Centre. In contrast to Sweden, the Finnish Transport Agency does not have a regional responsibility; instead the ELY Centre is the state administration that, among many things, is responsible for the national road network regionally. In general, the responsibilities of the ELY Centres are focused on three sectors – transport, business and the environment – hence, excluding the aspect of land use planning. However, in Finland the regional councils’ are obligated to outline regional land use plans including considerations for transport and these specific plans guide the lower level planning. Thus one of the legal obligations of the regional councils is to take part in planning that is associated with regional transport system planning. Consequently, in this case these three administrations from different administrative levels and incorporating several sectors form the steering committee in the examined case in the Finnish context.

In Sweden, plans for regional transport infrastructure are established by different administrations depending on the county: the county councils, regional governments or municipal cooperation bodies. Also, the land use planning in Sweden is merely a municipal concern thus not including a regional level planning. In addition, it seems that the transport planning work is quite widely supported by the STA, i.e. regionally and to some degree also municipally. It can be said that in Finland the responsibilities within transport and land use planning responsibilities are more spread across different administrations and the same structure exists in each region. Therefore, it could be concluded that the formation of a steering committee possibly takes place more naturally in the Finnish context due to the administrative organization of transport and land use planning. Consequently, the process in the Finnish context is not only being run by a transport administration, the FTA, as it seems to be in the Swedish context based on the examined test cases. Nevertheless, what can be learned through the comparison is that the formation of a steering committee will most likely have a beneficial influence on achieving a normative and neutral process control that is required to create a successful collaborative decision-making process. For searching alternative solutions to transport infrastructure implementation, such process management is an important achievement in order to truly start examining alternative measures and to start shifting focus away from the automobile-based planning ideology.

The third distinctive difference between the approaches is the inclusion of a guiding concept and thus some of the differences in the processes between Sweden and Finland can be explained by the creation of such concept. What is referred to here is the MALPE concept that has been innovated through the Transport Revolution development program that, in turn, has been initiated to create a new mid-set for urban and transport planning. The program highlights the service-oriented approach to transport planning and in part, the MALPE concept has a role in assisting to transfer the reformations into practice. In that, the concept should support the collaborative process so that issues become examined from a holistic view as presented in chapter 2.4. However, when looking for explanation for the differences, the concept as such can hardly be seen as a part of the administrative organization of transport and land use planning in Finland. It can, on the other hand, be seen as a tool used by the transport administration in assisting to transfer policies into practice and thus the concept does play an important part in enhancing the integration of transport and land use planning.

Based on the comparison, it could be noted that the presence of a guiding concept may help to keep the focus of a process on a holistic set of issues, while at the same time guiding the division and identification of the complexity of issues presented in the society. Even though the MALPE concept should guide the collaborative process in Finland, it has been argued
earlier that the concept still leaves room for interpretation. It was apparent in the Finnish context that the application of the MALPE concept in practice is not simple. In the examined pilot case for instance, the consideration of solutions ended up focusing more on the transport and land use questions that include housing, even though the business sector was included to some extent as well. In other words, the focus was on the M, A, and L of the concept. Thus, regardless of a guiding concept, this demonstrates that in practice it is not an easy task for a process to be inclusive. Conclusions can be drawn that, for instance, the identification of participants for a diverse group composition without a guiding concept does not in principle entail any more hindrances than doing it with such concept. In other words, a creation of a guiding concept does not guarantee that a transparent and inclusive process will be achieved.

It can be argued, however, that without any clear guidance the responsibility of ensuring that a diverse group will come together to scrutinize issues in a holistic manner lie in the process management, e.g. the process leader that in the Swedish test case context consisted of a single administration. Moreover, the process thus becomes rather reliant on the group members’ standpoints over the problem as well as on their abilities to detect all the necessary issues for examination. The Swedish test cases thus indicate that such approach is very sensitive for interpretation and consequently it allowed the cases in the Swedish context rather to seek a “competent” group of actors and interest that thus ended up having very little interest in diversity. It can be interpreted from the reframed method handbook that even though the importance of defining different interests for a SCM study is now indicated, the importance of searching for diversity still has not been addressed very distinctly. The comparison thus has pointed out that the existence of a guiding concept, together with a steering committee, has played an important role in helping to seek a diverse group of participants and to examine issues from a comprehensive perspective. At least it seems to have served the initiators, i.e. the steering committee, a motivation to seek diversity even though it came apparent that in the examined case the use of the concept did not reach its full purpose. However, what can be learned is that some form of a guiding concept can be beneficial in achieving a successful collaborative decision-making process and keeping the focus on a holistic set of issues.

