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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The objective of this project was to calculate the optimum speeds for six categories of New Zealand rural State Highways:

1. Motorways/Expressways (divided four-lane) roads (435 km with 26,611 vehicles/day)
2. High Volume National Strategic (undivided) roads ( 371 km with 12,817 vehicles/day)
3. Straight National \& Regional Strategic roads ( $2,825 \mathrm{~km}$ with 4,764 vehicles/day)
4. Winding National \& Regional Strategic roads ( 343 km with 4,478 vehicles/day)
5. Straight Regional Connector \& Distributor roads ( $4,920 \mathrm{~km}$ with 1,829 vehicles/day)
6. Winding Regional Connector \& Distributor roads ( $1,118 \mathrm{~km}$ with 1,850 vehicles/day).

The optimum speed for a class of road was defined as one which minimises the total social costs of the impacts of speed. As such, an optimum speed limit is one that provides maximum benefit from reduced travel times and minimises the costs of road trauma, environmental emissions and vehicle operating costs. However, noise pollution could not be considered.

The economic evaluation considered the effect of cruise speeds of each vehicle type (passenger cars and light, medium and heavy commercial vehicles) ranging from 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on:

- Crash frequencies and costs
- Travel time costs, including costs for the freight industry
- Vehicle operating costs
- Air pollution costs.

The effects of changes in speed on crashes at each injury severity level were estimated using well-established relationships for rural roads originated in Sweden by Nilsson and recalibrated by recent meta-analysis of extensive evaluations of speed changes. Travel time was considered inversely related to cruise speed, but was adjusted for the number of stopping points and decelerations for slow curves using the additional time per speed change cycle given in NZTA's Economic Evaluation Manual (EEM). Vehicle operating cost (VOC) functions related to speed were obtained from EEM for each vehicle type and road gradient. Additional VOC per speed change cycle for each stop and deceleration for curves was also obtained from EEM. Carbon dioxide emissions were estimated from VOC and other air pollution emissions from procedures in EEM. Emissions other than carbon dioxide were adjusted for stops and curves using a cruder method than that available for travel time and VOC in EEM, but these emissions were valued at only $1 \%$ of their urban cost because of their lower impact in rural areas.

Each of the costs of crashes, travel time, vehicle operations and carbon dioxide emissions on each category of rural State Highway for each vehicle type were valued using the unit costs in EEM and updated to 2009 values by the update factors provided. For each cruise speed, the total economic cost was aggregated and the speed that minimised the total cost for all light vehicles, within the range 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, was found. The optimum speed that minimised the total cost for all heavy vehicles was found in the same way. The estimated optimum speeds, in comparison with current cruise speeds provided by NZTA, are shown in Table I.

Table I: Current cruise speeds by vehicle type and estimated optimum speeds (not less than 70 km/h).

|  | Current cruise speeds on straight sections of |  |  | Optimum cruise <br> rural highways (km/h) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Category | Cars \& light <br> commercial <br> vehicles <br> (LCV) | Medium <br> commercial <br> vehicles <br> (MCV) | Heavy <br> commercial <br> vehicles I <br> (HCV I) | Heavy <br> commercial <br> vehicles II <br> (HCV II) | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br>  <br> HCVs) |
| 1. Motorways/Expressways <br> (divided four-lane) roads | 99.1 | 90.7 | 92.5 | 91.5 | 105 | 80 |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 93.9 | 86.1 | 87.7 | 86.9 | 85 | 70 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 95.8 | 87.8 | 89.5 | 88.6 | 80 | 70 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 83.6 | 77.2 | 78.4 | 77.8 | 75 | 70 |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 95.7 | 87.7 | 89.4 | 88.5 | 80 | 70 |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 79.7 | 73.9 | 74.9 | 74.4 | 70 | 70 |

The impacts if light and heavy vehicles changed from travelling at their current cruise speeds to their optimum speeds were calculated for each road category. The total impact of such a change, aggregated across all categories of rural State Highway, is shown in Tables II and III.

Table II: Physical impact if all vehicles changed to travelling at their optimum speed, compared to travelling at their current speeds.

| Type of impact | Before | After | Change |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total travel time on link, hours/day | 466,877 | 515,889 | 49,012 | $10.5 \%$ |  |
| Number of Casualty Crashes per year | 8,728 | 7,240 | $-1,489$ | $-17.1 \%$ |  |
| Emissions, t/year | Carbon monoxide CO | 115,307 | 98,560 | $-16,747$ | $-14.5 \%$ |
|  | Hydrocarbons HC | 7,129 | 6,168 | -961 | $-13.5 \%$ |
|  | Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 37,095 | 31,169 | $-5,926$ | $-16.0 \%$ |
|  | Particles PM | 3,542 | 2,908 | -633 | $-17.9 \%$ |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |  | $8,027,707$ | $7,462,776$ | $-564,931$ | $-7.0 \%$ |

Table III: Economic impact if all vehicles changed to travelling at their optimum speed.

| $\$ ’ \mathbf{0 0 0} /$ year | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle operating costs | $6,617,280$ | $6,202,356$ | $-414,924$ | $-6.3 \%$ |
| Time costs | $4,661,854$ | $5,192,801$ | 530,947 | $11.4 \%$ |
| Crash costs | $1,484,548$ | 911,946 | $-572,602$ | $-38.6 \%$ |
| Air pollution costs | 335,556 | 310,396 | $-25,160$ | $-7.5 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 , 0 9 9 , 2 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 6 1 7 , 4 9 9}$ |  |  |
| Change |  | $\mathbf{- 4 8 1 , 7 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 . 7} \%$ |  |

While crashes on motorways/expressways may increase due to an increase in car and LCV speeds, the overall reduction in casualty crashes represents an annual saving of 90 fatal crashes (approximately $60 \%$ of the fatal crashes on rural State Highways), 334 serious injury crashes, and 1,065 minor injury crashes. When these savings in road trauma were valued using the unit costs of crashes in EEM related to their injury severity, it was estimated that there would be $39 \%$ reduction in crash costs on rural highways (Table III). The overall economic impact if all vehicles travelled at their optimum speeds was estimated to be a saving of $\$ 482$ million per annum in total social costs or $3.7 \%$ reduction in the estimated $\$ 13.1$ billion annual cost of rural State Highway travel in New Zealand.

## Sensitivity analysis

The analysis described in this report included many assumptions, constraints and cost valuations. Three of these were examined to test the sensitivity of the estimates of optimum speed to the following variations on the economic analysis:

1. Cruise speeds below $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for each vehicle type
2. Increased valuation of travel time costs
3. Ignoring under-reporting of non-fatal reported crashes.

The results of the sensitivity analysis are shown in Table IV.
Table IV: Estimated optimum speeds resulting from variations in the economic analysis.

|  | Optimum cruise <br> speeds without 70 <br> km/h lower limit |  | Optimum cruise <br> speeds with travel <br> time costs per hour <br> doubled |  | Optimum cruise <br> speeds based on <br> reported crashes <br> (ignoring under- <br> reporting) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Category | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br> (MCVs <br> \& HCVs) | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br> (MCVs <br> \& HCVs) | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br> (MCVs <br> \& HCVs) |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 105 | 80 | 130 | 95 | 110 | 80 |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 85 | 70 | 95 | 85 | 90 | 75 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 80 | 70 | 95 | 80 | 85 | 70 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 75 | 65 | 85 | 75 | 80 | 65 |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 80 | 70 | 90 | 75 | 80 | 70 |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 65 | 55 | 75 | 65 | 70 | 55 |

## Conclusions

The findings of this report depend on the functional relationships between speed and road trauma, travel time, air pollution emissions and vehicle operating costs, the assumptions made, and the input parameters. The sensitivity of the findings to variations in these factors has been
tested only to a limited extent. Within the limits of the assumptions made and the data available, the following conclusions were reached.

1. The optimum speeds on Category 1 Motorways/Expressways (divided four-lane) roads would be $105 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for cars and light commercial vehicles and $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for trucks ${ }^{1}$. On other categories of (undivided) rural highways, the optimum speeds would be at most $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for trucks, but the optimum speed for cars and light commercial vehicles ranges from 85 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ down to $65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ depending on the quality of the road and whether through a winding road environment.
2. Rationalisation of speed limits applicable to each class of rural highway and for each type of vehicle, making the limits consistent with the optimum speed in each case, has the potential to reduce casualty crashes and crash costs substantially. Although travel times and costs would increase, there would be a reduction in the total social costs on rural highways when all the benefits of reduced road trauma, air pollution emissions and vehicle operating costs from reduced speeds are considered.
3. The results suggest that differential speed limits would be appropriate in each category of rural highway apart from those through winding road environments (where, however, substantially reduced general speed limits for all vehicle types are appropriate). If differential speed limits were to be applied on some undivided rural highways, then attention should be given to providing adequate overtaking opportunities.
[^0]
## ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF OPTIMUM SPEEDS ON RURAL HIGHWAYS IN NEW ZEALAND

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The optimum speed for a class of road was defined as one which minimises the total social costs of the impacts of speed. As such, an optimum speed limit is one that provides maximum benefit from reduced travel times and minimises the costs of road trauma, environmental emissions and vehicle operating costs.

The objective of this project was to calculate the optimum speeds for six categories of New Zealand rural State Highways:

1. Motorways/Expressways (divided four-lane) roads ( 435 km with 26,611 vehicles/day)
2. High Volume National Strategic (undivided) roads ( 371 km with 12,817 vehicles/day)
3. Straight National \& Regional Strategic roads ( $2,825 \mathrm{~km}$ with 4,764 vehicles/day)
4. Winding National \& Regional Strategic roads ( 343 km with 4,478 vehicles/day)
5. Straight Regional Connector \& Distributor roads ( $4,920 \mathrm{~km}$ with 1,829 vehicles/day)
6. Winding Regional Connector \& Distributor roads ( $1,118 \mathrm{~km}$ with 1,850 vehicles/day).

The system-wide impacts if cars and trucks were to travel at their optimum speeds, as a basis for setting speed limits in each road environment, are also calculated. It should be noted that optimum speeds are not necessarily Safe System speeds (NZ MoT 2009).

The economic evaluation considered the effect of a range of cruise speeds of each vehicle type (passenger cars and light, medium and heavy commercial vehicles) on:

- Travel time costs, including costs for the freight industry;
- Vehicle operating costs;
- Crash costs; and
- Air pollution costs.

Previous research in Europe suggested that there is sufficient knowledge relating road trauma, vehicle operating costs, air pollution emissions, noise and travel time to vehicle speeds to indicate that the project was feasible (Nilsson 1984; Andersson et al 1991; Peters et al 1996; Rietveld et al 1996; Carlsson 1997; Toivanen and Kallberg 1998; Elvik 1999, 2002). Also, subsequent Australian research has built on the European experience and calibrated the relationships with vehicle speeds using Australian data (Cameron 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2011, 2012).

## 2. PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON IMPACTS OF SPEEDS

Much of the previous research was concerned with estimating the optimum speed of vehicle travel on various classes of road in different road environments. The optimum speed is defined as one which balances the social costs and benefits of increased travel time with decreased road trauma, vehicle operating costs, emissions, and other costs.

### 2.1 EUROPEAN RESEARCH

Nilsson (1984) reported separate relationships between the increase in the numbers of killed, seriously injured, and slightly injured car occupants, and the increase in the median speed relative to baseline conditions. He built on these relationships to estimate the total injury cost for car occupants per million vehicle kilometres travelled as a function of median speed, for each of six rural road environments in Sweden.

Some roads had much higher median speeds than would be expected if they had the same 'accepted' balance between speed and injury cost rate which was displayed on other roads. Nilsson argued that speeds on these roads would need to be reduced (in the order of 5-10 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) if the same balance of speed and injury costs were to be achieved on all roads. While Nilsson's proposals may not have achieved the optimum balance, they were aimed in this direction.

Andersson et al (1991) calculated optimal speeds on different classes of Swedish roads on the basis of socio-economic costs. The optimal speed was defined as the speed where the sum of crash costs (injuries and material damage), vehicle operating costs, and travel time costs was lowest. The prices or values used were the same as those normally used in official transport economic calculations in Sweden.

They found that the optimal speeds on three types of urban roads, presently speed-zoned with $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ limits, was in the range $47-58 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. However, in the rural road environments, the optimal speeds were considerably lower than the current mean speeds and the speed limits.

Plowden and Hillman (1996) calculated optimal speed limits for UK main roads, both outside and inside towns. The calculations took into account the speed-related impacts on and economic values of fuel, other vehicle operating costs, travel time and crashes. The results were considered to be the upper boundaries of the speed limits because all the impacts left out of the calculations were negative, and increase with speed (e.g. noise pollution). The calculations were made with and without the assumption of an effect whereby reduced speed limits influence how much road users travel.

For motorways and 'A' roads outside towns, in general they found that optimal speed limits were up to 15 mph lower than existing limits, depending on the road class and assumptions on fuel taxation. Their analysis of urban roads had greater difficulties determining the effects of speed changes, but they concluded that the urban speed limit should normally be 20 mph ( $32 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ). However, it appears that some of their assumptions may have been extreme, so this figure could be viewed as a lower limit for optimal speeds in urban areas. They made a number of suggestions for further work to refine this area.

Rietveld et al (1996) calculated the socially optimal speed for passenger cars on different roads types in the Netherlands, with and without the assumption that total travel is independent of changes in speed. The calculations made a distinction between fatal and other serious crashes, and also included the speed-related impacts on travel time, energy use, and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ emissions. Further information on their methods and data is given by Peeters et al (1996) and Coesel and Rietveld (1998).

The researchers had to rely on general estimates of the elasticity between travelling time and vehicle travel when estimating the speed-related impacts. They noted that a full network model would have been necessary to provide a more realistic estimate of the effects of speed
changes on travel demand. They also stated that their analysis was incomplete because they were not able to consider the effects on noise pollution and costs.

Rietveld et al noted that vehicles seldom travel at constant speed and that actual average speeds are considerably lower than speed limits and desired speeds, especially in urban areas. On urban roads with a $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ limit, they found that the average speed was $38 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on major urban through roads and $27 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on other urban roads. The average speed was 15 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ in residential streets, which have a $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ limit. They also found that the optimal speed on the urban roads/streets was close to (or a little less than) the average speed in each case, whereas on the higher speed limited rural roads the optimal speeds were considerably less than the corresponding averages. In the urban areas in the Netherlands, it appears that desired speed behaviour is generally consistent with the current speed limits and produces average speeds which are close to socially optimal.

Elvik (1999) undertook a similar analysis to calculate the optimal speed in urban areas in Norway, considering in addition the speed-related impacts on noise pollution and feelings of insecurity towards children. He found that the optimal speed on urban main roads was 50 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$, on collector roads it was $40 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, and on residential access roads it was $30 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Carlsson (1997) calculated the optimum speeds of passenger cars on different types of rural roads in Sweden. The speed-related effects on fatalities, serious injuries, slight injuries, property damage, travel time, fuel consumption, tyre wear, and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}, \mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and HC emissions were all included. He found that the present travel speeds in Sweden were $15-25 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ higher than the optimum speed for each type of road.

Kallberg and Toivanen (1998) described a framework for assessing the impacts of speed, developed as part of the European project MASTER (Managing Speeds of Traffic on European Roads). While they did not use this to calculate optimum speeds, the framework was a valuable basis for the project described here. The framework aimed to provide a comprehensive coverage of all the impacts, both direct and indirect, and quantifiable and non-quantifiable.

Kallberg and Toivanen drew an important distinction between the impacts of speed at the level of the individual road section or link, viewed in isolation, and at the level of the transport network. It is possible that changes in speeds or speed limits on individual links can have impacts on perceived accessibility, transport modal split, and broader socioeconomic impacts, all of which can have feedback effects on travel speeds. They also noted that speed management can have objectives related to efficiency (where socio-economic cost-benefit analysis is an important tool) and equity (where the distribution of the costs and benefits of speed needs to be considered). Speeds which are desirable from an efficiency point-of-view may not be acceptable because of real or perceived inequities to some parts of society. However, the inequities are usually difficult to quantify.

The MASTER project developed a computer spreadsheet to allow all the impacts of a change in speed management policy to be recorded, and analysed where appropriate. A copy of the output from the spreadsheet (without data entered) is given in Appendix A to illustrate its structure. Kallberg and Toivnanen (1998) gave a detailed description, and illustrated its use by applying it to speed policy issues in Finland, Hungary and Portugal. The spreadsheet provided a useful computational basis (with modifications) for the calculation of the impacts of different travel speeds for the project described here (Appendix B onwards).

