

Table 1: Sub-objective 1a: assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		1a Elimination of congestion at borders				
Alternatives	General measures	Railway			Road	
Measures of the Strategy	R.36, R.37, Ro.41	R.1, R.2, R.3, R.6, R.7, R.8, R.21			Ro.1, Ro.2, Ro.32	
Analysis of alternatives		R.21	R.2, R.6, R.7, R.8	R.1, R.3	Ro.32	Ro.1, Ro.2
Comments		The impact of air emissions, impact on climate change and noise pollution will be lasting positive (cumulative impact). New development may have a negative effect particularly on the use of soil, groundwater quality and flood safety, fragmentation of habitats and areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. The R.1 measure is planned for the sensitive Karst area (vulnerable aquifer, Natura 2000 sites); a cross-border impact is also possible. R.6 and R.7 may also have cross-border impacts on water.			The Ro.1 measure is a new development but it has a positive impact on air quality and improvement of international connections and transit traffic. Ro.2 is sited in a tunnel, so no great environmental impact is expected. Ro.2 may have an impact on water protection areas (WPA) and groundwater on the Austrian side of the border.	
Guidelines		The need to site new rail connections should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.			Priority alternative. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of technical measures for pollution prevention.	

Table 2: Sub-objective 1b: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE										
1b Improving the accessibility of international interurban passenger transport (including transit traffic)										
Alternatives	General measures	Railway			Road transport			Maritime transport	Air traffic	
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, Ro.42	R.2, R.3, R.4, R.5, R.8, R.9, R.10, R.21, R.22			Ro.1, Ro.2, Ro.12, Ro.32, Ro.35			M.5	A.1, A.2, A.3	
Analysis of alternatives		R.4, R.21, R.22	R.2, R.5, R.8, R.9, R.10	R.3	Ro.32, Ro.35	Ro.1, Ro.2	Ro.12	M.5	A.1	A.2, A.3
Comments		The impact of air emissions, climate factors and noise pollution will be lasting positive (cumulative impact). New development may have a negative effect particularly on the use of soil, groundwater quality and flood safety, fragmentation of habitats and areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. The R.1 measure is planned for the sensitive Karst area; cross-border impact on water is also possible.			The Ro.1 and Ro.2 measures from the road group will have a lasting positive impact on air and climate conditions. The Ro.12 measure may have a negative impact on drinking water and a lasting impact on biodiversity (Natura 2000), cultural heritage and landscape. Ro.2 may have an impact on WPAs and groundwater on the Austrian side of the border.			The implementation of the measure may have negative effects on seawater quality. On the other hand, the arrangement of a passenger terminal may have a positive effect on the development of tourism.	The A.3 measure has a great negative impact on noise pollution in the wider area, biodiversity and the integrity of the protected area of the Sečovlje salt-pans. A negative cross-border impact is possible due to noise.	
Guidelines		Priority alternative. The need to site new rail connections should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.			Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status. The need for the Ro.12 measure should be established in a comprehensive study, which also observes anticipated improvements in urban and suburban public passenger transport. Due to excessive ambient air pollution in the area of the Municipality of Ljubljana (MOL) and noise pollution, it is necessary to ensure the implementation			Planning suitable technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on the environment.	Definition of measures to reduce long-term impacts on climate change and people's health. Study the alternative measure for the Portorož Airport (A.3), which would not be based on an extensive development of airport infrastructure; instead Portorož Airport would provide multimodal connections with other larger airports in the wider surroundings. The expansion of the airport is not permitted into habitats important for the preservation of biodiversity in the area of the Sečovlje salt-pans.	

			of suitable mitigation measures, particularly the controlled reduction of road vehicle speeds and regular cleaning in order to reduce the resuspension of particles as much as possible.	
--	--	--	--	--