The purpose of this thesis has been to compare the collaborative dialogues in strategic multimodal studies in practice, one in Finland and four in Sweden, in order to see what ways the process experiences differ from each other. Initially, there were no indication on what the scope of the possible differences could be since the examined cases both take place in the Nordic countries and one may thus assume that differences in planning practices may not be particularly big. In the end, the differences appeared to be rather distinct. It must be noted, however, that the comparison could have gotten a different tone to it if a case study had been carried out in Sweden as well. In this way the comparison would have consisted of an examination of one case against one. Instead, now the empirics are compiled through experiences of one case in Finland and four cases in Sweden, that is in addition based on a secondary source. Therefore, the comparison perhaps seems to be more in favor of the Finnish context, in part explained by the fact that the author’s knowledge of the Finnish approach became stronger through the case study that was conducted personally. On the other hand, the fact that in Finland the process of developing the method is still underway can rightfully be seen as a factor that can distort the comparison. However, that can be seen as being non-dependent of the research methodology used in this thesis. In other words, the work had to be carried out with the material that was available at the time of the thesis work.

In order to be able to compare the processes in full and to also include more in-depth considerations of the use of the four-step principle, one should go deeper into the investigations of the context and possibly also include observations of the collaborative
processes. This could improve the understanding and reinforce the investigation, i.e. whether the differences and what can be learned from them are realistic, and if they are truly relevant. However, the scope of the investigation that has been carried out and presented in this thesis has confirmed that there is a point in making comparisons between different countries contexts in order to learn from one another. The comparison has shown that it requires skills to manage a collaborative process, a notion supported by theory. Through the comparison, it can be interpreted that the knowledge of the initiators, steering committees, and facilitators over a process that seeks to find collaboratively rational solutions to transport related issues is also in a stage of development. Therefore, a new comparison later, when the processes have become better integrated to the existing planning procedures, could be a fruitful way to further increase the knowledge of such processes.

In relation to above, one may assume that the knowledge of the process leaders has grown through the test cases as well. Exactly because of the testing nature of the cases examined in this thesis, there is an opportunity to go back and reflect over the experiences and possible mistakes. In addition, in many cases a consultant has also been taking part in a process, in the Finnish context perhaps having a bigger role than in the Swedish context. In the Finnish case, the consultant had a clear role as a facilitator, but not necessarily fulfilling the requirements for a skilled facilitator, in accordance with theory. Thus it can be interpreted that these processes are not just new for the actors who were invited to participate, but also for the parties responsible for leading them. Therefore, in order to investigate the strategic multi-modal approaches in transport planning in a deeper manner, it could be of interest to make new comparisons; firstly when the method and its description in Finland has been completed and secondly when the approaches in both countries have been applied to practice without the status of being either test or pilot cases.

It is apparent that both countries’ approaches are new in kind and unfamiliar to all the actors. In addition, they are very distinct from the traditional planning and decision-making procedures. Therefore, learning in this case also bears an importance in increasing the relevance and credibility of the approaches. In other words, the collaborative processes should also be seen as learning processes in increasing the understanding of the difference between mobility-based and accessibility-based planning, and how are they related to the integration of transport and land use planning. What is the latter trying to achieve, and what is its importance in terms of the future of our society? The importance of the collaborative processes also lie in distributing knowledge and increasing understanding that in turn can contribute to renewing the planning culture. That is, to move away from the capacity-oriented planning ideology that favors movement by car.

Learning has also been taking place in relation to the four-step principle. As discussed in the earlier chapter, there have been difficulties in both countries’ collaborative dialogue to include the complementary considerations of the “soft” measures of the four-step principle. Consequently, the focus in both countries seem to be leaning more against the cost-efficiency goal than sustainable development. Hence, what is actually the relation between cost-efficiency and sustainable development, and how to make their importance equally valued and understood? It could be argued that in terms of sustainable development, the issue should always be scrutinized from the perspective of decreasing the demand for travel, which on the other hand, always requires a change in behavior. It can thus be concluded that we must stop handling the consequences of the transport system and instead begin to look at problems from a causal perspective. We can only start making conscious choices if we become aware of the causes, in other words, we must start raising the awareness of sustainability.
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Appendix of the interview structure

Questions regarding the method formulation for the representative of the Finnish Transport Agency

Relations and roles regarding the connection between land use and transport planning:

1. Does the new method for preliminary transport planning seek to clarify the aims of the transport policy? Explain how.

2. How does the four-step principle relate to the new planning method?

3. What is the link in practice between the ideology of MALPE approach (e.g. the pilot cases conducted for the Transport Policy) and the new method for preliminary transport planning?

4. How is the MAL – letter of intent process related and what does it contribute to in relation to MALPE approach and the new method?