### 2.2 AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH

Cameron (2000, 2001) used the MASTER framework to estimate the optimum speed on urban residential streets in Australia. He found that the optimum speed depended on the method used to value road trauma. When the 'human capital' valuations of road trauma costs (BTE 2000) were used, the analysis suggested that the optimum speed on residential streets is $55 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. When the analysis was repeated making use of road trauma costs valued by the 'willingness to pay' approach (BTCE 1997), the analysis suggested that the optimum speed on residential streets is $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Noise costs in urban areas could not be valued in the analysis, but the travel time on residential streets was (using the value per hour for private car travel, since most travel in residential areas is for non-business purposes).

Cameron (2003, 2004, 2011) also used the MASTER framework (modified) to aggregate the economic costs and benefits of changes to speed limits on rural roads in Australia. The key modification was that the effects of speed on road trauma levels were calculated using relationships linking changes in average free speed on rural roads with changes in crashes at each severity level, developed in Sweden by Nilsson (1981, 2004). Road trauma was valued by the then official Australian-government 'human capital' unit costs related to the injury severity of crash outcomes (BTE 2000). The unit cost of a fatal crash was valued at A\$1.74 million in year 2000 dollars. Subsequent official government publications have valued the unit cost of a fatal crash at A $\$ 2.67$ million in year 2006 (BITRE 2009).
Net costs and benefits were estimated over a range of mean travel speeds ( 80 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) for the following road classes:

- freeway standard rural roads
- other divided rural roads (not of freeway standard)
- two-lane undivided rural roads (with and without shoulder sealing).

Vehicle operating costs for cars, light commercial vehicles and rigid and articulated trucks were based on Austroads published models linking these costs with speed (Thoresen, Roper and Michel 2003). Emission rates of air pollutants of each type were derived from research conducted as part of the MASTER project for the European Commission (Robertson, Ward and Marsden 1998, Kallberg and Toivanen 1998). Increased fuel consumption and emission rates associated with deceleration from cruise speeds for sharp curves (and occasional stops) on undivided rural roads, and then acceleration again, were estimated from mathematical models calibrated for this purpose in the USA (Ding 2000). Air pollution cost estimates were provided by Cosgrove (1994). The analysis also provided estimates of average speeds over 100 km sections of curvy undivided roads. Otherwise it was assumed that travel time = link length / speed of traffic flow. This was considered to be a reasonable assumption on rural roads where traffic congestion, and hence constrained speeds, are a rarity. Travel time was valued by Austroads estimates of time costs reflecting the vehicle type and trip purposes (Thoresen, Roper and Michel 2003).

An update of that analysis (Cameron 2012) used recent 'willingness to pay' estimates of the values assigned to preventing person casualties (NSW Roads and Traffic Authority 2008). The value assigned to each fatal crash in the update was A $\$ 8.03$ million in 2011. Table 1 shows the difference in optimum speeds in each rural road environment when crashes at each level of injury severity (fatal, serious injury and minor injury) are valued by 'willingness to pay' unit costs compared with 'human capital’ unit costs (Cameron 2012 and 2011, respectively). The method of valuing the changes in crash frequencies at each level of cruise speed on rural roads was the principal difference between to two studies. New vehicle
operating cost models and unit costs of travel time and air pollution updated by Perovic et al (2008) for Austroads had little effect on the estimation of optimum speeds.

Table 1: Estimated optimum speeds using ‘willingness to pay’ (WTP) values of road trauma (Cameron 2012) and using 'human capital' unit costs (Cameron 2011)

|  | Current cruise <br> speeds (speed limits) |  | Optimum speeds based <br> on WTP values |  | Optimum speeds based <br> on human capital costs |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road environment |  <br> LCVs | Trucks |  <br> LCVs | Trucks |  <br> LCVs | Trucks |
| Rural freeways | 110 | 100 | 110 | 95 | 125 | 100 |
| Rural divided roads | 110 | 100 | 95 | 90 | 120 | 95 |
| Standard sealed <br> two-way undivided | 100 | 100 | 90 | 85 | 100 | 85 |
| - curvy roads with <br> crossroads and towns | 100 | 100 | 85 | 85 | 85 | $80^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| Shoulder-sealed <br> two-way undivided | 100 | 100 | 90 | 90 | 105 | 90 |
| - curvy roads with <br> crossroads and towns | 100 | 100 | 85 | 85 | 90 | 85 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ This estimate is less than $85 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ because of the earlier vehicle operating cost model used by Cameron (2011) compared with that used by Cameron (2012), resulting in lower estimated cost at low speeds

## 3. METHOD OF THIS STUDY

### 3.1 CURRENT SPEEDS ON RURAL HIGHWAYS

The current mean free speeds on straight roads in each road category in New Zealand were provided by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and are shown in Table 2. These speeds formed the basis ('before' speeds) to examine the effects on road trauma, travel time, emissions and vehicle operating costs of each change in cruise speed from current conditions. For each vehicle type and road category, cruise speeds from $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in steps of $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ were analysed.

### 3.2 EFFECT OF SPEED ON ROAD TRAUMA

### 3.2.1 Nilsson's relationships between speed and crashes of different injury severity

The effects of speed on road trauma levels were calculated using relationships linking changes in average free speed with changes in numbers of fatal, serious injury and minor injury crashes, as follows:

$$
\mathbf{n}_{A}=\left(\mathbf{v}_{A} / \mathbf{v}_{B}\right)^{p} * \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{B}}
$$

where $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{A}}=$ number of crashes after the speed change
$\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{B}}=$ number of crashes before the speed change
$\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{A}}=$ mean or median free speed after
$\mathbf{v B}_{\mathbf{B}}=$ mean or median free speed before
$\mathbf{p}=$ estimated exponent depending on the injury severity of the crashes.

Relationships of this form were originally developed by Nilsson (1981) based on research linking changes in median free speeds with changes in crash frequencies at various injury severities, as a result of many changes in rural speed limits in Sweden during 1967-1972.

Table 2: Estimated mean free speeds by vehicle type and road category (km/h)

| Road Category | Passenger <br> cars | Light <br> commercial <br> vehicles <br> (LCV) | Medium <br> commercial <br> vehicles <br> (MCV) | Heavy <br> commercial <br> vehicles I <br> (HCV I) | Heavy <br> commercial <br> vehicles II <br> (HCV II) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 99.1 | 99.1 | 90.7 | 92.5 | 91.5 |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 93.9 | 93.9 | 86.1 | 87.7 | 86.9 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 95.8 | 95.8 | 87.8 | 89.5 | 88.6 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 83.6 | 83.6 | 77.2 | 78.4 | 77.8 |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 95.7 | 95.7 | 87.7 | 89.4 | 88.5 |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 79.7 | 79.7 | 73.9 | 74.9 | 74.4 |

### 3.2.2 Meta-analysis to update Nilsson's relationships

Meta-analysis of a large number of subsequent studies of road trauma changes associated with speed limit changes has since been conducted (Elvik et al 2004; Elvik 2009; Cameron and Elvik 2010). The analysis confirmed Nilsson's relationships on rural roads and freeways, but found that the relationships were weaker or non-existent on urban roads. The final exponent estimates (p) for fatal crashes (4.1), serious injury crashes (2.6) and slight injury crashes (1.1) on rural roads and freeways (Cameron and Elvik 2010) were used here.

### 3.2.3 Current crash rates on rural highways

The casualty crash rate per 100 million vehicle-km on each category of road during 20062010, adjusted for under-reporting of the non-fatal crashes, provided the base road trauma situation associated with the current mean free speeds (Table 3).

An adjustment for under-reporting of crashes in Australia has not been considered in Austroads reports (Thoresen et al 2003, Perovic et al 2008) and the casualty crash rates per 100 million vehicle-km used by Cameron (2003, 2004, 2011, 2012) were based on reported casualty crashes and their severity distribution to produce the results in Table 1. EEM Table A6.20(a) requires that non-fatal reported crashes on motorways (both serious and minor injury crashes) be increased by $90 \%$ to estimate actual numbers, and that on other 80 or 100 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit roads the serious and minor injury crashes be increased by factors of 1.9 and 4.5, respectively. The influence of these adjustments for the under-reporting of crashes in New Zealand on any comparison of the results in this report with those from Australia will be discussed in Section 7.

Table 3: Casualty crash rates and crash injury severity profiles (2006-2010)

| Road Category | Casualty crash rate per <br> 100 M vehicle-km | Fatal | Serious <br> injury | Minor <br> injury |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 23.6 | $0.7 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $91.1 \%$ |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 47.7 | $2.0 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $86.3 \%$ |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 66.8 | $1.9 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $86.4 \%$ |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 58.9 | $1.3 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $85.5 \%$ |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 78.6 | $1.8 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $86.1 \%$ |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 89.0 | $1.7 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $85.0 \%$ |

The estimated annual casualty crash frequency involving each vehicle type was sub-divided by injury outcome (fatal, serious or minor injury crashes) based on crash injury severity data for 2001-2010 provided by NZTA (Table 4).

Table 4: Injury severity profile of casualty crashes by vehicle type involved (2001-2010)

| Road Type | Vehicle Type | Fatal (\%) | Serious <br> injury (\%) | Minor <br> injury (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Passenger car | 0.44 | 6.27 | 93.29 |
|  | Van or Utility (LCV) | 0.64 | 8.62 | 90.74 |
|  | Truck (MCV or HCV) | 1.09 | 12.31 | 86.60 |
| Other State Highways <br> (open road) | Passenger car | 2.06 | 12.05 | 85.89 |
|  | Van or Utility (LCV) | 2.20 | 13.24 | 84.55 |
|  | Truck (MCV or HCV) | 4.15 | 14.46 | 81.39 |

Injury severity in crashes on motorways was substantially less than that on other rural highways, reflecting the superior design and more-forgiving roadside environment on that class of road.

### 3.2.4 Valuation of changes in road trauma due to changes in speed

Modified Nilsson (1981) relationships, as described in Section 3.2.2, were used to estimate the annual crash frequency and injury severity, by vehicle type, for each specific speed.

The annual crash numbers were weighted by the unit crash costs, by injury severity, on New Zealand $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit roads, given in NZTA's (2010) Economic Evaluation Manual (EEM). The unit costs updated from 2006 values to 2009 were:

- Fatal crashes NZ\$ 4.332 million
- Serious injury crashes NZ\$ 461,700
- Minor injury crashes NZ\$ 27,400


### 3.3 EFFECT OF SPEED ON TRAVEL TIME

On straight rural roads without stops it can generally be assumed that travel time = link length / free speed of traffic flow (cruise speed). However, all categories of New Zealand rural highways had some stop points and a number of curves of different radii. The curve negotiation speeds provided by NZTA, based on the nominal radius of each curve category, are shown in Table 5. NZTA also provided information on the numbers of stop points and curves of each radius on each category of rural highway. The density of these stops and curves per 100 kilometre of road is shown in Table 6.

Table 5: Estimated negotiation speeds by vehicle type and curve radius category

| Maximum <br> radius | Minimum <br> radius | Nominal <br> radius | Cars and <br> LCVs <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | MCV <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | HCVI <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | HCVII <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 400 m | 200 m | 300 m | 89 | 81.9 | 83.3 | 82.6 |
| 200 m | 100 m | 150 m | 79 | 73.3 | 74.3 | 73.8 |
| 100 m | 20 m | 50 m | 49 | 47.4 | 47.3 | 47.4 |

Table 6: Stops and curves per 100 km in each road category

|  |  | Curve radius category |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Category | Stops | $200-400 \mathrm{~m}$ | $100-200 \mathrm{~m}$ | $20-100 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 2.1 | 14.0 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 1.9 | 61.2 | 8.6 | 7.0 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 0.6 | 70.2 | 36.7 | 14.6 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 0.9 | 84.1 | 56.3 | 49.0 |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 1.0 | 85.8 | 52.4 | 33.6 |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 0.4 | 107.5 | 126.3 | 117.1 |

### 3.3.1 Additional travel time due to curves and stops

The additional travel time per curve due to the reduction in vehicle speed from its cruise speed to the negotiation speed (if necessary), and back to cruise speed, has been calculated for each vehicle type in EEM Tables A5.7 (NZTA 2010).

Formulae derived from these tables were used to calculate the additional time per curve (and per stop, using a negotiation speed of zero), then summed across all curves and stops in each road category, and then added to the travel time calculated as if vehicles had cruised throughout the full road length.

The formulae were developed for NZTA by MWH New Zealand Ltd by fitting high order polynomials to the data in EEM Tables A5.7 as functions of the initial entry speeds and
negotiation speeds ranging from 0 to $120 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Separate formulae were provided for each of the five vehicle types analysed in this study. MWH New Zealand indicated that the formulae were accurate to within 0.1 seconds of the additional travel time per speed change cycle (i.e. time required for the vehicle to decelerate from the initial cruise speed to the negotiation speed and accelerate back again to the cruise speed) in the EEM tables (for example, Table A5.24 for passenger cars, shown below) and could be interpolated between the tabulated speeds.

Table A5.24: Passenger car additional travel time due to speed change cycles (seconds/speed cycle)

| Initial speed (km/h) | Additional travel time in seconds/speed cycle by final speed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | \|50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 |
| 5 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 4.1 | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 5.8 | 2.8 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 7.4 | 4.4 | 2.1 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 8.9 | 6.0 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 10.4 | 7.5 | 5.1 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | 11.8 | 9.0 | 6.5 | 4.4 | 2.6 | 13 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 13.1 | 10.4 | 8.0 | 5.8 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | 13.7 | 11.4 | 9.2 | 7.2 | 5.2 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 14.3 | 12.1 | 10.0 | 8.1 | 63 | 4.7 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | 14.9 | 12.8 | 10.8 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 5.6 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 15.4 | 13.4 | 11.5 | 9.7 | 8.1 | 6.5 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 15.9 | 14.0 | 12.2 | 10.5 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 5.9 | 4.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 16.4 | 14.6 | 12.9 | 11.2 | 9.6 | 8.2 | 6.8 | 55 | 43 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | 16.9 | 15.2 | 13.5 | 11.9 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 7.5 | 6.2 | 5.0 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | 17.4 | 15.7 | 14.1 | 12.5 | 11.1 | 9.6 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 | 17.8 | 16.2 | 14.7 | 13.2 | 11.7 | 10.3 | 9.0 | 7.7 | 6.6 | 5.4 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 25 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 | 183 | 16.7 | 15.2 | 13.8 | 12.4 | 11.0 | 9.7 | 8.5 | 73 | 6.2 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95 | 18.8 | 17.2 | 15.8 | 14.4 | 13.0 | 11.7 | 10.4 | 9.1 | 8.0 | 6.9 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 19.2 | 17.7 | 16.3 | 14.9 | 13.6 | 12.3 | 11.0 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| 105 | 19.6 | 18.2 | 16.8 | 15.5 | 14.2 | 12.9 | 11.7 | 10.5 | 9.3 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 4.3 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 110 | 20.1 | 18.7 | 17.3 | 16.0 | 14.7 | 13.5 | 12.3 | 11.1 | 10.0 | 8.9 | 7.8 | 6.8 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.1 |  |  |
| 115 | 20.5 | 19.1 | 17.8 | 16.5 | 15.3 | 14.0 | 12.9 | 11.7 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 5.6 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 13 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.1 |  |
| 120 | 20.9 | 19.6 | 18.3 | 17.0 | 15.8 | 14.6 | 13.4 | 12.3 | 11.2 | 10.1 | 9.1 | 8.1 | 7.1 | 6.2 | 5.4 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.1 |

Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

### 3.3.2 Valuation of travel time

Travel time was valued by NZTA’s (2010) estimates of time costs reflecting the vehicle type and trip purposes in EEM Tables A4.1 and A4.2, and vehicle occupancy in Table A2.4. The unit costs per hour were updated from 2002 values to 2009 using a factor of 1.22 given in EEM Table A12.3.