Table 3: Sub-objective 1c: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		1c Improving the accessibility of international freight transport (including transit traffic)								
Alternatives	General measures	Railway			Road transport			Maritime transport		Air traffic
Measures of the Strategy	R.31, R.35, R.37, R.40, Ro.42, M.21, A.21	R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4, R.5, R.6, R.7, R.8, R.9, R.10, R.21, R.22			Ro.2, Ro.3, Ro.12, Ro.32, Ro.34			M.1, M.2, M.3, M.4, M.12		A.1
Analysis of alternatives		R.4, R.21, R.22	R.2, R.5, R.6, R.7, R.8, R.9, R.10	R.1, R.3	Ro.32, Ro.34	Ro.2, Ro.3	Ro.12	M.12	M.1, M.2, M.3, M.4	A.1
Comments		Increasing the capacities of the railway network will have a lasting positive impact on air and climate factors (cumulative impact). New development may have a negative effect particularly on land management and soil protection, biodiversity, nature protected areas, cultural heritage and landscape. The R.1 measure is planned for the sensitive Karst area; a cross-border impact is also possible. R.6 and R.7 may also have cross-border impacts on water.			The Ro.2 and Ro.3 measures from the road group will have a lasting impact on improving the road transport capacity of the international connection with Austria through the Karavanke Tunnel, which will result in a positive impact on air and climate conditions. The Ro.12 measure may have a negative impact on drinking water and a lasting impact on biodiversity (Natura 2000), cultural heritage and landscape. Ro.2 may impact WPAs and groundwater on the Austrian side of the border.			Due to an increase in maritime transport, the measures will have a greater but insignificant impact on air and climate factors. An impact is possible particularly in view of sea pollution, i.e. during construction and operation. The main direct effects of the maritime transport on water quality are mainly the results of oil spills and ballast water discharges (also cross-border impact).		Due to the increase in air traffic frequency, the measure will have an insignificant impact on air, climate factors and noise.

Guidelines		It may be understood as a priority alternative on the existing railway lines. The need to site new railway corridors should be established in a special study (in terms of space, the environment and economic viability).	Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status. The need to expand the motorway network (Ro.12) should be established in a comprehensive study, which also observes anticipated improvements in urban and suburban public passenger transport.	The transport strategy should include measures which ensure the long-term prevention of negative impacts of the fleet on seawater quality (modernisation of the fishing fleet,	The transport strategy should include measures which reduce environmental impacts (limitation of air emissions, noise pollution).
		When drafting the project documentation, prepare a groundwater risk assessment and provide suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.	Due to excessive ambient air pollution in the area of the MOL, and noise pollution, it is necessary to ensure the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, particularly the controlled reduction of road vehicle speeds and regular cleaning in order to reduce the resuspension of particles as much as possible.	provision of suitable inspection control of waste management and wastewater discharge, enabling access to the Port of Koper only for environment-friendly fleets and similar).	

Table 4: Sub-objective 2a: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2a North-eastern Slovenia					
Alternatives	General measures	Railway		Road transport			Public transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.2, R.4, R.5, R.22, R.24		Ro.1, Ro.13, Ro.14, Ro.16, Ro.19, Ro.20, Ro.22, Ro.32, Ro.33			U.12
Analysis of alternatives		R.4, R.22, R.24	R.2, R.5	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.1, Ro.13, Ro.14, Ro.19, Ro.20, Ro.22	Ro.16	U.12
Comments		Positive impact on the safety of level crossings. Measures may indirectly contribute to the sustainable reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and emissions from traffic pollutants, since the improvement of passenger and cargo transport on the railway reduces the pressure to use fossil fuels in road transport (cumulative impact).		Positive impact on traffic safety and the reduction of noise pollution. New development has a negative effect particularly on land management and soil protection, drinking water quality, flood safety, areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. Ro.16 will improve road transport capacity; however, it is also anticipated that emissions of pollutants would increase due to the increased transit of cargo transport in this network. Large flood areas are present in the broader area of the Ro.20 corridor.			U.12 has a lasting positive impact on people's health.
Guidelines		It may be understood as a priority alternative on the existing railway lines. Verification of whether measures R.7, R.8, R.9 and R.10 are also related to the attainment of this sub-objective. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.		The need for siting new transport corridors should be established in a special study. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.			Priority alternative.

