

ASSIST - Assessment of social and economic impacts of transport policy measures
 Workpackage 2: Transport Policy Measure Impact Assessment

FACT SHEET NO.: 1 / 1

PERFORMED BY: NEA

A GENERAL INFORMATION	
A 1	Category
A 2	Subcategory
A 3	Transport policy measure (TPM)
A 4	Description of TPM
A 5	Implementation examples
A 6	Objectives of TPM
A 7	Key changes concerning:
A 7.1	- Choice of transport mode / Multimodality:
A 7.2	- Origin and/or destination of trip:
A 7.3	- Trip frequency:
A 7.4	- Choice of route:
A 7.5	- Timing (day, hour):
A 7.6	- Occupancy rate / Loading factor:
A 7.7	- Energy efficiency / Energy usage:
A 8	Main source

B IMPACTS	
B 1	OVERVIEW ON IMPACTS
B 1.1	Summary
B 1.2	Summary: Income groups
B 1.3	Summary: Age groups
B 1.4	Summary: Disabled people
B 1.5	Summary: Gender groups
B 1.6	Summary: Ethnic groups

B 2 TRAFFIC IMPACTS	
B 2.1	Travel or transport time
B 2.2	Risk of congestion
B 2.3	Vehicle mileage
B 2.4	Service and comfort
B 2.I	Overall impacts on social groups
B 2.II	Implementation phase
B 2.III	Operation phase
B 2.IV	Summary / comments concerning the main impacts
B 2.V	Quantification of impacts

B 3 ECONOMIC IMPACTS	
B 3.1	Transport costs
B 3.2	Private income / commercial turn over
B 3.3	Revenues in the transport sector
B 3.4	Sectoral competitiveness
B 3.5	Spatial competitiveness
B 3.6	Housing expenditures
B 3.7	Insurance costs
B 3.8	Health service costs
B 3.9	Public authorities & adm. burdens on businesses
B 3.10	Public income (e.g.: taxes, charges)
B 3.11	Third countries and international relations
B 3.I	Overall impacts on social groups
B 3.II	Implementation phase
B 3.III	Operation phase
B 3.IV	Summary / comments concerning the main impacts
B 3.V	Quantification of impacts

ASSIST - Assessment of social and economic impacts of transport policy measures
 Workpackage 2: Transport Policy Measure Impact Assessment

B 4	SOCIAL IMPACTS	AFFECTED SEGMENTS													Geographical level		Source			
		Passengers					Transport operators					Employees in transport	Residents	Economy	Public bodies	Society	1st level	2nd level	Source of assessment	Spatial level of source
		Road	Rail	Air	Public transport	Slow modes	Road	Rail	IWW	Air	Maritime									
B 4.1	Health (incl. well-being)																			
B 4.2	Safety																			
B 4.3	Crime, terrorism and security																			
B 4.4	Accessibility of transport systems																			
B 4.5	Social inclusion, equality & opportunities																			
B 4.6	Standards and rights (related to job quality)																			
B 4.7	Employment and labour markets																			
B 4.8	Cultural heritage / culture																			
B 4.I	Overall impacts on social groups																			
B 4.II	Implementation phase																			
B 4.III	Operation phase																			
B 4.IV	Summary / comments concerning the main impacts	<p>Positive contribution to social cohesion on a regional level: authorities may decide to exempt isolated areas or economically weak regions from applying tolls or user charges</p> <p>Negative impact on transport companies which need to deal with the administrative burden to purchase the Eurovignette; additional burden on public administration</p> <p>Internalization of external costs from road freight transport. The overall positive results affecting the society is a reduction of external (negative) effects, higher public income, support of climate change and the conservation of resources.</p>																		
B 4.V	Quantification of impacts																			