Table A4.1: Values for vehicle occupant
transport user time in \$/h (all road categories; all time periods - July 2002)

| Vehicle occupant | Work travel <br> purpose | Commuting to/ <br> from work | Other non-work <br> travel purposes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Base values of time for uncongested traffic $(\$ / \mathrm{h})$ |  |  |  |
| Car (motorcycle driver) | 23.85 | 7.80 | 6.90 |
| Car (motorcycle passenger) | 21.70 | 5.85 | 5.20 |
| Light commercial driver | 23.45 | 7.80 | 6.90 |
| Light commercial passenger | 21.70 | 5.85 | 5.20 |
| Medium/heavy commercial driver | 20.10 | 7.80 | 6.90 |
| Medium/heavy commercial passenger | 20.10 | 5.85 | 5.20 |

[^1]Table A4.2: Base values for vehicle and freight time in $\$ / \mathrm{h}$ (July 2002) for vehicles used for work purposes

| Vehicle type | Vehicle and freight time $(\$ / \mathrm{h})$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Passenger car | 0.50 |
| Light commercial vehicle | 1.70 |
| Medium commercial vehicle | 6.10 |
| Heavy commercial vehicle I | 17.10 |
| Heavy commercial vehicle II | 28.10 |
| Bus | 17.10 |

Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

Table A2.4: Vehicle occupancy and travel purpose

| Road category | Car |  |  |  | LCV |  |  |  | MCV and HCV |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Occupancy | Travel purpose (\%) |  |  | Occupancy | Travel purpose (\%) |  |  | Occupancy | Travel purpose (\%) |  |  |
|  |  | Work | Commute | Other |  | Work | Commute | Other |  | Work | Commute | Other |
| Rural strategic and rural other roads |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Weekday | 1.6 | 40 | 10 | 50 | 1.6 | 75 | 5 | 20 | 1.3 | 90 | 5 | 5 |
| Weekend | 2.2 | 5 | 5 | 90 | 2.0 | 10 | 10 | 80 | 1.8 | 75 | 5 | 20 |
| All periods | 1.7 | 30 | 10 | 60 | 1.7 | 55 | 5 | 40 | 1.4 | 85 | 5 | 10 |

Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

### 3.4 EFFECT OF SPEED ON VEHICLE OPERATING COSTS

### 3.4.1 VOC related to cruise speed and gradient

Vehicle operating costs (VOC) per kilometre travelled as a function of speed and road gradient were calculated from formulae given in EEM Table A5.11 (NZTA 2010) for each vehicle type during 2009. Passenger car VOCs calculated by the formula are tabulated and graphed in EEM Table A5.1 shown below, but the actual formula for each vehicle type was used in the analysis for this study. The estimates did not need to be updated to 2009.

Table A5.11: Running cost by speed and gradient regression coefficients (cents/km - July 2008)

| Regression coefficient | Vehicle class |  |  |  |  |  | Road category |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PC | LCV | MCV | HCVI | HCVII | Bus | Uban arterial | Urban other | Rural strategic | Rural other |
| a | 24.616 | 15.852 | 20.230 | -75.602 | -263.90 | $-125.50$ | 15.837 | 19.898 | 5.1705 | 12.034 |
| $b\left(\times 10^{-2}\right)$ | -44.832 | -109.65 | -70.181 | 82.435 | 2722.4 | -21.363 | 5.8087 | -21.958 | 91.522 | 35.415 |
| c | 43.489 | 64.641 | 87.808 | 263.07 | 469.66 | 272.77 | 59.846 | 52.292 | 77.703 | 66.095 |
| $\mathrm{d}\left(\times 10^{-4}\right)$ | -445.63 | -118.58 | 2731.4 | 9566.1 | 15069 | 5637.9 | 193.04 | -129.24 | 918.9 | 444.87 |
| E | -21.157 | -30.064 | -39.668 | -101.34 | -159.79 | -102.10 | -26.979 | -24.332 | -33.024 | -29.079 |
| $f\left(\times 10^{-2}\right)$ | 38.558 | 68.678 | 55.741 | -65.136 | -1446.2 | 81.726 | 10.316 | 25.549 | -36.259 | -5.8716 |
| $g\left(\times 10^{-4}\right)$ | 17.595 | 12.105 | -165.84 | -608.65 | -1306.0 | -413.78 | -4.2281 | -27.46 | -83.300 | -46.897 |
| h | 2.5663 | 3.6463 | 4.8935 | 11.615 | 17.174 | 11.711 | 3.2172 | 2.9233 | 3.8723 | 3.4431 |
| $\mathrm{i}\left(\times 10^{-3}\right)$ | -61.237 | -99.936 | -147.07 | -48.388 | 1796.9 | -318.64 | -30.26 | -46.859 | 24.414 | -11.163 |
| $j\left(\times 10^{-3}\right)$ | 12.523 | 15.750 | 58.615 | 171.01 | 488.06 | 157.89 | 26.908 | 19.615 | 45.233 | 33.217 |
| Notes: $V^{\text {VOC }}$ | $=$ base vehicle operating costs in cents $/ \mathrm{km}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GR | $=$ absolute value of average gradient ( $\mathrm{i} \mathrm{e}>0$ ) over range of $0-12$ percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S | $=$ speed in $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ over range of $10-120 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In | $=$ natural logarithm. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Sample equation for passenger cars (PC):
$V O C_{B}=24.616-44.832 \times 10^{-2} \times G R+43.489 \times \ln (S)-445.63 \times 10^{-4} \times G R^{2}-21.157 \times[\ln (S)]^{2}+38.558 \times 10^{-2} \times G R \times \ln (S)+17.595 \times 10^{-4} \times G R^{3}+2.5663 \times[\ln (S)]^{3}-$ $61.237 \times 10^{-3} \times \mathrm{GR} \times[\ln (\mathrm{S})]^{2}+12.523 \times 10^{-3} \times \mathrm{GR}^{2} \times \ln (\mathrm{S})$
Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

Table A5.1: Passenger car VOC by speed and gradient (cents/km - July 2008)

| Speed <br> (km/h) | Gradient in percent (both directions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 10 | 43.9 | 44.0 | 44.1 | 44.2 | 44.2 | 44.3 | 44.4 | 44.5 | 44.7 | 45.0 | 45.2 | 45.6 | 46.1 |
| 15 | 38.2 | 38.3 | 38.5 | 38.6 | 38.7 | 38.9 | 39.1 | 39.3 | 39.6 | 39.9 | 40.4 | 40.9 | 41.5 |
| 20 | 34.0 | 34.2 | 34.3 | 34.5 | 34.6 | 34.9 | 35.1 | 35.4 | 35.7 | 36.1 | 36.6 | 37.2 | 37.9 |
| 25 | 31.0 | 31.1 | 31.3 | 31.5 | 31.7 | 31.9 | 32.2 | 32.5 | 32.9 | 33.3 | 33.9 | 34.5 | 35.3 |
| 30 | 28.8 | 28.9 | 29.1 | 29.2 | 29.5 | 29.7 | 30.0 | 30.3 | 30.8 | 31.3 | 31.9 | 32.6 | 33.4 |
| 35 | 27.1 | 27.3 | 27.4 | 27.6 | 27.8 | 28.1 | 28.4 | 28.8 | 29.2 | 29.7 | 30.4 | 31.1 | 31.9 |
| 40 | 26.0 | 26.1 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 26.7 | 26.9 | 27.2 | 27.6 | 28.1 | 28.6 | 29.3 | 30.1 | 30.9 |
| 45 | 25.1 | 25.3 | 25.4 | 25.6 | 25.8 | 26.1 | 26.4 | 26.8 | 27.3 | 27.9 | 28.5 | 29.3 | 30.2 |
| 50 | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 25.1 | 25.3 | 25.5 | 25.9 | 26.3 | 26.8 | 27.4 | 28.0 | 28.8 | 29.8 |
| 55 | 24.3 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 25.2 | 25.5 | 26.0 | 26.5 | 27.0 | 27.7 | 28.6 | 29.5 |
| 60 | 24.1 | 24.3 | 24.4 | 24.6 | 24.8 | 25.1 | 25.4 | 25.8 | 26.3 | 26.9 | 27.6 | 28.4 | 29.4 |
| 65 | 24.2 | 24.3 | 24.4 | 24.6 | 24.8 | 25.0 | 25.4 | 25.8 | 26.3 | 26.9 | 27.6 | 28.5 | 29.4 |
| 70 | 24.3 | 24.4 | 24.5 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 25.2 | 25.5 | 25.9 | 26.4 | 27.0 | 27.8 | 28.6 | 29.6 |
| 75 | 24.5 | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 25.1 | 25.4 | 25.7 | 26.1 | 26.6 | 27.3 | 28.0 | 28.9 | 29.8 |
| 80 | 24.9 | 24.9 | 25.1 | 25.2 | 25.4 | 25.7 | 26.0 | 26.4 | 26.9 | 27.6 | 28.3 | 29.2 | 30.2 |
| 85 | 253 | 25.3 | 25.4 | 25.6 | 25.8 | 26.0 | 26.4 | 26.8 | 27.3 | 28.0 | 28.7 | 29.6 | 30.6 |
| 90 | 25.7 | 25.8 | 25.9 | 26.0 | 26.2 | 26.5 | 26.8 | 27.2 | 27.8 | 28.4 | 29.1 | 30.0 | 31.0 |
| 95 | 26.3 | 26.3 | 26.4 | 26.5 | 26.7 | 27.0 | 27.3 | 27.7 | 28.3 | 28.9 | 29.6 | 30.5 | 31.6 |
| 100 | 26.8 | 26.9 | 27.0 | 27.1 | 27.3 | 27.5 | 27.9 | 28.3 | 28.8 | 29.4 | 30.2 | 31.1 | 32.1 |
| 105 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 27.6 | 27.7 | 27.9 | 28.1 | 28.4 | 28.9 | 29.4 | 30.0 | 30.8 | 31.7 | 32.7 |
| 110 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 28.2 | 28.3 | 28.5 | 28.7 | 29.1 | 29.5 | 30.0 | 30.6 | 31.4 | 32.3 | 33.3 |
| 115 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 28.9 | 29.0 | 29.1 | 29.4 | 29.7 | 30.1 | 30.7 | 31.3 | 32.1 | 33.0 | 34.0 |
| 120 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.6 | 29.7 | 29.8 | 30.1 | 30.4 | 30.8 | 31.3 | 32.0 | 32.7 | 33.6 | 34.7 |



Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

Figure 1 shows the calculated VOC for each vehicle type as a function of speed in the range from 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, assuming a gradient of zero.

Figure 1: Vehicle operating costs per kilometre related to vehicle speed and type


In the analysis, the VOC for each vehicle type related to speed was calculated for each of three representative categories of gradient ranges found on New Zealand rural roads (Table 8). In each road category, the proportions of vehicle-kilometres travelled in mountainous (grade $7-11 \%$ ), rolling ( $4-6 \%$ ) and 'flat' terrain (1-3\%) were used to weight the calculated costs to provide an average VOC per kilometre for the road category.

Table 8: Percentage of vehicle-km spent in each terrain by heavy and light vehicles

|  | Flat terrain |  | Rolling terrain |  | Mountainous |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Category | Heavy <br> vehicles | Light <br> vehicles | Heavy <br> vehicles | Light <br> vehicles | Heavy <br> vehicles | Light <br> vehicles |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | $51.73 \%$ | $50.18 \%$ | $45.49 \%$ | $46.78 \%$ | $2.78 \%$ | $3.04 \%$ |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | $40.97 \%$ | $39.78 \%$ | $51.25 \%$ | $52.75 \%$ | $7.78 \%$ | $7.47 \%$ |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | $43.52 \%$ | $43.68 \%$ | $50.95 \%$ | $51.03 \%$ | $5.53 \%$ | $5.30 \%$ |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | $3.80 \%$ | $3.69 \%$ | $74.35 \%$ | $73.21 \%$ | $21.85 \%$ | $23.10 \%$ |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | $39.84 \%$ | $41.33 \%$ | $53.62 \%$ | $51.51 \%$ | $6.54 \%$ | $7.15 \%$ |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | $3.61 \%$ | $2.95 \%$ | $70.55 \%$ | $68.85 \%$ | $25.80 \%$ | $28.19 \%$ |

### 3.4.2 Increase in VOC due to curves and stops

The additional VOC per curve and per stop due to reductions from cruise speed were calculated in an analogous way to additional travel time, using formulae based on VOC
estimates in EEM Tables A5.7 (NZTA 2010). The formulae for the additional VOC per speed change cycle (deceleration and acceleration back to cruise speed) were also provided by MHW New Zealand Ltd on behalf of NZTA. MWH New Zealand indicated that the formulae were accurate to within 0.1 cents of the additional VOC per speed change cycle.

These additional costs were summed across all curves and stops in each road category, then added to the total VOC calculated as if vehicles had cruised throughout the full road length.

| Initial speed (km/h) | Additional VOC (in cents/speed cycle) by final speed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 |
| 5 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 55 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 80 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 12 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 02 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 85 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 23 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 23 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| 105 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |
| 110 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.1 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 12 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |
| 115 | 5.7 | 5.6 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 35 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |
| 120 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 17 | 1.4 | 12 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |

Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

### 3.5 EFFECT OF SPEED ON VEHICLE EMISSIONS

### 3.5.1 Carbon dioxide emissions and their unit cost

Carbon dioxide emissions are directly related to VOC in EEM Appendix A9.7 (NZTA 2010). VOC related to speed for each vehicle type was used to calculate annual carbon dioxide emissions (tonnes per year) and these were costed at NZ\$40 per tonne.

### 3.5.2 Unit costs of other air pollution emissions in rural areas

Other air pollutants were considered to be predominantly an urban issue and their unit cost per tonne emitted in rural areas was discounted to $1 \%$ of the urban unit cost (Perovic et al 2008). The unit costs of air pollution emissions provided by Perovic et al (2008) in year 2007 A\$ were:

- Carbon monoxide

A\$ 3 per tonne

- Hydrocarbons
- Oxides of nitrogen
- Particulates (PM10)

A\$ 958 per tonne
A\$ 1,912 per tonne
A\$ 304,298 per tonne

### 3.5.3 Emissions of carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and particulates

Emission rates of carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and particulates related to speed were calculated from formulae given in EEM Appendix A9.3 separately for light and heavy vehicle types (NZTA 2010).

Emission $(\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{vkt})=\mathrm{A} \times$ Speed $^{2}+B \times$ Speed $+C$
Where: Speed = average speed on link road from step 3
A, B, C = coefficients from table below

| Emission | Vehicle | A | B | C |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CO | Light | $3.6 \times 10^{-3}$ | -0.545 | 25.5 |
|  | Heavy | $6.47 \times 10^{-4}$ | -0.11 | 7.31 |
| $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | Light | $2.46 \times 10^{-4}$ | -0.0287 | 1.67 |
|  | Heavy | $2.04 \times 10^{-3}$ | -0.275 | 17.4 |
| $\mathrm{PO}_{10}$ | Light | $2.45 \times 10^{-5}$ | -0.00342 | 0.153 |
|  | Heavy | $3.82 \times 10^{-4}$ | -0.0455 | 2.65 |

Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)
Figure 1a: Emission rates of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides ( $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ ) and particulates $\left(\mathrm{PO}_{10}\right)$ related to speed of light vehicles (LV) and heavy vehicles (HV)


### 3.5.4 Hydrocarbon emissions

Emission rates of hydrocarbons were derived from research conducted as part of the MASTER project (Robertson, Ward and Marsden 1998). They provided estimates of the levels of emissions from a typical stream of vehicles travelling at steady speeds at 80 and 90
$\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ on flat roads. The traffic mix consisted of $15 \%$ trucks, of which $2 / 3$ were heavy trucks, and $80 \%$ of the cars were fitted with catalytic converters. This traffic composition was considered to be reasonably representative of rural traffic in New Zealand.

Robertson et al's estimates have been extrapolated to estimate the air pollution emission impacts (in grams per km) for hydrocarbons. Information presented by Ward et al (1998) suggested that it was reasonable to extrapolate its emission rate as a linear function of speed in the range from 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

### 3.5.5 Increase in emissions due to curves and stops

Traffic slowing for sharp bends would need to decelerate then accelerate to normal cruising speeds, resulting in increased emissions of air pollutants. The impact of variations in traffic speed on fuel consumption and emissions, due to acceleration and deceleration, has been modelled by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in the USA (Ding 2000). Ding (2000) developed statistically-based mathematical models linking the rate of fuel consumption and pollutant emitted ( $\mathrm{HC}, \mathrm{CO}$ and $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ ) per kilometre to the average speed, the average speed squared, the variance of speeds, the number of stops, and parameters reflecting the variation in acceleration rates and kinetic energy. The models had an accuracy of $88 \%-96 \%$ when compared with instantaneous microscopic models (Ahn et al 1999). These models were used to estimate the increases in emission rates for vehicles travelling at a given cruise speed encountering 50 sharp bends and stopping three times, to illustrate the influence of curves and stops, compared with the straight, featureless road section (Table 9). Further details of the models are given by Cameron (2003).