Table 5: Sub-objective 2b: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2b South-eastern Slovenia				
Alternatives	General measures	Railway		Road transport		Public transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.3, R.4, R.22, R.24		Ro.4, Ro.5, Ro.14, Ro.22, Ro.32, Ro.33		U.3
Analysis of alternatives		R.4, R.22, R.24	R.3	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.4, Ro.5, Ro.14, Ro.22	U.3
Comments		Positive impact on the safety of level crossings. The impact on air emissions and climate change will be lasting positive (cumulative impact). The R.3 measure does not focus on the development of the Posavje statistical region or SE Slovenia (Bela Krajina).		Positive impact on traffic safety and the reduction of noise pollution. New development has a negative effect particularly on land management and soil protection, fragmentation of habitats, areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. A positive impact on social cohesion, accessibility and the economic development of less-developed areas.		The measure has a positive impact on the cohesion of, and accessibility to, city centres, including the improvement of the quality of the living environment (cumulative impact on climate change).
Guidelines		The alternative is suitable.		Improvement of transport connections towards less developed areas (Ro.4) should be planned as a priority. The need to site new routes should be established in a special study. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.		Priority alternative. The selection of suitable public transport, including the schedule of implementation, should be planned in a special study. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status and the living environment.

Table 6: Sub-objective 2c: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE	2c North-western Slovenia							
Alternatives	General measures	Railway		Road transport			Public transport	
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.3, R.4, R.22, R.24		Ro.2, Ro.6, Ro.7, Ro.8, Ro.13, Ro.15, Ro.32, Ro.33			U.1, U.2, U.4 (ž), U.4 (c)	
Analysis of alternatives		R.4, R.22, R.24	R.3	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.2, Ro.6, Ro.8, Ro.13, Ro.7	Ro.15	U.4 (c)	U.1, U.2, U.4 (ž)
Comments		The R.3 measure may have a negative impact particularly on the use of soil, flood safety, fragmentation of habitats, areas with nature protection status (Šmarna gora), cultural heritage and landscape. The improvement of railway infrastructure, including the network, has a lasting positive impact (cumulative impact) from the viewpoint of air emissions and climate change. Positive impact on the safety of level crossings.		Positive impact on traffic safety and the reduction of noise pollution. New development, including extensive reconstruction, has a negative effect particularly on land management and soil protection, fragmentation of habitats, important nature protection areas, water, cultural heritage and landscape. Positive impact on social cohesion, accessibility and economic development of less developed areas (Ro.7). Ro.2 may impact WPAs and groundwater on the Austrian side of the border.			The measures have a positive impact on the cohesion of, and accessibility to, city centres, including the improvement of the quality of the living environment in city centres (cumulative impact).	
Guidelines		The need for the R.3 measure should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.		The optimal manner of implementing the measure (reconstruction or new construction) should be established in a special study. Improving transport connections towards less developed areas (Ro.7) should be planned as a priority.			Priority alternative. The selection of suitable public transport, including the schedule of implementation, should be planned in special studies. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status and the living environment.	

Table 7: Sub-objective 2d: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2d Goriška region			
Alternatives	General measures	Railway		Road transport	
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.6, R.22, R.23, R.24		Ro.21, Ro.32, Ro.33	
Analysis of alternatives		R.22, R.23, R.24	R.6	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.21
Comments		Positive impact on the safety of level crossings. Measures may indirectly contribute to the sustainable reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and emissions from traffic pollutants, since the improvement of passenger and cargo transport on the railway reduces the pressure to use fossil fuels in road transport (cumulative impact). R.6 and R.7 may also have cross-border impacts on water.		Positive impact on traffic safety and the reduction of noise pollution. The construction of the bypass (Ro.21) will have a lasting positive impact on the living environment in the city centre and will improve accessibility to Nova Gorica. The new construction may have a negative impact on areas with protection status. Cross-border impact is possible (Ro.21 – noise).	
Guidelines		On a primary basis, the course of the route should be planned outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.		Priority alternative. On a primary basis, the new route is sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Attention should be paid to WPAs, cultural heritage and landscape. The Ro.7 measure is missing from the measures in the road group which would enable access from the Soča River valley to the regional centre of Nova Gorica and Central Slovenia.	