B 5	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	AFFECTED SEGMENTS													Geographical level		Source			
		Passengers					Transport operators					Employees in transport	Residents	Economy	Public bodies	Society	1st level	2nd level	Source of assessment	Spatial level of source
		Road	Rail	Air	Public transport	Slow modes	Road	Rail	IWW	Air	Maritime									
B 5.1	Air pollutants																			
B 5.2	Noise emissions																			
B 5.3	Visual quality of the landscape																			
B 5.4	Land use																			
B 5.5	Climate																			
B 5.6	Renewable or non-renewable resources																			
B 5.I	Overall impacts on social groups																			
B 5.II	Implementation phase																			
B 5.III	Operation phase																			
B 5.IV	Summary / comments concerning the main impacts	<p>- Reduction of noise levels and pollution caused by road freight transport. Society as a whole benefits from lower noise levels and pollutant emissions; within the modes there is a likely shift from road to rail (also in terms of pollution); the additional negative environmental effects due to more IWW transport are negligible.</p> <p>To encourage fleet renewal, the Eurovignette provides for staggered exemptions that are limited in time for heavy vehicles with the cleanest engines (EURO 5, 6), including in sensitive areas such as mountain regions.</p> <p>- Improvement of infrastructure: the funds raised by the Eurovignette are used to finance the maintenance of the road infrastructure but also to cross-finance rail and IWW</p>																		
B 5.V	Quantification of impacts	In the example of the Paris-Amsterdam corridor a decrease in congestion by 50%, of CO2 by 20%, of pollution by 30% and external costs by 14% were estimated [16].																		

C REFERENCES	
C 1	Other TPMs of this subcategory
C 2	References
	<p>International</p> <p>[1] Eur-lex: Directive_2006/38/EC amending Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures (17 May 2006) [FR] [DE]</p> <p>[2] OECD Observer: Road pricing: what's the deal? (March 2002)</p> <p>[3] European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT): Tolls on Interurban Road Infrastructure. An Economic Evaluation (Report of the Round Table on Transport Economics 118, July 2002)</p> <p>[4] CEMR, Council of European Municipalities and Regions: Eurovignette directive : European Parliament and CEMR speak with one voice (Press release, 19 March 2004)</p> <p>[5] European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA): ACEA position on Eurovignette Revision (30 September 2008)</p> <p>[6] European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA): ACEA position on the internalisation of external costs (30 September 2008)</p> <p>[15] Gutiérrez Puebla, J. and Condepo-Melhorado (2011): A. Eurovignette impacts on market access: winners and losers, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.</p> <p>[16] Schrotten, A. et al. (2011): External and infrastructure costs of freight transport Paris-Amsterdam corridor. CE Delft.</p> <p>[17] Gibson, G. et al. (2014): Evaluation of the implementation and effects of EU infrastructure charging policy since 1995. Ricardo-AEA and TRT.</p> <p>National</p> <p>[7] UK - Department for Transport: White Paper: A New Deal for Transport - Better for Everyone (July 1998)</p> <p>[8] Germany - Ministry of Transport: Lkw-Maut – Inkrafttreten des neuen Bundesfernstraßenmautgesetzes (BFStrMG) zum 19. Juli 2011; http://www.bmvs.de/SharedDocs/DE/Artikel/UK/lkw-maut-inkrafttreten-neues-bundesfernstraassenmautgesetz.html (Juli 2011)</p> <p>[9] Germany - Ministry of Transport: Aktualisierung der Wegekostenrechnung I31-10-2011 für die Bundesfernstraßen in Deutschland (2007)</p> <p>[10] Netherlands - Belastingdienst: Belasting zware motorrijtuigen (bzm); http://download.belastingdienst.nl/belastingdienst/docs/mededeling_bzm_ev0061z12pl.pdf (March 2010)</p> <p>[11] Joint industry position paper: Eurovignette III - Charging of Heavy Goods Vehicles Proposal (15 January 2009)</p> <p>Regional / Local</p> <p>[12] Institute for Transport Economics at the University of Cologne: External Costs in the Transport Sector - A Critical Review of the EC-internalisation Policy (May 2008)</p> <p>[13] MORPACE International: Study on UK congestion charges and satellite-based road pricing (news release, October 2002)</p> <p>[14] Institute for Transport Studies, Leeds University (ITS): UK Surface Transport Costs and Charges (1998) [executive summary]</p>