Table 9: Relative rates of air pollutant emissions due to slowing from given cruise speeds for 50 sharp curves (down to $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ negotiation speed) and $\mathbf{3}$ stops per 100 kilometres

|  |  | Relative rates on curvy road with stops, <br> compared to straight road without stops |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cruise <br> speed <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | Average speed over <br> 100 km section <br> $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | $\mathrm{PO}_{10}$ | HC | CO | $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ |
| 70 | 69.78 | 1.029 | 1.068 | 1.078 | 1.082 |
| 75 | 74.60 | 1.056 | 1.114 | 1.131 | 1.139 |
| 80 | 79.43 | 1.083 | 1.159 | 1.185 | 1.195 |
| 85 | 84.04 | 1.104 | 1.191 | 1.224 | 1.237 |
| 90 | 88.49 | 1.166 | 1.294 | 1.351 | 1.374 |
| 95 | 92.76 | 1.244 | 1.422 | 1.516 | 1.553 |
| 100 | 96.82 | 1.350 | 1.599 | 1.750 | 1.810 |

This method was used to estimate the increased emission rates associated with deceleration from cruise speeds for stops and sharp curves (those less than 200 m radius) in each rural road category, and then acceleration again, for cruise speeds between 70 and $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. The density of stops and sharp curves per 100 kilometre of each category of road in New Zealand
can be seen in Table 6. The categories described as winding roads have 115 (Category 4) and 243 (Category 6) sharp curves per 100 kilometres. The density of sharp curves on New Zealand winding roads is substantially higher than that used for the analysis of curvy roads in Australia by Cameron (2003, 2004, 2011, 2012).

For cruise speeds in excess of $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, Ding's (2000) method estimated relative rates of emissions due to stops and curves that were substantially higher than the relative rates for VOC (and hence carbon dioxide emissions) calculated for each road category as described in Section 3.4.2 based on procedures from EEM (NZTA 2010). For this reason it was decided to cap the relative rates for emissions other than carbon dioxide at the rates calculated for slowing from $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ cruise speed in each road category. This may result in underestimation of the emission rates due to slowing for stops and curves from high cruise speeds. However the higher emission rates for pollutants other than carbon dioxide would have been valued at only $1 \%$ of their urban unit cost and hence the error is small.

To recap, carbon dioxide emissions were linked to VOC at each cruise speed and their increase related to curves and stops was estimated indirectly through the increase in VOC in these road environments (Sections 3.4.2 and 3.5.1). The costs associated with carbon dioxide emissions were at least $93 \%$ of the estimated total cost of air pollution emissions, in part because of the discounting of the unit cost of the other pollutants in rural areas.

Noise pollution related to speed could not be estimated nor valued. This social cost was considered to be small along rural highways in New Zealand.

### 3.6 RURAL ROAD USE

The analysis of the effects of different cruise speeds, compared with current mean free speeds in each road category, made use of actual traffic volumes in each category. This allowed the total annual costs of road trauma, travel time, vehicle operations, and air pollution emissions to be estimated, compared across road categories, and summed to estimate the total economic impact of different speeds by each vehicle type to be seen.

Estimated annual average daily traffic volumes of each vehicle type in each rural road category during 2006-2010 were provided by NZTA (Table 10).

Table 10: Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on rural roads during 2006-2010

| Road Category | Passenger | Light <br> cars | Medium <br> vehiclcles <br> (LCV) | Heavy <br> commercial <br> vehicle <br> (MCV) | Heavy <br> commercial <br> vehicle I <br> (HCV I) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| commercial <br> vehicle II <br> (HCV II) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 22,156 | 2,841 | 538 | 538 | 538 |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 10,169 | 1,304 | 448 | 448 | 448 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 3,691 | 473 | 200 | 200 | 200 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 3,446 | 442 | 197 | 197 | 197 |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 1,459 | 162 | 83 | 83 | 62 |


| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 1,480 | 164 | 82 | 82 | 62 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

### 3.6 ESTIMATION OF OPTIMUM SPEEDS

The total costs of road trauma, travel time, vehicle operations and air pollution emissions were calculated for each cruise speed in the range 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for each vehicle type and then aggregated into light vehicles (cars and LCVs) and heavy vehicles (MCVs and HCVs I and II). Within each road category, the cruise speed that minimises the total cost for light vehicles was found and a similar optimum cruise speed was found for heavy vehicles (no less than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ). The total cost if each vehicle type travelled at its optimum speed in each road category was then aggregated across all rural State Highways and compared with the total cost where vehicles travel at their current cruise speeds, given in Table 2.

### 3.7 ASSUMPTIONS FOR THE ANALYSIS

1. Crashes involving material damage only, and no personal injury, were not included in the analysis of crash changes with speed, and the change in these crashes with changes in mean speeds (albeit to a lesser extent than fatal and injury crashes) was not valued.
2. The travel time savings (costs) associated with increased (decreased) speeds on the rural highways are of sufficient magnitude to be aggregated and valued.
3. The economic valuations of travel time, road trauma, and air pollution emissions provided an appropriate basis for an analysis which summates their values, together with vehicle operating costs, in a way which represents the total social costs of each speed. In other words, the valuations are an appropriate basis for aggregating these tangible and intangible values of each impact to provide the total cost to society.

## 5. OPTIMUM SPEEDS IN EACH ROAD CATEGORY

### 5.1 RURAL MOTORWAYS/EXPRESSWAYS (CATEGORY 1)

The results of the analysis for rural motorways/expressways in New Zealand are given in Appendix B and are summarised in Table 11 for each cruise speed. The cruise speed in the range from 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ that minimises the total economic cost of speed (to the nearest 5 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ step) is shown in bold separately for heavy vehicles and for cars and light commercial vehicles (LCVs). Table 11 also shows the aggregated total economic cost of each cruise speed if performed by both the heavy and light vehicles. The single cruise speed that minimises the total economic cost across all types of vehicle is $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Table 11: Economic impact of different cruise speeds on motorways/expressways

| $\$$ '000/year | $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $75 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $85 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $90 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $95 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle op. costs | $1,337,579$ | $1,355,497$ | $1,377,788$ | $1,403,891$ | $1,434,710$ | $1,468,903$ | $1,506,467$ |
| Time costs | $1,584,812$ | $1,479,834$ | $1,388,020$ | $1,307,146$ | $1,235,597$ | $1,172,518$ | $1,116,894$ |
| Crash costs | 36,001 | 41,745 | 48,199 | 55,434 | 63,525 | 72,549 | 82,589 |
| Air pollution costs | 61,179 | 62,098 | 63,239 | 64,587 | 66,221 | 68,055 | 70,097 |


| Total | $3,019,570$ | $2,939,175$ | $2,877,246$ | $2,831,058$ | $2,800,053$ | $2,782,025$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 7 6 , 0 4 7}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

of which:

| Heavy vehicles | 603,001 | 599,062 | 597,573 | 598,214 | 602,277 | 608,105 | 615,398 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cars \& LCVs | $2,416,569$ | $2,340,113$ | $2,279,673$ | $2,232,844$ | $2,197,776$ | $2,173,920$ | $2,160,649$ |

Table 11 (cont.): Economic impact of different cruise speeds on motorways/expressways

| \$'000/year | $105 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $110 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $115 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $120 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $125 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ | $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle op. costs | $1,546,192$ | $1,587,810$ | $1,631,088$ | $1,675,822$ | $1,721,837$ | $1,768,978$ |
| Time costs | $1,066,918$ | $1,021,814$ | 980,937 | 943,748 | 909,791 | 878,678 |
| Crash costs | 93,733 | 106,070 | 119,696 | 134,710 | 151,216 | 169,320 |
| Air pollution costs | 72,190 | 74,407 | 76,739 | 79,177 | 81,715 | 84,346 |
| Total | $2,779,034$ | $2,790,102$ | $2,808,460$ | $2,833,458$ | $2,864,559$ | $2,901,322$ |

of which:

| Heavy vehicles | 623,946 | 633,692 | 644,548 | 656,441 | 669,313 | 683,118 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cars \& LCVs | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 5 , 0 8 8}$ | $2,156,410$ | $2,163,912$ | $2,177,017$ | $2,195,246$ | $2,218,204$ |

The speed that minimises the economic cost on motorways/expressways is substantially different for cars and LCVs ( $105 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) compared with the optimum speed for trucks (80 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ ). The optimum speed for cars and LCVs is shown with an arrow in Figure 2 and similarly for trucks in Figure 3.

Figure 2: Impacts of car and LCV speeds on rural motorways/expressways (\$'000 per year)


Figure 3: Impacts of truck speeds on rural motorwayslexpressways (\$'000 per year)


If the light vehicles increased their cruise speed to $105 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ and trucks reduced their speed on rural motorways to $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, there would be about one additional fatal crash per year, eight additional serious injury crashes and 50 additional minor injury crashes. The total economic impact would be a saving of $\$ 13.9$ million per year ( $0.5 \%$ ) because total travel time costs would be reduced by $2.9 \%$ although crash costs would be increased by $11.1 \%$ and vehicle operating costs increased by $0.8 \%$ (Table 12).

The situation on rural motorways contrasts with all other rural road categories analysed in this study. In each of the other categories of State Highway, the optimum speed for both light vehicles and trucks was found to be less than the current cruise speed for each vehicle type (see Sections 5.2-5.4). Hence there would be savings in road trauma as well as reductions in total economic costs in each road category (except motorways) if vehicles changed their speeds to the optimum speeds.

Table 12: Economic impact if all vehicles changed to travelling at their optimum speed on rural motorwayslexpressways (Category 1 roads)

| \$'000/year | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle operating costs | $1,483,293$ | $1,494,464$ | 11170 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Time costs | $1,136,251$ | $1,102,732$ | -33519 | $-2.9 \%$ |
| Crash costs | 78,685 | 87,429 | 8,744 | $11.1 \%$ |
| Air pollution costs | 68,336 | 68,036 | -301 | $-0.4 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 7 6 6 , 5 6 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 5 2 , 6 6 1}$ |  |  |
| Change |  | $\mathbf{- 1 3 , 9 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 5} \%$ |  |

### 5.2 HIGH VOLUME NATIONAL STRATEGIC ROADS (CATEGORY 2)

The results of the analysis for high volume rural National Strategic roads are given in Appendix C. The speeds that minimise the economic cost on these roads are $85 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for cars and LCVs (Figure 4) and $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for trucks (Figure 5).

If these two vehicle types reduced their current cruise speeds on high volume National Strategic roads to their optimum speeds, it is estimated that the total economic impact would be a saving of $\$ 25.3$ million per year (1.8\%) (Table 13).

When comparing Figures 4 and 5 with Figures 2 and 3 for motorways/expressways, it can be seen that the crash costs contribute a substantially greater proportion of the total social costs of each speed. This is because the casualty crash rate per 100 million vehiclekilometres on the high volume National Strategic roads is more than twice the rate on motorways/expressways (Table 3) and the crashes have more severe injury outcomes.

Figure 4: Impacts of car and LCV speeds on High Volume National Strategic roads (\$'000 p.a.)


Figure 5: Impacts of truck speeds on High Volume National Strategic roads (\$'000 p.a.)


Table 13: Economic impact if all vehicles changed to travelling at their optimum speed on high volume rural National Strategic roads (Category 2 roads)

| \$'000/year | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle operating costs | 730,208 | 688,927 | -41281 | $-5.7 \%$ |
| Time costs | 521,547 | 585,799 | 64252 | $12.3 \%$ |
| Crash costs | 149,140 | 103,389 | $-45,752$ | $-30.7 \%$ |
| Air pollution costs | 37,015 | 34,540 | $-2,475$ | $-6.7 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 4 3 7 , 9 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 1 2 , 6 5 5}$ |  |  |
| Change |  | $\mathbf{- 2 5 , 2 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 8} \%$ |  |

### 5.3 NATIONAL \& REGIONAL STRATEGIC ROADS (CATEGORIES 3 \& 4)

Other National Strategic roads and the Regional Strategic roads carry lower traffic volumes than the Category 2 roads. Separate analysis was conducted for the relatively straight National and Regional Strategic roads (Category 3) and those that have more winding alignments (Category 4). The density of curves in each radius category for each of these two sub-classes of rural road are given in Table 6 . The two sub-classes also differ substantially in terms of the proportion of vehicle travel conducted in rolling and mountainous terrain (Table 8). The detailed results of the analysis for the Category 3 and 4 roads are given in Appendices D and E, respectively.

Figures 6 and 7 show that the speed of cars and LCVs that minimises the economic cost on these roads is $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on both the straight and winding National and Regional Strategic roads. For trucks, a speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ minimises the economic cost on both the straight and winding roads of this type (Figures 8 and 9), within the range of speeds down to $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ considered in this analysis. (Speeds below $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in this road environment will be examined in the sensitivity analysis in Section 7.)

Figure 6: Impacts of car \& LCV speeds on straight National \& Regional Strategic roads (\$'000 pa)


Figure 7: Impacts of car \& LCV speeds on winding National \& Regional Strategic roads (\$'000 pa)


Figure 8: Impacts of truck speeds on straight National \& Regional Strategic roads (\$'000 p.a,)


Figure 9: Impacts of truck speeds on winding National \& Regional Strategic roads (\$'000 p.a.)


### 5.4 REGIONAL CONNECTOR \& DISTRIBUTOR ROADS (CATEGORIES 5 \& 6)

For the Regional Connector and Distributor roads, separate analysis was also conducted for the relatively straight (Category 5) and winding roads (Category 6). The density of curves on each of these two sub-classes of rural road is given in Table 6. While the curve density on Category 5 roads is less than on Category 6, it is not much less than the curve density on Category 4 roads labelled "winding" National and Regional Strategic roads.

However, the Category 5 and 6 roads do differ substantially in terms of the proportion of vehicle travel conducted in rolling and mountainous terrain (Table 8). Category 5 roads also have substantially lower proportions of travel in rolling and mountainous terrain than Category 4 roads.

The detailed results of the analysis for the Category 5 and 6 roads are given in Appendices F and G, respectively. Figures 10 and 11 show that the speeds of cars and LCVs that minimises the economic cost on the straight roads is $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, but only $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ on winding Regional Connector and Distributor roads. For trucks, a speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ minimises the economic cost on both the straight and winding roads of this type (Figures 12 and 13), within the range of speeds down to $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ considered in this analysis.

Figure 10: Impacts of car \& LCV speeds on straight Regional Connector \& Distributor roads


Figure 11: Impacts of car \& LCV speeds on winding Regional Connector \& Distributor roads (\$'000 p.a.)


Figure 12: Impacts of truck speeds on straight Regional Connector \& Distributor roads (\$'000 pa)


Figure 13: Impacts of truck speeds on winding Regional Connector \& Distributor roads (\$’000 p.a.)


## 6. IMPACT IF ALL VEHICLES TRAVELLED AT THEIR OPTIMUM SPEED

If cruise speeds in each category of rural highway were to be moved closer to the optimum speeds, there could be a substantial net gain in total economic costs across the road network. This is because a large proportion of rural road travel (and an even larger proportion of rural crashes) is on undivided roads where the optimum speeds are below current cruise speeds.

Table 14 summarises the estimate (to the nearest $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) of the optimum speed in each road category for the light vehicles and trucks separately. The optimum speeds are compared with the current cruise speeds (from Table 2).

Table 14: Current cruise speeds by vehicle type and estimated optimum speeds (not less than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ).

|  | Current cruise speeds on straight sections of |  |  |  | Optimum cruise <br> rural highways (km/h) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rpeeds (km/h) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Compared with the existing situation, assuming all vehicles travel at current cruise speeds, the change to travelling at the optimum speed in each road environment would result in an
overall $11 \%$ increase in travel time, $17 \%$ reduction in casualty crashes, and $7 \%$ to $18 \%$ reduction in air pollution emissions of various types (Table 15).

Table 15: Physical impact if all vehicles changed to travelling at their optimum speed, compared to travelling at their current speeds.

| Type of impact | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total travel time on link, hours/day | 466,877 | 515,889 | 49,012 | $10.5 \%$ |
| Number of Casualty Crashes per year | 8,728 | 7,240 | $-1,489$ | $-17.1 \%$ |
| Emissions, t/year | Carbon monoxide CO | 115,307 | 98,560 | $-16,747$ |
|  | $-14.5 \%$ |  |  |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 7,129 | 6,168 | -961 | $-13.5 \%$ |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 37,095 | 31,169 | $-5,926$ | $-16.0 \%$ |
| Particles PM | 3,542 | 2,908 | -633 | $-17.9 \%$ |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |  | $8,027,707$ | $7,462,776$ | $-564,931$ |
|  | $-7.0 \%$ |  |  |  |

The reduction in casualty crashes is estimated to represent an annual saving of 90 fatal crashes (approximately $60 \%$ of the fatal crashes on rural State Highways), 334 serious injury crashes, and 1,065 minor injury crashes (Table 16). When these savings in road trauma are valued using the unit costs in Section 3.2.4, there would be $39 \%$ reduction in crash costs on rural highways (Table 17). The overall economic impact if all vehicles travelled at their optimum speeds was estimated to be a saving of $\$ 482$ million per annum in total social costs or $3.7 \%$ reduction in the estimated $\$ 13.1$ billion annual cost of rural State Highway travel in New Zealand.