Table 8: Sub-objective 2e: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2e Koroška region		
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport	
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.22, R.23, R.24	Ro.9, Ro.32, Ro.33	
Analysis of alternatives		R.22, R.23, R.24	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.9
Comments		Lasting positive impact on the safety of level crossings and climate factors from the point of view of mitigating climate change. The R.23 measure anticipates the renewal and upgrading of other lines if necessary.	Positive impact on traffic safety and the reduction of noise pollution. Positive impact on the social cohesion, accessibility and economic development of less developed areas. The Ro.9 measure will have a lasting negative impact on land management soil protection, fragmentation of habitats, areas with nature protections status, water, areas of cultural heritage and landscape.	
Guidelines		Priority alternative. When renewing and constructing railway lines, special attention has to be paid to their routes through areas with protection status.	The need for the Ro.9 measure should be established in a special study. On a primary basis, new routes should be sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable.	

Table 9: Sub-objective 2f: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2f Primorska region					
Alternatives	General measures	Railway			Road transport		
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.1, R.6, R.11, R.21, R.23, R.24			Ro.17, Ro.18, Ro.32, Ro.33		
Analysis of alternatives		R.21, R.23, R.24	R.6, R.11	R.1	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.17	Ro.18
Comments		From the viewpoint of air emissions, climate factors and noise pollution, the transfer of road transport to the railway has a lasting positive and cumulative impact. The construction of new railway lines may have a negative effect, particularly on the use of soil, the quality of groundwater (Karst area), fragmentation of habitats and areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. A cross-border impact is possible with R.1. R.6 and R.7 may also have cross-border impacts on water.			From the viewpoint of mitigating climate change, a lasting positive impact on air quality and climate factors is possible. Ro.18 is sited in the influence area of the Škocjan Caves (Unesco, Ramsar); a long-distance negative impact on water quality and biodiversity of the cave system is possible. The Ro.17 measure may have a cross-border impact on the Dragonja River.		
Guidelines		The need for Ro.1 should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, the route is sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.			The need for Ro.18 should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, the route is sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.		

Table 10: Sub-objective 2g: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2g Central Slovenia							
Alternatives	General measures	Railway			Road transport			Public transport	
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, U.38	R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4, R.5, R.11			Ro.10, Ro.11, Ro.12, Ro.13, Ro.14, Ro.15, Ro.19, Ro.32, Ro.33			U.1, U.2, U.3, U.4 (ž), U.4 (c), U.11	
Analysis of alternatives		R.4	R.2, R.5, R.11	R.1, R.3	Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.13, Ro.14, Ro.19	Ro.10, Ro.11, Ro.12, Ro.15	U.4 (c), U.11	U.1, U.2, U.3, U.4 (ž)
Comments		Increasing the capacity of the railway network will have a lasting positive impact on air and climate factors (cumulative impact). New development has a negative effect particularly on land management and soil protection, biodiversity, nature protection areas, cultural heritage and landscape. The R.1 measure is planned for the sensitive Karst area; cross-border impact is also possible.			New development has a negative effect particularly on land management, soil protection, biodiversity, protection areas, cultural heritage and landscape. The R.1 measure is planned for the sensitive Karst area; a cross-border impact on water is also possible. The measures on city road networks will have a lasting positive impact on air quality and accessibility.			The measures have a positive impact on the cohesion of, and accessibility to, city centres, including the improvement of the quality of the living environment in cities and climate conditions (cumulative impact).	
Guidelines		It may be understood as a priority alternative on the existing railway lines. The need to site new railway corridors should be established in a special study (in terms of space, the environment and economic viability). Preparation of a groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of			The need for new construction should be established in a comprehensive study, which also observes anticipated improvements in urban and suburban public passenger transport. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.			Priority alternative. The selection of suitable public transport, including the schedule of implementation, should be planned in special studies. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status and the living environment.	