5. For areas outside city regions where there are no prerequisites for MAL – letter of intent, how is the collaboration managed and planned to be enhanced?

6. How does all this contribute to the aims of the transport policy and how is it made into a clear and coherent procedure?

The process approach:

1. How were the pilot studies initiated and by whom? Who coordinated them?

2. Did all the pilot cases use the same procedure or were the pilot cases used to test the applicability of different procedures? Were the pilot cases conducted in parallel or was the knowledge gained in one case taken into consideration in another?

3. How were the alternative measures generated?

4. Did the pilot cases have contradictory results?

5. Did the pilot cases result in any measures being implemented?

6. How is the gained knowledge from the pilot cases going to be utilized for the formation of a new method?

7. Are there still issues that need to be discussed and developed after conducting the pilot cases? Will more pilot cases be conducted or do you have sufficient data?

8. What are your (the agency’s) aims and expectations for the new planning procedure? (Realistic aims and expectations) What is the difference to the former ways of planning?

9. How are the method and the implementation costs planned to be financed? What about the relation to state budget?

10. Who is in responsible for outlining the method? Who are participating?
Questions for the actors in the steering committee

Actor’s role and regional conditions

1. Tell briefly about your role and mission as an organization?

2. How is the climate of cooperation in the county (between municipalities especially but also towards the county and the state)?

Project specific details regarding the engagement and participation

1. What is your (the agency’s) role in the pilot study? Why are you engaged in the process?

2. Which stakeholders are included in the group that carries out the pilot study? Which technical and decision-making competences are included?

3. Who is responsible for leading the process? / Which actors are included in the steering committee?

4. How big was the consultant’s role in the work process in relation to the role of the steering committee?

5. How was the selection of actors done? Was the group composition sufficient?

6. Which actors are not participating and why are they not participating?

7. What are the risks associated with certain interests not being represented?

Experience with the application of the preliminary planning

Problem and/or objective formulation:

1. Have you developed a joint comprehensive description of the issue? When was the issue outlined? To what extent you are devoted in the formulation of the issue? / Who defined it?

2. Is there jointly stated objectives for the pilot study? Who was responsible for outlining them?

3. In which stage did the dialogue with the representatives from them municipalities begin? In your opinion, were the interaction methods sufficient?

4. Have the participants understood the problem uniformly, in the sense that they have agreed on a common goal before embarking on the generation of measures? Is it possible to be obtained before the objectives of each actor are clarified?

5. Do you think that there are conflicting goals?
The process:

1. How well did the pilot study manage to take MALPE approach to practice? Was it included already in the stage of defining objectives?
2. Tell briefly how the dialogue (e.g. workshops) have worked?
3. What is difficult in finding different alternatives? What could be used as a support of this work?
4. How do you move on after the pilot study, have you defined it? Has there been a common agreement of the continuation?
5. Has this study and process, in your opinion, in some way led to new proposals that you believe would not have been formed without this study’s comprehensive approach?
6. In general, concerning the whole pilot study, were the desired results achieved or was there something that should have been done differently?

Questions for the participants from the municipalities

Actor’s role and regional conditions

1. Tell about your role and mission as an administration?
2. Are regional questions vivid in the region?
3. How is the climate of cooperation in the county (between municipalities especially but also towards the county and the state)?

Project specific details regarding the engagement and participation

1. What is your (the agency’s) role in the pilot study? Why are you engaged in the process? (What benefit do you see in participating?)
2. Do you have an actor internal working group?
3. How was the selection of actors done?
4. What are the risks associated with certain interests not being represented?

Experience with the application of the preliminary planning

Problem and/or objective formulation:

1. Has the "problem" been addressed in other contexts? Has the issue already been "solved"? If yes: How is this planning process different from the earlier ones?
2. Is there jointly stated objectives for the pilot study? Who was responsible for outlining them?

3. Have the participants understood the problem uniformly, in the sense that they have agreed on a common goal, before embarking on the generation of measures or is it possible to launch it before the objectives are clarified?

4. Do you think that there are conflicting goals?

The process:

1. Tell briefly how the dialogue (e.g. workshops) have worked?

2. How many alternative measures (concepts) have you generated? What is difficult in finding alternatives? What could be used as a support of this work?

3. Has there been conflicting ideas in finding alternatives?

4. Does this method of the study and process feel meaningful, appropriate?

5. How do you move on after the pilot study, have you defined it?

6. How would you react if the decision was left hanging in the air, that no clear decision is made on the continuation? How would you react if the process becomes interrupted?

7. Has this study and process, in your opinion, in some way led to new proposals that you believe would not have been formed without this study’s comprehensive approach?

8. As for the municipality, do you plan to carry out measures that emerged in the pilot study, e.g. land use and detailed plan solutions?