Table 16: Estimated crash reductions on rural State Highways per year (negative figures are estimated crash increases).

|  | Estimated crash savings due to <br> changes to optimum speeds |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road category | Fatal <br> crashes <br> p.a. | Serious <br> injury <br> crashes <br> p.a. | Other <br> injury <br> crashes <br> p.a. | Annual <br> casualty <br> crashes <br> (estimate) | Casualty <br> crash <br> saving <br> (\% p.a.) |
| 1. Motorways/Expressways (divided <br> four-lane) roads | -0.9 | -7.7 | -50.1 | 999.0 | $-5.9 \%$ |
| 2. High Volume National Strategic <br> roads | 7.3 | 26.0 | 80.9 | 827.7 | $13.8 \%$ |
| 3. Straight National \& Regional <br> Strategic roads | 41.8 | 158.1 | 519.0 | 3280.6 | $21.9 \%$ |
| 4. Winding National \& Regional <br> Strategic roads | 2.8 | 10.1 | 31.5 | 329.6 | $13.5 \%$ |
|  <br> Distributor roads | 33.0 | 125.1 | 411.1 | 2583.0 | $22.0 \%$ |
|  <br> Distributor roads | 5.9 | 22.5 | 72.4 | 671.5 | $15.0 \%$ |
| TOTAL CRASH SAVINGS p.a. | $\mathbf{8 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 4 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 6 4 . 8}$ | 8691.4 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 1 \%}$ |
| Annual crashes by severity (est.) | 148.4 | 1006.6 | 7536.4 |  |  |


| PERCENT CRASH SAVINGS | $60.5 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 17: Economic impact if all vehicles changed to travelling at their optimum speed.

| \$'000/year | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vehicle operating costs | $6,617,280$ | $6,202,356$ | $-414,924$ | $-6.3 \%$ |
| Time costs | $4,661,854$ | $5,192,801$ | 530,947 | $11.4 \%$ |
| Crash costs | $1,484,548$ | 911,946 | $-572,602$ | $-38.6 \%$ |
| Air pollution costs | 335,556 | 310,396 | $-25,160$ | $-7.5 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 3 , 0 9 9 , 2 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 , 6 1 7 , 4 9 9}$ |  |  |
| Change |  | $\mathbf{- 4 8 1 , 7 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 . 7} \%$ |  |

## 7. SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

The analysis described in this report included many assumptions, constraints and cost valuations. Three of these were examined in this section to test the sensitivity of the estimates of optimum speed to the following variations on the economic analysis:

1. Cruise speeds below $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for each vehicle type (where warranted)
2. Increased valuation of travel time costs
3. Ignoring under-reporting of non-fatal reported crashes.

The results of the sensitivity analysis are shown in Table 17 and are discussed in the following sections.

Table 17: Estimated optimum speeds resulting from variations in the economic analysis

|  | Optimum cruise <br> speeds without 70 <br> km/h lower limit |  | Optimum cruise <br> speeds with travel <br> time costs per hour <br> doubled |  | Optimum cruise <br> speeds based on <br> reported crashes <br> (ignoring under- <br> reporting) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Category | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br> (MCVs <br> \& HCVs) | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br> (MCVs <br> \& HCVs) | Light <br> vehicles <br>  <br> LCVs) | Heavy <br> vehicles <br> (MCVs <br> \& HCVs) |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 105 | 80 | 130 | 95 | 110 | 80 |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 85 | 70 | 95 | 85 | 90 | 75 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 80 | 70 | 95 | 80 | 85 | 70 |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 75 | 65 | 85 | 75 | 80 | 65 |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 80 | 70 | 90 | 75 | 80 | 70 |


| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 65 | 55 | 75 | 65 | 70 | 55 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

### 7.1 CRUISE SPEEDS BELOW 70 KM/H

The economic analysis of cruise speeds for each vehicle type examined only speeds in the range from 70 to $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in steps of $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. The optimum speeds recorded in Figures 2 to 13 and Table 14 were those for which the total economic cost was minimised in that speed range. Selected analysis was conducted to examine whether there was a lower total cost at speeds below $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for those vehicle types (principally heavy vehicles) and road categories for which the optimum speed was recorded as $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in Table 14.

The analysis was modified to cover speeds from 50 to $110 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. For the speeds below 70 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$, adjustment factors to reflect the additional air pollution emissions (except carbon dioxide) due to slowing for stops and accelerating again were not available from previous analysis based on Ding's (2000) models. As described in Section 3.5.5, Ding's models had been used to estimate factors for slowing for stops and for sharp curves with negotiation speeds of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$; such curves were not relevant for cruise speeds of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or less. Table 9 illustrates that the adjustment factor for stops alone associated with cruise speeds of 70 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ or less is between 1 and 1.1. For the sensitivity analysis, no adjustment was made to the air pollution emissions associated with slowing from cruise speeds in the range 50 to 65 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$. The exception to this was in the case of carbon dioxide emissions, which were estimated as a function of VOC and which in turn was adjusted for the number of stops and slowings for curves of different radii, from cruise speeds in the range 50 to $65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, as described in Section 3.4.2.

Only in the case of heavy vehicles on Category 4 roads (Figure 14) and on Category 6 roads for both light (Figure 15) and heavy vehicles (Figure 16) did the extended analysis reveal that the total economic cost was below $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for those cases recorded as $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in Table 14. In the remaining cases, the sensitivity analysis confirmed that $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ was the optimum speed.

In practice, the lower optimum speeds revealed in the extended analysis made very little difference to the total economic cost compared with $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. However, as can be seen in Figures 14 to 16, the crash costs associated with these lower optimum speeds are clearly smaller than the crash costs at a cruise speed of $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. If speed limits lower than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ could be considered on these winding rural roads in New Zealand, then this may result in further crash reductions than those estimated in Table 16 for Category 4 and 6 roads.

Figure 14: Impacts of truck speeds on winding National \& Regional Strategic roads (\$'000 p.a.)


Figure 15: Impacts of car \& LCV speeds on winding Regional Connector \& Distributor roads (\$'000 p.a.)


Figure 16: Impacts of truck speeds on winding Regional Connector \& Distributor roads (\$'000 p.a.)


### 7.2 INCREASED VALUATION OF TRAVEL TIME COSTS

It has been suggested that NZTA’s (2010) Economic Evaluation Manual undervalues the unit costs of travel time. To test the sensitivity to the unit values per hour given in Tables A4.1 and A4.2 of EEM, these values were doubled and the optimum speeds re-estimated in the same way as described in Sections 5.1 to 5.4.

The re-estimated optimum speeds shown in Table 17 are generally 10 to $15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ higher than those estimated using the unit travel time values in EEM, with the optimum for cars and LCVs on motorways/expressways being estimated as $130 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ compared with $105 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. Thus it can be seen the optimum speeds are sensitive to the values placed on travel time in a similar way as their sensitivity to valuation of road crash costs (Cameron 2012).

### 7.3 IGNORING UNDER-REPORTING OF NON-FATAL REPORTED CRASHES

EEM Table A6.20(a) requires that non-fatal reported crashes on motorways (both serious and minor injury crashes) be increased by $90 \%$ to estimate actual numbers, and that on other 80 or $100 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ speed limit roads the serious and minor injury crashes be increased by factors of 1.9 and 4.5 , respectively. It is beyond the scope of this study to examine whether this extent of inflation of non-fatal reported crashes in New Zealand is justified. It is possible that while there is under-reporting, the less severe injury crashes in each non-fatal injury severity category are under-reported to a greater degree than the more severe crashes. However, after the adjustment for under-reporting, the estimated crashes in each injury severity category are treated equally and multiplied by the unit crash costs in Section 3.2.4 to estimate the total social cost of crashes for the economic analysis reported here.

An adjustment for under-reporting of crashes in Australia has not been considered in Austroads reports (Thoresen et al 2003, Perovic et al 2008) and the casualty crash rates per 100 million vehicle-km used by Cameron (2003, 2004, 2011, 2012) were based on reported casualty crashes and their injury severity distribution. To facilitate a comparison and to examine the sensitivity of the economic analysis to the under-reporting adjustment, the analysis described in Sections 5.1 to 5.4 was repeated using crash rates and injury severity distributions of reported casualty crashes in New Zealand (Tables 18 and 19).

Table 18: Casualty crash rates and crash injury severity profiles based on reported crashes (2006-2010)

| Road Category | Reported casualty <br> crash rate per 100 M <br> vehicle-km | Fatal | Serious <br> injury | Minor <br> injury |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Motorways/ <br> Expressways (divided) | 12.5 | $1.4 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $90.5 \%$ |
| 2. High Volume National <br> Strategic roads | 13.0 | $7.2 \%$ | $22.6 \%$ | $70.3 \%$ |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 18.2 | $7.0 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ | $70.5 \%$ |
|  <br> Regional Strategic roads | 16.0 | $4.7 \%$ | $25.6 \%$ | $69.7 \%$ |
| 5. Straight Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 21.5 | $6.6 \%$ | $23.3 \%$ | $70.1 \%$ |
| 6. Winding Regional <br> Connectors \& Distributors | 24.6 | $6.3 \%$ | $25.4 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ |

The re-estimated optimum speeds based on reported crashes were about $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ higher for cars and LCVs and generally no higher for trucks compared with those estimated using the adjusted crashes. While it is not possible to make a direct comparison for each road environment, the re-estimated optimum speeds for cars and LCVs are generally 5 to $10 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ lower than the estimated optimum speeds for the same vehicle types in Australia, based on reported crashes and "willingness to pay" (WTP) values of crashes (Table 1). The reestimated optimum speeds for trucks are generally at least $15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ less than their estimated optimum speeds in Australia based on reported crashes and WTP values.

Table 19: Injury severity profile of reported casualty crashes by vehicle type involved (20012010)

| Road Type | Vehicle Type | Fatal (\%) | Serious <br> injury (\%) | Minor <br> injury (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Motorways | Passenger car | 0.83 | 6.24 | 92.93 |
|  | Van or Utility (LCV) | 1.21 | 8.57 | 90.22 |
|  | Truck (MCV or HCV) | 2.05 | 12.19 | 85.75 |
| Other State Highways <br> (open road) | Passenger car | 7.51 | 23.07 | 69.42 |
|  | Van or Utility (LCV) | 7.88 | 24.92 | 67.19 |
|  | Truck (MCV or HCV) | 13.89 | 25.50 | 60.61 |

Thus it can be seen that the estimation of optimum speeds in New Zealand is sensitive to the adjustments for under-reporting of non-fatal injury crashes. Differential adjustment factors are currently recommended in EEM for non-motorway rural roads related to the reported crash injury severity. Perhaps different adjustment factors are warranted for each rural road category and perhaps for crashes involving each type of vehicle.

## 8. DISCUSSION

The optimum speeds of trucks on rural highways are lower than those calculated for light vehicles, especially on rural motorways where $25 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ difference has been estimated (Table 14). A lower speed limit for trucks than light vehicles would appear appropriate on divided roads such as motorways. The availability of at least two traffic lanes in each direction on these divided roads would facilitate the safe overtaking manoeuvres that would be required to a greater extent if light vehicles and trucks had differential speed limits. Lower speed limits for trucks than light vehicles are common in Europe.

The optimum speeds on rural undivided highways for trucks and light vehicles, respectively, vary by up to $15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ depending on the category of road. Only on the winding roads (Categories 4 and 6), where deceleration for many curves, and acceleration back to cruise speed, adds substantially to vehicle operating costs and emissions, are the optimum speeds essentially the same for light and heavy vehicles. Hence, while lower general speed limits appear appropriate for winding rural roads, there is no case for differential speed limits for trucks and light vehicles on these categories of undivided road. The need for increased opportunities for safe overtaking manoeuvres on these roads, if general speed limits were reduced, would appear no greater than currently.

However, differential speed limits do appear to be appropriate for the undivided roads in Categories 2, 3 and 5 (high volume National Strategic roads and straight 'other' State Highways). The optimum speeds for trucks and light vehicles differ by 10 to $15 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$. If differential speed limits were to be applied in these road categories, then attention would need to be given to providing adequate overtaking opportunities, perhaps by more overtaking lanes or short sections of divided highway where the terrain allows. The influence on light vehicle speeds if truck speed limits were lower on the same undivided highways under current road conditions has not been modelled in the analysis presented here.

The findings of this report depend on the functional relationships between speed and road trauma, travel time, air pollution emissions and vehicle operating costs, the assumptions made, and the input parameters. The sensitivity of the findings to variations in these factors has been tested only to a limited extent.

## 9. CONCLUSIONS

Within the limits of the assumptions made and the data available for this study, a number of conclusions about optimal rural speeds and speed limits were reached.

1. The optimum speeds on Category 1 Motorways/Expressways (divided four-lane) roads would be $105 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for cars and light commercial vehicles and $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for trucks. ${ }^{2}$ On other categories of (undivided) rural highways, the optimum speeds would be at most 70 $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ for trucks, but the optimum speed for cars and light commercial vehicles ranges from $85 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ down to $65 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ depending on the quality of the road and whether through $a$ winding road environment.
2. Rationalisation of speed limits applicable to each class of rural highway and for each type of vehicle, making the limits consistent with the optimum speed in each case, has the potential to reduce casualty crashes and crash costs substantially. Although travel times and costs would increase, there would be a reduction in the total social costs on rural highways when all the benefits of reduced road trauma, air pollution emissions and vehicle operating costs from reduced speeds are considered.
3. The results suggest that differential speed limits would be appropriate in each category of rural highway apart from those through winding road environments (where, however, substantially reduced general speed limits for all vehicle types are appropriate). If differential speed limits were to be applied on some undivided rural highways, then attention should be given to providing adequate overtaking opportunities.
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## APPENDIX A: <br> MASTER FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY

LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier:
Institution:
$\qquad$

1. Outlining
A. Policy test

A1. Length of link $\qquad$ km
A2. Flow characteristics

*average annual daily traffic volume, vehicles per day
B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation.
C. Deciding on relevant impacts

| $\square$ Vehicle operating costs |
| :--- |
| Travel time |
| Accidents |
| Air pollution |
| Noise |
| Other |

End of sheet

## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

2. Measurement of impacts
D. Impact functions

## 1. Vehicle operating costs

(describe here)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time = link length/speed of traffic flow

D3a. Accidents
For example:
Injury accidents before $=n_{I B} \quad$ Average speed before $=v_{B}$
Injury accidents after $=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{IA}} \quad$ Average speed after $=\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{A}}$
$\qquad$ (Andersson \& Nilsson, 1997)

D3b. Accident costs
For example:
Total accident costs before $=C_{B}$, total accident costs after $=C_{A}$
$k=$ country specific constant $1.75 \ldots 2.30$
$C_{A}=\left[k^{\star}\left(\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right)^{2}-1\right)+1\right]^{*} C_{B} \quad$ (Andersson \& Nilsson, 1997)

D4 Air pollutant_emission_coefficients

| Emission factors* | At initial speed, $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{km}$ |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{km}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average |
| Carbon monoxide CO |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| Hydrocarbons HC |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| Particles PM |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |  |  |  |  |  | \#DIVIO! |

D5. Noise pollution
(specify model used here)

## E. Unit prices

E1. Vehicle operating_costs

*Without tax

E2a. Time costs per hour

| Value of travel time | ECU per hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Business trips, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips, $\%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leisure trips, \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ |  |


| E2b.Time costs per kilometre | ECU per vehicle-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average |
| Time costs | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIVIO! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |


| E3. Total user costs (vehicle operating+ time costs) | ECU per vehicle-km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average |
| Total user costs | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIVIO! |

E4. Accident costs

|  | Before | After |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Accident type | kECUI <br> accid. | kECU/ <br> accid. |
| Personal injury accident | 316 | \#DIV/O! |

E5a_Air pollution costs

| Air pollutants' unit costs | ECU/t |
| :--- | :--- |
| Carbon monoxide CO |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC |  |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOx |  |
| Particles PM |  |
| Carbon dioxide CO2 |  |

E5b_Noise pollution costs

| Unit costs of noise pollution | ECUlyear |
| :--- | :--- |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB |  |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB |  |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ |  |

E1. Vehicle operating costs

|  | Before policy, kECU/year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, kECU/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total |
| Vehicle operating costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| E2a Traveltime | Before policy, vehicle-hours/dav |  |  |  |  | After policv, vehicle-hours/dav |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total |
| Total travel time on link | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIVI0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |


| E2b. Travel time costs | Before policy, kECU/year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, kECU/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total |
| Total travel time costs | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIVIO! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIVIO! |



|  | Change in consumer surplus |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| kECU/year | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |
| \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |  |  |  |

E4a Accidents

| Number of accidents per year | Before <br> policy | After <br> policy | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Personal injury accident |  | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/0! |

E4b. Accident costs


E5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Particles PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carbon dioxide CO2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

E5b_Air_pollution_costs

| Emissions | At initial speed, kECU/year |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, kECU/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | - | - | - | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Particles PM | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ |  |
| Carbon dioxide CO2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

E5c. Noise pollution

| No. of residents | Before <br> policy | After <br> policy | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB |  |  | 0 | \#DIV/O! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB |  |  | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ |  |  | 0 | \#DIV/0! |


| E5d_Noise poollution_costs | kECU/ year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before policy | After policy | Change |  |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIVIO! |

G. Non-quantified impacts
(describe here)

## H. Net impacts

H1. Physical impacts

|  |  | Before | After | Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total travel time on link, hours/day |  | \#DIVIO! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! |
| Number of accidents per year |  | 0.0 | \#DIVIO! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/0! |
| Emissions, t/year | Carbon monoxide CO | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Hydrocarbons HC | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Particles PM | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Residents in area where ${ }_{\text {keq, } 07-22 \mathrm{hrs}}>55 \mathrm{~dB}$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |

H2. Monetary impacts

| kECU/year | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Consumber surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  |
| Vehicle operating costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/O! |
| Time costs | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! |
| Accident costs | 0 | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! |
| Air pollution costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/O! |
| Noise costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/O! |
| Total | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/0! |  |  |
| Change |  | \#DIV/O! | \#DIV/O! |  |

NB: Table H 2 has two alternative appearances depending on whether the traffic volume changes: If the traffic volume does not change, the difference of the sums of vehicle operating and time costs is used normally. Without an estimate of the demand curve of traffic as a function of user costs, the before and after figures for consumer surplus (CS) cannot, however, be presented. In this case, the change in consumer surplus equals the change in vehicle operating + time costs. If the traffic volume changes as a result of the policy, change of the user costs cannot be used as a component of socio-economic costs of the policy. Instead, the change in consumer surplus is used. But, as stated above, the CS figures for the initial and final situation are not known, and thus the Total row will only include accident and environmental costs in the before and after columns. The absolute figure for total change will in all cases include changes in the total costs, as this can always be calculated. No percent change is presented in this latter case.