		suitable corridors for wild animals.		
--	--	--------------------------------------	--	--

Table 11: Sub-objective 2h: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		2h Accessibility within regions (to regional centres)					
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport			Public transport	Maritime transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, R.39, U.31, U.32, U.33, U.35, U.36, U.38	R.24	Ro.7, Ro.9, Ro.10, Ro.11, Ro.19, Ro.20, Ro.21, Ro.22, Ro.31, Ro.32, Ro.33			U.13, U.14, U.16, U.17	M.12
Analysis of alternatives		R.24	Ro.31, Ro.32, Ro.33	Ro.7, Ro.19, Ro.20, Ro.21, Ro.22	Ro.9, Ro.10, Ro.11	U.13, U.14, U.16, U.17	M.12
Comments		The elimination of dangerous level crossings will have a lasting positive impact on traffic safety.	The measures on the road network will have a lasting positive impact on better integration and accessibility, road traffic safety and improvement of living conditions (noise). New development and extensive reconstruction have a negative effect particularly on land management and soil protection, flood safety, fragmentation of habitats, areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. A cross-border impact is possible (Ro.21 – noise).			The suitable arrangement of public passenger transport (intermodality), cycle routes and car parks (P+R) has a lasting positive effect (cumulative impact).	Positive impact on the integration of stakeholders in maritime transport. In the case of severely increased maritime transport, a permanent negative impact on the environment is possible.
Guidelines		Improving safety (R.24) is a priority measure.	Improving safety (R.33) is a priority measure. The need for siting new transport corridors should be established in a special study. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.			Priority alternative.	Care must be taken when implementing M.12 due to possible impact on water, biodiversity and increasing noise pollution.

Table 12: Sub-objective 3a: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		3a Ljubljana						
Alternatives	General measures	Railway			Road transport		Public transport	
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, R.39, U.31, U.35, U.36, U.39	R.1, R.3, R.4, R.5			Ro.12, Ro.32, Ro.34, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37		U.1, U.2, U.3, U.4 (ž), U.4 (c), U.11, U.15, U.16, U.17	
Analysis of alternatives		R.4	R.5	R.1, R.3	Ro.32, Ro.34, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37	Ro.12	U.11, U.15, U.16, U.17, U.4 (c)	U.1, U.2, U.3, U.4 (ž)
Comments		The impact of air emissions, impact on climate factors and noise pollution will be lasting positive (cumulative impact). New development (R.1, R.3) may have a negative effect particularly on land management, groundwater quality, fragmentation of habitats, areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. The R.1 measure is planned for the sensitive Karst area; a cross-border impact is also possible.			The measures on the road network will have a lasting positive impact on improving the environment and accessibility. The Ro.12 measure may have a negative impact on drinking water, and a lasting impact on biodiversity (Natura 2000), cultural heritage and landscape. Due to the increased transit of cargo transport in this section, emissions of pollutants and noise pollution will increase.		The measures have a positive impact on the cohesion of, and accessibility to, the city centre, including the improvement of the quality of the living environment in cities and climate conditions (cumulative impact).	
Guidelines		The need to site new rail connections should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, new routes are sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors for wild animals.			The need to expand the motorway network (Ro.12) should be established in a comprehensive study, which also observes anticipated improvements in urban and suburban public passenger transport. Due to excessive ambient air pollution in the area of the MOL, and noise pollution, it is necessary to ensure the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, particularly the controlled reduction of road vehicle speeds, regular cleaning of road surfaces and noise barriers. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas		Priority alternative. The selection of suitable public transport, including the schedule of implementation, should be planned in special studies. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status and the living environment.	

with protection status (the Ljubljana Marshes).