## I. Distribution of impacts

| Affected Groups | Vehicle <br> costs | Travel <br> time | Accid- <br> ents | Pollut- <br> ion |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Private motorists |  |  |  |  |
| Coach passengers |  |  |  |  |
| Goods traffic |  |  |  |  |
| Nearby residents |  |  |  |  |
| Animals crossing road |  |  |  |  |
| Oth 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Oth 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Oth 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Oth 4 |  |  |  |  |

## J. Sensitivity tests

(list here)

End of sheet

## APPENDIX B: <br> CATEGORY 1 - MOTORWAYS/EXPRESSWAYS

managing speeds of traffic on european roads
Application of the MASTER framework (see separate instructions)
Ver. 01/99
LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier: Max Cameron
Institution: Monash University Accident Research Centre

1. Outlining

A Policy test Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 1 (Motorway/Expressway) roads

A1. Length of link 435.4 km

A2. Flow characteristics

| Traffic attributes | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge |
| Cruise speed, km/h | 92.5 | 91.5 | 99.1 | 99.1 | 90.7 | 98.6 | 80 | 80 | 105 | 105 | 80 | 103.5 |
| Average of all speeds on link | 91.5 | 90.4 | 98.2 | 98.2 | 89.9 |  | 79.5 | 79.4 | 103.7 | 103.6 | 79.5 |  |
| AADT* | 538 | 538 | 22,156 | 2,841 | 538 | 26,611 | 538 | 538 | 22,156 | 2,841 | 538 | 26,611 |
| Share of traffic | 2\% | 2\% | 83\% | 11\% | 2\% | 100\% | 2\% | 2\% | 83\% | 11\% | 2\% | 100\% |
| Business trips, \% | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 36 | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 36 |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips, | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Leisure trips, \% | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 55 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 55 |

B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook
contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation.
c. Deciding on relevant impacts

[^3]MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS


Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 1 (Motorway/Expressway) roads
2. Measurement of impacts

## D. Impact function

D1. Vehicle operating costs
VOC running cost models from EEM Table A5.11 for speed and grade (adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time $=$ link length/free speed of traffic flow (flat straight roads only; adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)
D3a. Accidents

| Injury accidents before $=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{IB}}$ | Average speed before $=v_{B}$ <br> Average speed after $=\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{A}}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Exponent | Value |  |
| Fatal accidents | $n_{1_{A}}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) F * n_{1}$ | F | 4.1 | Rural highway/freeway exponent estimates |
| Serious injury accidents | $n_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) S * n_{1}$ | s | 2.6 | trom Cameron and Eluk (2010), Table 8 |
| Other injury accidents | $\mathrm{C}_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) \mathrm{O} * \mathrm{n}_{1}$ | o | 1.1 |  |

## D4. Air pollutant emission coefficients

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Source: } \\
& \text { MASTER Working } \\
& \text { Paper R1.2.1. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Paper R1.2.D, } \\
& \text { Ap. D, p. D-6 }
\end{aligned}
$$

| Base emissions functions (g/vkt) from EEM table in Appendix A9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carbon monoxide co |  |  | Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ |  |  | Part | PO10 |
| A | B | c | A | B | C A | B |  |
| LV 0.00360 | 545 | 5 | 0.000246 | ${ }^{-0.0287}$ | 1.67 \#\#\#\# | -0.0 | 0.153 |
|  | -0.11 | 7.31 |  |  | 17.40 .000 |  |  |


| Cruise speed, $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ / ${ }^{\text {Emission factors* }}$ | 92.5 | 91.5 | 99.1 | 99.1 | 90.7 |  | 80 | 80 | 105 | 105 | 80 |  | HC: g/km from 2000 <br> Flat road 80 kmh 90 kmh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | At initial speed, $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{km}$ |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average |  |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 3.10 | 3.09 | 8.27 | 8.27 | 3.08 | 7.96 | 2.90 | 2.90 | 10.10 | 10.10 | 2.90 | 9.66 |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.42 | 0.47 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.37 | 0.50 | 678 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{x}$ | 11.03 | 10.91 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 10.82 | 2.09 | 9.31 | 9.31 | 1.76 | 1.76 | 9.31 | 2.2 |  |
| Particles PM | 1.84 | 1.81 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 1.79 | 0.166 | 1.52 | 1.52 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 1.52 | 0.160 |  |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 2224.8 | 4805.7 | 234.5 | 272.0 | 1006.3 | 386.8 | 2083.5 | 4595.1 | 241.5 | 283.4 | 950.1 | 385.5 |  |



Emission coefficients for HC not available by vehicle type, only for mix of traffic close to mix outined here CO2: EEM function of VOC from row $59+$ row 70

## D5. Noise pollution

No impact function available; noise pollution assumed small because of negligible human population living in vicinity of rural roads considered




F4a. Casualty accident rates



| F4c. Accidents | Before policy, crashes/year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, crashes/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Fatal accident | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 4.6 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 5.9 |
| Serious injury accident | 2.5 | 2.5 | 52.1 | 9.2 | 2.5 | 68.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 60.6 | 10.7 | 1.8 | 76.5 |
| Minor injury accident | 17.5 | 17.5 | 776.0 | 96.8 | 17.5 | 925.2 | 14.9 | 15.1 | 827.0 | 103.1 | 15.2 | 975.3 |
| Total casualty accidents | 20.2 | 20.2 | 831.8 | 106.6 | 20.2 | 999.0 | 16.7 | 17.0 | 892.2 | 114.7 | 17.2 | 1,057.7 |



## F5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, tyear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 265 | 264 | 29,125 | 3,734 | 264 | 33,652 | 248 | 248 | 35554 | 4558 | 248 | 40,857 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 37 | 36 | 1,647 | 211 | 36 | 1,968 | 31 | 31 | 1793 | 230 | 31 | 2,117 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 943 | 933 | 5,343 | 685 | 925 | 8,828 | 796 | 796 | 6198 | 795 | 796 | 9,381 |
| Particles PM | 157 | 155 | 212 | 27 | 153 | 704 | 130 | 130 | 254 | 33 | 130 | 675 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 190,222 | 410,891 | 825,645 | 122,798 | 86,037 | 1,635,592 | 178,139 | 392,890 | 850,170 | 127,947 | 81,238 | 1,630,384 |

## F5b. Air pollution costs



5c. Noise pollution

G. Non-quantified impacts

Noise pollution
Summary of quantified impacts


## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

## Application of the MASTER framework Ver. 01/99

Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 1 (Motorway/Expressway) roads

| H. Net impacts |  | Cruise Speed (km/h) |  |  |  |  | Average speed on link (km/h) |  |  | Before 91.5 | After |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Trucks (LCV I) | 92.5 | 80 |  |  | Trucks (LCVI) |  |  |  | $79.5$ |  |
| H1. | Physical impacts | Cars | 99.1105 |  |  |  | Increase/vehicle/100km (mins.) |  | Cars | 98.2 | 103.7 |  |
|  |  |  | Before | After | Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total travel time on link, hours/day |  | 118,546 | 113,764 | -4,781 | -4.0 \% |  |  | Trucks: | 9.9 | Cars: | -3.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Serious inj: | -7.7 | Other Inj: | -50.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## H2. Monetary impacts

| k\$/year | Before | After | Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs | 1,483,293 | 1,494,464 | 11170 | 0.8 \% |
| Time costs | 1,136,251 | 1,102,732 | -33519 | -2.9 \% |
| Crash costs | 78,685 | 87,429 | 8,744 | 11.1\% |
| Air pollution costs | 68,336 | 68,036 | -301 | -0.4 \% |
| Noise costs (not valued) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | 2,766,566 | 2,752,661 |  |  |
| Change |  |  | -13,905 | -0.5 \% |

H3. Summary of monetary impacts for each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 1,337,579 | 1,355,497 | 1,377,788 | 1,403,891 | 1,434,710 | 1,468,903 | 1,506,467 | 1,546,192 | 1,587,810 | 1,631,088 | 1,675,822 | 1,721,837 | 1,768,978 |
| Time costs |  | 1,584,812 | 1,479,834 | 1,388,020 | 1,307,146 | 1,235,597 | 1,172,518 | 1,116,894 | 1,066,918 | 1,021,814 | 980,937 | 943,748 | 909,791 | 878,678 |
| Crash costs |  | 36,001 | 41,745 | 48,199 | 55,434 | 63,525 | 72,549 | 82,589 | 93,733 | 106,070 | 119,696 | 134,710 | 151,216 | 169,320 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 61,179 | 62,098 | 63,239 | 64,587 | 66,221 | 68,055 | 70,097 | 72,190 | 74,407 | 76,739 | 79,177 | 81,715 | 84,346 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 3,019,570 | 2,939,175 | 2,877,246 | 2,831,058 | 2,800,053 | 2,782,025 | 2,776,047 | 2,779,034 | 2,790,102 | 2,808,460 | 2,833,458 | 2,864,559 | 2,901,322 |

 of which:
Heavy vehicles

| 603,001 | 599,062 | 597,573 | 598,214 | 602,277 | 608,105 | 615,398 | 623,946 | 633,692 | 644,548 | 656,441 | 669,313 | 683,118 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2,416,569$ | $2,340,113$ | $2,279,673$ | $2,232,844$ | $2,197,776$ | $2,173,920$ | $2,160,649$ | $2,155,088$ | $2,156,410$ | $2,163,912$ | $2,177,017$ | $2,195,246$ | $2,218,204$ |

Cars \& light comm. vehs 

H4. Monetary impacts for cars and LCVs at each cruise speed

| kA\$lyear | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 943,993 | 955,259 | 970,121 | 988,099 | 1,008,831 | 1,032,330 | 1,058,707 | 1,086,797 | 1,116,365 | 1,147,211 | 1,179,159 | 1,212,055 | 1,245,764 |
| Time costs |  | 1,405,705 | 1,312,545 | 1,231,053 | 1,159,261 | 1,095,628 | 1,039,525 | 990,138 | 945,766 | 905,720 | 869,429 | 836,413 | 806,268 | 778,649 |
| Crash costs |  | 32,265 | 37,276 | 42,887 | 49,158 | 56,149 | 63,927 | 72,559 | 82,118 | 92,678 | 104,320 | 117,125 | 131,178 | 146,570 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 34,605 | 35,033 | 35,612 | 36,326 | 37,168 | 38,138 | 39,246 | 40,408 | 41,646 | 42,952 | 44,320 | 45,745 | 47,221 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 2,416,569 | 2,340,113 | 2,279,673 | 2,232,844 | 2,197,776 | 2,173,920 | 2,160,649 | 2,155,088 | 2,156,410 | 2,163,912 | 2,177,017 | 2,195,246 | 2,218,204 |

H5. Monetary impacts for heavy vehicles at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 393,585 | 400,239 | 407,667 | 415,792 | 425,879 | 436,573 | 447,760 | 459,396 | 471,445 | 483,876 | 496,663 | 509,782 | 523,214 |
| Time costs |  | 179,106 | 167,289 | 156,966 | 147,885 | 139,969 | 132,993 | 126,756 | 121,152 | 116,094 | 111,509 | 107,336 | 103,523 | 100,028 |
| Crash costs |  | 3,736 | 4,469 | 5,312 | 6,276 | 7,375 | 8,622 | 10,031 | 11,615 | 13,392 | 15,376 | 17,586 | 20,038 | 22,751 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 26,573 | 27,065 | 27,628 | 28,261 | 29,053 | 29,917 | 30,851 | 31,782 | 32,761 | 33,787 | 34,857 | 35,970 | 37,125 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 603,001 | 599,062 | 597,573 | 598,214 | 602,277 | 608,105 | 615,398 | 623,946 | 633,692 | 644,548 | 656,441 | 669,313 | 683,118 |

## APPENDIX C: <br> CATEGORY 2 - HIGH VOLUME NATIONAL STRATEGIC ROADS

managing speeds of traffic on european roads
Application of the MASTER framework (see separate instructions)
Ver. 01/99
LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier: Max Cameron
Institution: Monash University Accident Research Centre

1. Outlining
A. Policy test Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 2 (High Volume National Strategic) roads

A1. Length of link $\quad 371.0 \mathrm{~km}$
A2. Flow characteristics

| Traffic attributes | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total Avera ge |
| Cruise speed, km/h | 87.7 | 86.9 | 93.9 | 93.9 | 86.1 | 93.2 | 70 | 70 | 85 | 85 | 70 | 83.4 |
| Average of all speeds on link | 85.7 | 84.7 | 91.9 | 91.8 | 84.5 |  | 69.2 | 69.1 | 83.8 | 83.7 | 69.3 |  |
| AADT* | 448 | 448 | 10,169 | 1,304 | 448 | 12,817 | 448 | 448 | 10,169 | 1,304 | 448 | 12,817 |
| Share of trafic | 3\% | 3\% | 79\% | 10\% | 3\% | 100\% | 3\% | 3\% | 79\% | 10\% | 3\% | 100\% |
| Business trips, \% | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 38 | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 38 |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips, | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Leisure trips, \% | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 53 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 53 |

B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation.
C. Deciding on relevant impacts

```
x Vehicle operating costs
    x 位Travel time
    X Accidents
```



```
    Noise
```


## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS



Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 2 (High Volume National Strategic) roads
2. Measurement of impacts

## D. Impact function

## D1. Vehicle operating costs

VOC running cost models from EEM Table A5.11 for speed and grade (adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time $=$ link length/free speed of traffic flow (flat straight roads only; adiustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)
D3a. Accidents

| Injury accidents before $=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{IB}}$ | Average speed before $=v_{B}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Exponent | Value |  |
| Fatal accidents | $n_{1_{A}}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) F * n_{1}$ | F | 4.1 | Rural highway/freeway exponent estimates |
| Serious injury accidents | $\mathrm{n}_{1 /}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) S * n_{1}$ | s | 2.6 | from Cameron and Elvik (2010), Table 8 |
| Other injury accidents | $\mathrm{C}_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) \mathrm{O} \mathrm{n}_{\text {H }}$ | o | 1.1 |  |

Average speed after $=v_{A}$

## 4. Air pollutant emission coefficients

Source: MASTER Working Paper R1.2.1. App. D, p. D-6

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base emissions functions (g/vkt) from EEM table in Appendix A9.3 } \\
& \text { Carbon monoxide CO Oxides of nitrogen } \mathrm{NO}_{x} \quad \text { Particles PO10 } \\
& \text { A B Partic } \\
& \begin{array}{lrrrrrrr} 
& \text { AV } & \text { B } & \text { C } & \text { A } & \text { B } & \text { C } & \text { A } \\
& 0.00360 & -0.545 & 25.5 & 0.000246 & -0.0287 & 1.67 \text { \#\#\#\#\#\#\# } & -0.00342
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{lllllllll}
\text { HV } & 0.000647 & -0.11 & 7.31 & 0.002040 & -0.275 & 17.4 & 0.000382 & -0.0455 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

| uise speed, $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ | 87.7 | 86.9 | 93.9 | 93.9 | 86.1 |  | 70 | 70 | 85 | 85 | 70 |  | HC: g/km from 2000 A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Emission factors* | At initial speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | cv | Average | Flat road 80 kmh 90 kmh |  |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 2.96 | 2.96 | 7.13 | 7.13 | 2.9 | 6.69 | 2.91 | 2.91 | 5.82 | 5.8 | 2.91 | 5.52 |  |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.32 | 0.38 | 678 | 739 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 10.14 | 10.06 | 1.36 | 1.36 | 9.99 | 2.27 | 8.56 | 8.56 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 8.56 | 1.92 |  |  |
| Particles PM | 1.69 | 1.67 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 1.65 | 0.222 | 1.36 | 1.36 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.36 | 0.18 |  |  |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 2321.4 | 5286.1 | 229.6 | 263.5 | 1022.3 | 510.6 | 2112.4 | 4922.3 | 220.9 | 248.2 | 938.2 | 479.2 |  |  |




## D5. Noise pollution

No impact function available; noise pollution assumed small because of negligible human population living in vicinity of rural roads considered



F4d. Accident costs

|  | Before policy, $\mathrm{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, $\mathbf{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Fatal accident | 5,195 | 5,195 | 58,724 | 8,041 | 5,195 | 82,351 | 2,062 | 2,141 | 39,040 | 5,346 | 2,223 | 50,811 |
| Serious injury accident | 1,931 | 1,931 | 36,535 | 5,147 | 1,931 | 47,477 | 1,075 | 1,101 | 28,202 | 3,973 | 1,127 | 35,478 |
| Minor injury accident | 644 | 644 | 15,432 | 1,948 | 644 | 19,312 | 503 | 508 | 13,831 | 1,746 | 513 | 17,100 |
| Total casualty accidents | 7,771 | 7,771 | 110,692 | 15,136 | 7,771 | 149,140 | 3,639 | 3,749 | 81,072 | 11,06 | ,86 | 103,38 |

F5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, tyear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 180 | 180 | 9,820 | 1,259 | 179 | 11,617 | 177 | 177 | 8016 | 1028 | 177 | 9,574 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 24 | 24 | 604 | 77 | 24 | 753 | 20 | 20 | 539 | 69 | 20 | 667 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOX | 615 | 610 | 1,869 | 240 | 606 | 3,940 | 519 | 519 | 1568 | 201 | 519 | 3,327 |
| Particles PM | 102 | 101 | 71 | 9 | 100 | 385 | 83 | 83 | 57 | 7 | 83 | 312 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 140,809 | 320,635 | 316,228 | 46,516 | 62,011 | 886,199 | 128,129 | 298,571 | 304,195 | 43,811 | 56,905 | 831,612 |

F5b. Air pollution costs

| Emissions | At initial speed, $\mathrm{ks} / \mathrm{l}$ ear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, k \$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCv2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOX | 15 | 15 | 45 | 6 | 14 | 94 | 12 | 12 | 37 | 5 | 12 | 80 |
| Particles PM | 390 | 385 | 272 | 35 | 381 | 1,463 | 314 | 314 | 218 | 28 | 314 | 1,188 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 5,632 | 12,825 | 12,649 | 1,861 | 2,480 | 35,448 | 5,125 | 11,943 | 12,168 | 1,752 | 2,276 | 33,264 |
| Total | 6,037 | 13,226 | 12,973 | 1,902 | 2,877 | 37,015 | 5,452 | 12,270 | 12,430 | 1,786 | 2,603 | 34,540 |

F5c. Noise pollution

| No. of residents | Before <br> policy | After <br> policy | Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB |  | 0 | \#DV/0! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB |  |  | 0 |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ |  |  | \#DV/0! |


| F5d. Noise pollution costs | k\$/ year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Before } \\ \text { policy } \end{gathered}$ | After policy | Change |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB | 0 | 0 | O \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DV/0! |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DIV10! |

G. Non-quantified impacts

Noise pollution
Summary of quantified impacts

|  | Before policy, $\mathrm{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, k\$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCv2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | V | Tot |
| Total monetary impact | 136,238 | 264,36 | 829 | 132,089 | 76,126 | \#\#\#\#\#\#\# | 794 | 255,3 | 819 | \#\#\#\#\#\# | 74,606 | \#\#\#\#\#\# |

## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

## Application of the MASTER framework Ver. 01/99

Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 2 (High Volume National Strategic) roads


H2. Monetary impacts

| k\$/year | Before | After | Change |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  | (N. A.) |  |
| Vehicle operating costs | 730,208 | 688,927 | -41281 | $-5.7 \%$ |  |
| Time costs | 521,547 | 585,799 | 64252 | $12.3 \%$ |  |
| Crash costs | 149,140 | 103,389 | $-45,752$ | $-30.7 \%$ |  |
| Air pollution costs | 37,015 | 34,540 | $-2,475$ | $-6.7 \%$ |  |
| Noise costs (not valued) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 4 3 7 , 9 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 1 2 , 6 5 5}$ |  |  |  |
| Change | $\mathbf{- 2 5 , 2 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 8} \%$ |  |  |  |

H3. Summary of monetary impacts for each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 670,571 | 680,733 | 693,402 | 708,430 | 731,016 | 756,347 | 784,599 | 814,394 | 845,605 | 878,123 | 911,851 | 946,703 | 982,603 |
| Time costs |  | 680,611 | 636,425 | 597,887 | 564,197 | 535,195 | 510,846 | 490,655 | 473,003 | 457,530 | 443,936 | 431,968 | 421,407 | 412,063 |
| Crash costs |  | 63,277 | 77,501 | 94,219 | 113,738 | 136,387 | 162,511 | 192,479 | 226,680 | 265,521 | 309,433 | 358,866 | 414,291 | 476,202 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 33,826 | 34,402 | 35,122 | 35,981 | 37,336 | 38,863 | 40,574 | 42,313 | 44,152 | 46,085 | 48,110 | 50,223 | 52,420 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 1,448,285 | 1,429,060 | 1,420,630 | 1,422,345 | 1,439,933 | 1,468,567 | 1,508,307 | 1,556,389 | 1,612,808 | 1,677,578 | 1,750,796 | 1,832,624 | 1,923,288 |


| of which: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Heavy vehicles |  |
| Cars \& light comm. vehs. |  |


| 461,715 | 462,148 | 465,413 | 471,406 | 486,159 | 503,894 | 524,040 | 546,501 | 571,342 | 598,592 | 628,293 | 660,505 | 695,301 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 986,570 | 966,913 | 955,217 | 950,939 | 953,774 | 964,673 | 984,267 | $1,009,888$ | $1,041,465$ | $1,078,986$ | $1,122,502$ | $1,172,119$ | $1,227,988$ |

H4. Monetary impacts for cars and LCVs at each cruise speed

| kA\$lyear | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 368,317 | 373,065 | 379,225 | 386,673 | 395,371 | 405,657 | 417,985 | 431,001 | 444,599 | 458,685 | 473,177 | 487,998 | 503,082 |
| Time costs |  | 552,725 | 516,786 | 485,399 | 457,913 | 433,810 | 413,425 | 396,636 | 381,906 | 368,946 | 357,514 | 347,405 | 338,442 | 330,475 |
| Crash costs |  | 52,025 | 63,379 | 76,672 | 92,137 | 110,024 | 130,599 | 154,141 | 180,946 | 211,326 | 245,606 | 284,131 | 327,258 | 375,361 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 13,502 | 13,682 | 13,921 | 14,216 | 14,569 | 14,992 | 15,505 | 16,035 | 16,594 | 17,180 | 17,790 | 18,420 | 19,070 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 986,570 | 966,913 | 955,217 | 950,939 | 953,774 | 964,673 | 984,267 | 1,009,888 | 1,041,465 | 1,078,986 | 1,122,502 | 1,172,119 | 1,227,988 |

H5. Monetary impacts for heavy vehicles at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 302,254 | 307,668 | 314,178 | 321,756 | 335,645 | 350,690 | 366,614 | 383,393 | 401,006 | 419,438 | 438,674 | 458,705 | 479,521 |
| Time costs |  | 127,886 | 119,639 | 112,488 | 106,283 | 101,385 | 97,421 | 94,019 | 91,096 | 88,583 | 86,422 | 84,563 | 82,965 | 81,588 |
| Crash costs |  | 11,252 | 14,122 | 17,547 | 21,602 | 26,362 | 31,912 | 38,338 | 45,733 | 54,195 | 63,827 | 74,735 | 87,034 | 100,841 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 20,324 | 20,720 | 21,200 | 21,765 | 22,767 | 23,871 | 25,068 | 26,278 | 27,558 | 28,905 | 30,320 | 31,802 | 33,350 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 461,715 | 462,148 | 465,413 | 471,406 | 486,159 | 503,894 | 524,040 | 546,501 | 571,342 | 598,592 | 628,293 | 660,505 | 695,301 |

## APPENDIX D: <br> CATEGORY 3 - STRAIGHT NATIONAL \& REGIONAL STRATEGIC ROADS

managing speeds of traffic on european roads
Application of the MASTER framework (see separate instructions)
Ver. 01/99
LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier: Max Cameron
Institution: Monash University Accident Research Centre

1. Outlining
A. Policy test Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 3 (Straight National \& Regional Strategic) roads

A1. Length of link
2824.6 km

A2. Flow characteristics

| Traffic attributes | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge |
| Cruise speed, km/h | 89.5 | 88.6 | 95.8 | 95.8 | 87.8 | 94.9 | 70 | 70 | 80 | 80 | 70 | 78.7 |
| Average of all speeds on link | 86.4 | 85.3 | 93.0 | 92.7 | 85.3 |  | 69.3 | 69.2 | 79.2 | 79.1 | 69.4 |  |
| AADT* | 200 | 200 | 3,691 | 473 | 200 | 4,764 | 200 | 200 | 3,691 | 47 | 200 | 4,762 |
| Share of trafic | 4\% | 4\% | 77\% | 10\% | 4\% | 100\% | 4\% | 4\% | 77\% | 10\% | 4\% | 00\% |
| Business trips, \% | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 39 | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 39 |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips, | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Leisure trips, \% | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 52 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 5 |

B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation
C. Deciding on relevant impacts

```
x Vehicle operating costs
    x 位Travel time
    \ Accidents
    \: Accidents
    * Noise
```

MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS
Application of the MASTER framework
Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 3 (Straight National \& Regional Strategic) roads
2. Measurement of impacts

## D. Impact function

D1. Vehicle operating costs
VOC running cost models from EEM Table A5.11 for speed and grade (adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time = link length/free speed of traffic flow (flat straight roads only; adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)
D3a. Accidents

| Injury accidents before $=\mathrm{n}_{1 B}$ <br> Injury accidents after $=n_{I A}$ | Average speed before $=\mathrm{v}_{\text {B }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average speed after $=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | Exponent | Value |  |
| Fatal accidents | $n_{n_{A}}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) F * n_{1}$ | F | 4.1 | Rural highway/freeway exponent estimates |
| Serious injury accidents |  | s | 2.6 | trom Cameron and Eluk (2010), Table 8 |
| Other injury accidents | $\mathrm{C}_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) \mathrm{O} * \mathrm{n}_{1}$ | o | 1.1 |  |

D4. Air pollutant emission coefficients

|  | 89.5 | 88.6 | 95.8 | 95.8 | 87.8 |  | 70 | 70 | 80 | 80 | 70 |  | HC: g/km | 200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | At initial speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  | Flat road 80 kmh 90 kmh |  |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | McV | Average | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average |  |  |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 2.85 | 2.85 | 7.90 | 7.90 | 2.8 | 7.2 | 2.8 | 2.82 | 5.29 | 5.29 | 2.82 | 4.98 |  |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.46 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.3 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 35 | 678 | 739 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 9.86 | 9.77 | 9 | 1.49 | 9.70 | 2.5 | 8.27 | 8.27 | 1.0 | 1.02 | 8.27 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Particles PM | 1.70 | 1.68 | 0.0 | 0.06 | 1.66 | 262 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.34 | 0.202 |  |  |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 2369.8 | 5334.1 | 233.4 | 270.1 | 1041.6 | 574.8 | 2081.2 | 4790.5 | 217.3 | 241.8 | 930.4 | 519.9 |  |  |



Source:
Source:
MASTER Work
Paper R1.2.1,

CO2: EEM function of VOC from row $59+$ row 70
CO, Nox, PM: EEM functions with Ding adjustment factors

## D5. Noise pollution

No impact function available; noise pollution assumed small because of negligible human population living in vicinity of rural roads considered



## F5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, tyear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Tot |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 588 | 587 | 30,076 | 3,856 | 586 | 35,692 | 581 | 581 | 20117 | 2579 | 581 | 24,440 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 81 | 80 | 1,771 | 227 | 80 | 2,239 | 64 | 64 | 1368 | 175 | 64 | 1,73 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOX | 2,033 | 2015 | 5,671 | 727 | 2,000 | 12,446 | 1,705 | 1705 | 3875 | 497 | 1705 | 9,489 |
| Particles PM | 351 | 347 | 216 | 28 | 343 | 1,286 | 277 | 277 | 143 | 18 | 277 | 992 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 488,601 | 1,099,778 | 888,290 | 131,761 | 214,750 | 2,823,180 | 429,096 | 987,693 | 827,031 | 117,956 | 191,831 | 2,553,6 |

F5b. Air pollution costs


F5c. Noise pollution

| No. of residents | Before policy | $\begin{array}{r} \text { After } \\ \text { policy } \end{array}$ | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB |  |  | 0 \#DVIO! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB |  |  | 0 \#DV/0! |
| Noise zone >70 dB |  |  | 0 \#DIV/0! |


G. Non

Noise pollution
Summary of quantified impacts

|  | Before policy, k Slyear |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, k\$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Total monetary impact | 79,342 | 4,797 |  | 383,644 |  |  | 447,303 |  | 952 |  |  |  |

## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

## Application of the MASTER framework Ver. 01/99

Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 3 (Straight National \& Regional Strategic) roads
H. Net impacts

Cruise Speed (km/h)
Average speed on link (km/h)
Before

## After

 Trucks (LCV I)Cars
93.0 79.2

H1. Physical impacts
Trucks (LCVI) $89.5 \quad 70$

| Physical impacts | Cars | 95.8 | 80 |  |  | Increase/vehicle/10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Before | After | Change |  |  |
| Total travel time on link, hours/day |  | 146,319 | 173,040 | 26,720 | 18.3 \% |  |
| Number of Crashes per year |  | 3,280.6 | 2,561.7 | -718.9 | -21.9\% | Saving p.a. Fatal: |
| Emissions, t/year | Carbon monoxide CO | 35692 | 24440 | -11252 | -31.5\% |  |
|  | Hydrocarbons HC | 2239 | 1737 | -502.1 | -22.4 \% |  |
|  | Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 12446 | 9486 | -2960 | -23.8 \% |  |
|  | Particles PM | 1285.5 | 992.3 | -293.29 | -22.8 \% |  |
|  | Carbon dioxide CO2 | 2823180 | 2553608 | -269572 | -9.5 \% |  |
| Residents in area where $\mathrm{L}_{\text {Aeq,07-22hrs }}>55 \mathrm{~d}$ |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |

Trucks:
17.1 Cars:
11.3

Monetary impacts

| k\$/year | Before | After | Change |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  | (N. A.) |  |  |
| Vehicle operating costs | $2,260,345$ | $2,055,373$ | -204972 | $-9.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Time costs | $1,491,755$ | $1,773,374$ | 281619 | $18.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Crash costs | 597,960 | 329,789 | $-268,171$ | $-44.8 \%$ |  |  |
| Air pollution costs | 118,143 | 106,167 | $-11,976$ | $-10.1 \%$ |  |  |
| Noise costs (not valued) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Total | $4,468,202$ | $4,264,704$ |  |  |  |  |
| Change | $\mathbf{y y y y}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 0 3 , 4 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 . 6} \%$ |  |  |  |