Table 13: Sub-objective 3b: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		3b Maribor			
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport		Public transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.32, R.34, R.37, R.38, R.39, U.31, U.35, U.36, U.39	R.7, R.8, R.9, R.10	Ro.16, Ro.32, Ro.34, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37		U.12, U.15, U.17
Analysis of alternatives		R.7, R.8, R.9, R.10	Ro.32, Ro.34, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37	Ro.16	U.12, U.15, U.17
Comments		Improving railway transport will have a lasting positive impact on air, climate change and noise (cumulative impact).	The measures on the road network will have a lasting positive impact on the environment and will improve accessibility to the city centre. The impact may be negative, since Ro.16 is sited in the water protection area of a cultural monument and exceptional landscape.		The suitable arrangement of public passenger transport, cycle routes and car parks (P+R) has a lasting positive effect (cumulative impact).
Guidelines		Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status. Anticipating measures to prevent collisions of birds with power lines.	The need to expand the motorway network (Ro.16) should be established in a comprehensive study, which also observes anticipated improvements in urban and suburban public passenger transport. Planning suitable spatial and technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on areas with protection status.		Priority alternative.

Table 14: Sub-objective 3c: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		3c Koper			
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport		Public transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.39, U.32, U.35, U.36, U.39	R.1	Ro.17, Ro.32, Ro.34, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37		U.17
Analysis of alternatives		R.1	Ro.32, Ro.34, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37	Ro.17	U.17
Comments		From the viewpoint of air emissions, climate factors and noise pollution, the transfer of road transport to the railway has a lasting positive and cumulative impact. The siting of the railway line may have a negative impact particularly on the use of soil, groundwater quality (Karst area), fragmentation of habitats and areas with nature protection status, cultural heritage and landscape. A cross-border impact is also possible.	Lasting positive impact on the living environment (cumulative impact) and accessibility. The area in the inshore belt in the vicinity of Koper is densely build-up; the implementation of the measure may thus increase noise pollution along the traffic route. The Ro.17 measure may have a cross-border impact on the Dragonja River.		The development of the cycle network will have a lasting positive impact on people's health and the living environment.
Guidelines		The need for a new railway line should be established in a special study. Preparation of groundwater risk assessment and the provision of suitable technical measures for pollution prevention. On a primary basis, the route is sited outside areas with protection status, or such technical solutions have to be provided so that the impact is acceptable. Provision of migration corridors	Planning suitable technical solutions which prevent negative impacts on the living environment and long-distance impacts on bathing water.		Priority alternative.

		for wild animals.		
--	--	-------------------	--	--

Table 15: Sub-objective 4a: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		4a Harmonisation of legislation, rules and standards with European requirements and best practice		
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Maritime transport	
Measures of the Strategy	R.36, Ro.41, U.34, U.39, M.34	R.21	M.11, M.12	
Analysis of alternatives		R.21	M.11, M.12	
Comments		The measure will increase the interoperability of the entire network, which will result in lasting positive impacts on the quality of air, climate change and noise (cumulative impact).	Positive impact on the integration of stakeholders in maritime transport. In the case of severely increased transport, a permanent negative impact on the environment is possible.	
Guidelines		The alternative is suitable.	Priority implementation of the M.11 measure is proposed. Care must be taken when implementing M.12 due to possible impacts on noise, water and natural environment.	

Table 16: Sub-objective 4b: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE	4b Improving the organisational system structure and cooperation between respective stakeholders	
Alternatives	General measures	Road transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.36, R.37, Ro.41, U.33, U.36, U.37, U.38, U.39, M.34	Ro.32
Analysis of alternatives		Ro.32
Comments		The monitoring of traffic is a basis for the long-term planning of traffic flows and for decisions relating to the needs for construction/upgrading of infrastructure.
Guidelines		Suitable alternative.

Table 17: Sub-objective 4c: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		4c Improving the operational system structure			
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport	Air traffic	Maritime transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.37, U.33, U.36, U.37, U.38, U.39, M.34	R.21	Ro.32	A.10	M.13
Analysis of alternatives		R.21	Ro.32	A.10	M.13
Comments		The measure will increase the interoperability of the entire network, which will result in positive impacts on the quality of air, climate change and noise.	The monitoring of traffic is a basis for the long-term planning of traffic flows and for decisions relating to the needs for the construction/upgrading of infrastructure.	The implementation of the measure will have a positive impact on the safety of air traffic, its regularity and continuity.	The introduction of a system for maritime transport monitoring is anticipated.
Guidelines		The alternative is suitable.	Priority implementation of the Ro.32 measure is proposed.	It may be considered a priority alternative.	The alternative is suitable, but not a priority.

Table 18: Sub-objective 4d: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		4d Improving transport system safety		
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport	Air traffic
Measures of the Strategy	R.37, U.35	R.24	Ro.33	A.10
Analysis of alternatives		R.24	Ro.33	A.10
Comments		The elimination of dangerous level crossings will have a lasting positive impact on traffic safety.	Measures related to environmental protection in the field of transport refer to preventing the spread of noise in the environment and the rehabilitation of crossroads and road sections with high risk levels. Lasting positive impact on inhabitants and material assets.	The implementation of the measure will have a lasting positive impact on the safety of air traffic, its regularity and continuity.
Guidelines		From the viewpoint of railway safety, it is considered a priority alternative.	From the viewpoint of road safety, it is considered a priority alternative.	From the viewpoint of air traffic safety, it is considered a priority alternative.

Table 19: Sub-objective 4e: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE	4e Environmental impact reduction/mitigation				
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport	Maritime transport	Air traffic
Measures of the Strategy	R.34, R.35, R.37, R.38, R.39, U.35	R.22	Ro.33, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37	M.11	A.11
Analysis of alternatives		R.22	Ro.33, Ro.35, Ro.36, Ro.37	M.11	A.11
Comments		The electrification of regional railway lines would have a lasting positive impact on air quality and climate changes; the emission of noise from rail transport would also be reduced (cumulative impact). Possible negative impact on birds, particularly in the case of fragmenting migration routes.	The measures anticipate a reduction of CO2 emissions in the environment, reduction of noise pollution due to noise barriers, promotion of the use of alternative fuels (mitigation of climate change), traffic safety and similar. Lasting positive impact on people's health.	Positive impact on climate change due to the provision of infrastructure for alternative fuels (cumulative impact).	Positive impact on climate change due to the provision of infrastructure for alternative fuels (cumulative impact).
Guidelines		The alternative is suitable, immediately after the road alternative. Preventing the collision of birds with power lines with suitable measures.	Priority alternative. Measures have to be implemented on new construction and the existing enclosed traffic routes (e.g. Vrhnika-Postojna section) which enable the migration of wild animals.	The alternative is suitable, equivalent to the air alternative.	The alternative is suitable, equivalent to the maritime alternative.

Table 20: Sub-objective 4f: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		4f Improving energy efficiency			
Alternatives	General measures	Railway	Road transport	Maritime transport	Air traffic
Measures of the Strategy	R.34, R.35, R.37, U.35	R.22	Ro.33, Ro.35	M.11	A.11
Analysis of alternatives		R.22	Ro.33, Ro.35	M.11	A.11
Comments		The electrification of regional railway lines will have a lasting positive impact (cumulative impact).	The arrangement of filling stations for alternative fuels will have a lasting positive impact (cumulative impact).	Positive impact due to the provision of infrastructure for alternative fuels (lasting, cumulative impact).	Positive impact due to the provision of infrastructure for alternative fuels (lasting, cumulative impact).
Guidelines		All alternatives are of the same priority.	All alternatives are of the same priority. Ro.33 is supplemented with a description of the manner of improving energy efficiency.	All alternatives are of the same priority.	All alternatives are of the same priority.

Table 21: Sub-objective 4g: - assessment of individual groups of alternative measures

OBJECTIVE		4g Financial sustainability of the transport system
Alternatives	General measures	Road transport
Measures of the Strategy	R.31, R.32, R.33, R.37, Ro.42, Ro.43, U.31	Ro.32, Ro.36
Analysis of alternatives		Ro.32, Ro.36
Comments		Charging external costs will have a positive impact on the distribution of traffic, climate factors and air quality in city centres. The monitoring of traffic is a basis for the long-term planning of traffic flows and for decisions relating to needs for the construction/upgrading of infrastructure.
Guidelines		Suitable alternative.