H3. Summary of monetary impacts for each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 2,024,988 | 2,057,255 | 2,102,344 | 2,156,809 | 2,238,370 | 2,329,180 | 2,429,688 | 2,535,709 | 2,646,868 | 2,762,836 | 2,883,325 | 3,008,078 | 3,136,867 |
| Time costs |  | 1,958,502 | 1,831,881 | 1,721,951 | 1,627,585 | 1,548,568 | 1,483,444 | 1,430,647 | 1,385,283 | 1,346,290 | 1,312,774 | 1,283,972 | 1,259,225 | 1,237,961 |
| Crash costs |  | 240,607 | 294,436 | 357,674 | 431,478 | 517,082 | 615,793 | 728,998 | 858,159 | 1,004,816 | 1,170,587 | 1,357,170 | 1,566,339 | 1,799,950 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 104,997 | 106,889 | 109,567 | 112,761 | 117,814 | 123,492 | 129,870 | 136,231 | 142,957 | 150,036 | 157,456 | 165,207 | 173,280 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 4,329,094 | 4,290,461 | 4,291,536 | 4,328,633 | 4,421,834 | 4,551,909 | 4,719,204 | 4,915,383 | 5,140,932 | 5,396,234 | 5,681,923 | 5,998,849 | 6,348,057 |

## ,

| $1,557,211$ | $1,562,579$ | $1,584,043$ | $1,617,839$ | $1,683,274$ | $1,760,432$ | $1,847,463$ | $1,943,954$ | $2,050,345$ | $2,166,832$ | $2,293,670$ | $2,431,174$ | $2,579,704$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Cars \& light comm. vehs


H4. Monetary impacts for cars and LCVs at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 1,019,600 | 1,032,834 | 1,049,986 | 1,071,197 | 1,097,118 | 1,127,677 | 1,164,275 | 1,202,804 | 1,242,952 | 1,284,439 | 1,327,015 | 1,370,454 | 1,414,549 |
| Time costs |  | 1,524,555 | 1,425,705 | 1,339,427 | 1,264,822 | 1,201,059 | 1,147,965 | 1,105,266 | 1,068,353 | 1,036,406 | 1,008,735 | 984,754 | 963,955 | 945,899 |
| Crash costs |  | 190,363 | 231,475 | 279,545 | 335,411 | 399,965 | 474,152 | 558,974 | 655,484 | 764,796 | 888,075 | 1,026,545 | 1,181,486 | 1,354,233 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 37,365 | 37,868 | 38,535 | 39,363 | 40,418 | 41,682 | 43,226 | 44,788 | 46,434 | 48,154 | 49,939 | 51,781 | 53,672 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 2,771,883 | 2,727,882 | 2,707,493 | 2,710,794 | 2,738,560 | 2,791,478 | 2,871,741 | 2,971,429 | 3,090,587 | 3,229,403 | 3,388,252 | 3,567,675 | 3,768,353 |

H5. Monetary impacts for heavy vehicles at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 1,005,388 | 1,024,422 | 1,052,358 | 1,085,612 | 1,141,252 | 1,201,503 | 1,265,413 | 1,332,905 | 1,403,917 | 1,478,398 | 1,556,310 | 1,637,624 | 1,722,318 |
| Time costs |  | 433,947 | 406,176 | 382,525 | 362,763 | 347,510 | 335,478 | 325,382 | 316,931 | 309,885 | 304,039 | 299,218 | 295,270 | 292,062 |
| Crash costs |  | 50,244 | 62,961 | 78,129 | 96,067 | 117,117 | 141,641 | 170,025 | 202,675 | 240,020 | 282,512 | 330,625 | 384,853 | 445,716 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 67,632 | 69,021 | 71,031 | 73,398 | 77,396 | 81,810 | 86,644 | 91,443 | 96,524 | 101,883 | 107,517 | 113,426 | 119,607 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 1,557,211 | 1,562,579 | 1,584,043 | 1,617,839 | 1,683,274 | 1,760,432 | 1,847,463 | 1,943,954 | 2,050,345 | 2,166,832 | 2,293,670 | 2,431,174 | 2,579,704 |

managing speeds of traffic on european roads
Application of the MASTER framework (see separate instructions)
Ver. 01/99
LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier: Max Cameron
Institution: Monash University Accident Research Centre

1. Outlining
A. Policy test Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 4 (Winding National \& Regional Strategic) roads

A1. Length of link
342.6 km

A2. Flow characteristics

| Traffic attributes | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera ge |
| Cruise speed, km/h | 78.4 | 77.8 | 83.6 | 83.6 | 77.2 | 82.8 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 70 | 74.3 |
| Average of all speeds on link | 75.6 | 74.8 | 79.6 | 79.2 | 74.9 |  | 68.4 | 68.2 | 72.6 | 72.4 | 68.6 |  |
| AADT* | 197 | 197 | 3,446 | 442 | 197 | 4,478 | 197 | 197 | 3,446 | 442 | 197 | 4,478 |
| Share of traffic | 4\% | 4\% | 77\% | 10\% | 4\% | 100\% | 4\% | 4\% | 77\% | 10\% | 4\% | 100\% |
| Business trips, \% | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 40 | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 40 |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips, | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Leisure trips, \% | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 51 |

B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation.
C. Deciding on relevant impacts

```
x Vehicle operating costs
    |x
    X Accidents
```



```
    Noise
```

MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS
Application of the MASTER framework
Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 4 (Winding National \& Regional Strategic) roads
2. Measurement of impacts

## D. Impact function

D1. Vehicle operating costs
VOC running cost models from EEM Table A5.11 for speed and grade (adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time $=$ link length/free speed of traffic flow (flat straight roads only; adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)
D3a. Accidents

| Injury accidents before $=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{IB}}$ | Average speed before $=\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{B}}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Injury accidents atter $=n_{\text {IA }}$ |  | Exponent | Value |  |
| Fatal accidents |  | F | 4.1 | Rural highway/freeway exponent estimates |
| Serious injury accidents | $n_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) S * n_{1}$ | s | 2.6 | from Cameron and Eluk (2010), Table 8 |
| Other injury accidents |  | o | 1.1 |  |

## D4. Air pollutant emission coefficients

Source MASTER Working aper R1.2.1. App. D, p. D-6

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base emissions functions (g/vkt) from EEM table in Appendix A9.3 } \\
& \text { Carbon monoxide CO Oxides of nitrogen } \mathrm{NO}_{x} \quad \text { Particles PO10 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{lrrrrrrrr} 
& \text { AV } & \text { B } & \text { C } & \text { A } & \text { B } & \text { C } & \text { A } & \text { B } \\
& 0.00360 & -0.545 & 25.5 & 0.000246 & & -0.0287 & 1.67 \text { \#\#\#\#\#\#\# } & -0.00342
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{lllllllll}
\text { HV } & 0.000647 & -0.11 & 7.31 & 0.002040 & -0.275 & 17.4 & 0.000382 & -0.0455 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

| Cruise speed, $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h}$ | 78.4 | 77.8 | 83.6 | 83.6 | 77.2 |  | 70 | 70 | 75 | 75 | 70 |  | g/km from 2000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | At initial speed, $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{km}$ |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  | Flat road 80 kmh 90 kmh |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average |  |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 2.87 | 2.88 | 5.78 | 78 | 2.88 | 5.40 | 2.84 | 2.84 | 5.26 | 5.26 | 24 | 4.94 |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.39 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.31 | 0.34 | 678 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 9.07 | 9.04 | 1.13 | 1.13 | 9.01 | 2.17 | 8.34 | 8.34 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 8.34 | 1.95 |  |
| Particles PM | 1.49 | 1.48 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.47 | 0.230 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.35 | 0.209 |  |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 2594.3 | 6612.7 | 221.5 | 247.1 | 1073.8 | 646.3 | 2477.0 | 6394.5 | 213.7 | 232.9 | 1031.6 | 622.3 |  |

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Emission coefficients for } \mathrm{HC} \text { not available by vehicle type, only for mix of traffic close to mix outined here } & \text { CO2: EEM function of VOC from row } 59+\text { row } 70 \\ \text { CO, Nox, PM: EEM functions with Ding adiustment factors }\end{array}$


## D5. Noise pollution

No impact function available; noise pollution assumed small because of negligible human population living in vicinity of rural roads considered



[^4]F4d. Accident costs

|  | Before policy, $\mathrm{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, $\mathbf{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCv2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Fatal accident | 2,600 | 2,600 | 22,682 | 3,106 | 2,600 | 33,587 | 1,633 | 1,686 | 14,53 | 1,99 | 1,740 | 21,583 |
| Serious injury accident | 966 | 966 | 14,112 | 1,988 | 966 | 18,999 | 720 | 734 | 10,641 | 1,499 | 749 | 14,344 |
| Minor injury accident | 322 | 322 | 5,961 | 752 | 322 | 7,680 | 285 | 287 | 5,290 | 668 | 289 | 6,81 |
| Total casualty acciden | , 888 | 3,888 | 42,754 | 5,846 | 3,88 | 60,26 | 2,63 | 2,70 | 30,465 | 4,15 |  | 2,74 |

F5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, tlyear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 71 | 71 | 2,491 | 319 | 71 | 3,023 | 70 | 70 | 2265 | 290 | 70 | 2,765 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 9 | 9 | 168 | 22 | 9 | 216 | 8 | 8 | 149 | 19 | 8 | 191 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 223 | 222 | 487 | 62 | 222 | 1,216 | 205 | 205 | 420 | 54 | 205 | 1,089 |
| Particles PM | 37 | 36 | 18 | 2 | 36 | 129 | 33 | 33 | 15 | 2 | 33 | 117 |

F5b. Air pollution costs

| Emissions | At initial speed, k \$/year |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, k S/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOX | 5 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 5 | 29 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 26 |
| Particles PM | 139 | 138 | 67 | 9 | 137 | 490 | 126 | 126 | 58 | 7 | 126 | 444 |
| Carbon dioxide CO2 | 2,551 | 6,503 | 3,817 | 546 | 1,056 | 14,474 | 2,436 | 6,289 | 3,683 | 515 | 1,015 | 13,937 |
| Total | 2,696 | 6,647 | 3,898 | 556 | 1,199 | 14,995 | 2,567 | 6,420 | 3,753 | 524 | 1,146 | 14,409 |

F5c. Noise pollution

| No. of residents | Before <br> policy | After <br> policy | Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB |  | 0 | \#DV/0! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB |  |  | 0 |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ |  |  | \#DV/0! |


| F5d. Noise pollution costs | k\$/ year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Before } \\ \text { policy } \end{gathered}$ | After policy | Change |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB | 0 | 0 | O \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DV/0! |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DIV10! |

G. Non-quantified impacts

Noise pollution
Summary of quantified impacts

|  | Before policy, $\mathrm{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, k\$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Tota |
| Total monetary impa | 62,267 | 887 | 691 | 531 | 33,801 | 53,178 | 60,753 | ,030 | 6,827 |  |  |  |

## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

## Application of the MASTER framework Ver. 01/99

Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 4 (Winding National \& Regional Strategic) roads
H. Net impacts

Cruise Speed (km/h)
Trucks (LCVI) $78.4 \quad 70$
H1. Physical impacts

Average speed on link (km/h) Trucks (LCVI)

Cars
Trucks:
Serious inj:

|  | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total travel time on link, hours/day | 19,438 | 21,307 | 1,869 | $9.6 \%$ |
| Increase/ve | nicle/ |  |  |  |
| Number of Crashes per year | 329.6 | 285.3 | -44.3 | $-13.5 \%$ |
| Saving p.a. Fatal: |  |  |  |  | Emissions, t/year C


| Emissions, t/year | Carbon monoxide CO | 3023 | 2765 | -258 | $-8.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hydrocarbons HC | 216 | 191 | -24.7 | $-11.5 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 1216 | 1089 | -127 | $-10.4 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Particles PM | 128.8 | 116.7 | -12.03 | $-9.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Carbon dioxide CO2 | 361842 | 348422 | -13421 | $-3.7 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residents in area where $\mathrm{L}_{\text {Aeq,07-22hrs }}>55 \mathrm{~d}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

After
68.4
72.6

H2. Monetary impacts

| k\$lyear | Before | After | Change |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  | (N. A.) $)$ |  |
| Vehicle operating costs | 279,172 | 268,775 | -10397 | $-3.7 \%$ |  |
| Time costs | 198,745 | 217,903 | 19159 | $9.6 \%$ |  |
| Crash costs | 60,265 | 42,746 | $-17,520$ | $-29.1 \%$ |  |
| Air pollution costs | 14,995 | 14,409 | -586 | $-3.9 \%$ |  |
| Noise costs (not valued) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5 3 , 1 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 3 , 8 3 3}$ |  |  |  |
| Change | $\mathbf{y y y y}$ |  |  |  |  |

## H3. Summary of monetary impacts for each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 266,712 | 272,005 | 279,210 | 287,722 | 299,472 | 312,376 | 326,488 | 341,327 | 356,846 | 373,004 | 389,766 | 407,098 | 424,970 |
| Time costs |  | 228,178 | 214,786 | 203,311 | 193,755 | 186,105 | 180,030 | 175,353 | 171,510 | 168,375 | 165,842 | 163,817 | 162,222 | 160,985 |
| Crash costs |  | 36,245 | 44,900 | 55,146 | 67,183 | 81,226 | 97,502 | 116,254 | 137,736 | 162,217 | 189,979 | 221,318 | 256,545 | 295,984 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 14,331 | 14,643 | 15,074 | 15,570 | 16,308 | 17,132 | 18,056 | 18,948 | 19,890 | 20,880 | 21,917 | 22,999 | 24,125 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 545,466 | 546,333 | 552,741 | 564,230 | 583,110 | 607,040 | 636,151 | 669,521 | 707,328 | 749,705 | 796,818 | 848,864 | 906,064 |
| of which: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy vehicles |  | 222,898 | 225,398 | 230,398 | 237,211 | 247,836 | 260,119 | 273,888 | 289,080 | 305,804 | 324,111 | 344,060 | 365,719 | 389,162 |
| Cars \& light comm. vehs. |  | 322,568 | 320,935 | 322,343 | 327,019 | 335,274 | 346,921 | 362,263 | 380,441 | 401,523 | 425,593 | 452,758 | 483,144 | 516,902 |

H4. Monetary impacts for cars and LCVs at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 114,535 | 116,597 | 119,117 | 122,166 | 125,909 | 130,189 | 135,164 | 140,358 | 145,733 | 151,250 | 156,878 | 162,586 | 168,345 |
| Time costs |  | 175,713 | 165,439 | 156,568 | 149,109 | 143,041 | 138,179 | 134,487 | 131,438 | 128,934 | 126,894 | 125,247 | 123,932 | 122,895 |
| Crash costs |  | 28,122 | 34,622 | 42,284 | 51,252 | 61,679 | 73,729 | 87,574 | 103,397 | 121,389 | 141,754 | 164,701 | 190,454 | 219,243 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 4,198 | 4,277 | 4,375 | 4,492 | 4,645 | 4,824 | 5,038 | 5,248 | 5,468 | 5,696 | 5,931 | 6,173 | 6,420 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 322,568 | 320,935 | 322,343 | 327,019 | 335,274 | 346,921 | 362,263 | 380,441 | 401,523 | 425,593 | 452,758 | 483,144 | 516,902 |

H5. Monetary impacts for heavy vehicles at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 152,178 | 155,408 | 160,094 | 165,556 | 173,563 | 182,187 | 191,325 | 200,969 | 211,113 | 221,754 | 232,888 | 244,512 | 256,626 |
| Time costs |  | 52,465 | 49,347 | 46,743 | 44,646 | 43,063 | 41,851 | 40,866 | 40,072 | 39,441 | 38,948 | 38,570 | 38,290 | 38,090 |
| Crash costs |  | 8,123 | 10,278 | 12,861 | 15,931 | 19,546 | 23,773 | 28,680 | 34,339 | 40,827 | 48,225 | 56,617 | 66,091 | 76,742 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 10,133 | 10,366 | 10,699 | 11,078 | 11,663 | 12,308 | 13,018 | 13,700 | 14,423 | 15,185 | 15,986 | 16,826 | 17,705 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 222,898 | 225,398 | 230,398 | 237,211 | 247,836 | 260,119 | 273,888 | 289,080 | 305,804 | 324,111 | 344,060 | 365,719 | 389,162 |

## CATEGORY 5 - STRAIGHT REGIONAL CONNECTOR \& DISTRIBUTOR ROADS

managing speeds of traffic on european roads
Application of the MASTER framework (see separate instructions)
Ver. 01/99
LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier: Max Cameron
Institution: Monash University Accident Research Centre

1. Outlining
A. Policy test Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 5 (Straight Regional Other) roads

A1. Length of link
4920.3 km

A2. Flow characteristics

| Traffic attributes | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera |
| Cruise speed, km/h | 89.4 | 88.5 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 87.7 | 94.8 | 70 | 70 | 80 | 80 | 70 | 78. |
| Average of all speeds on link | 84.0 | 82.8 | 90.2 | 89.7 | 83.4 |  | 68.6 | 68.5 | 78.1 | 77.9 | 68.8 |  |
| AADT* | 83 | 62 | 1,459 | 162 | 83 | 1,850 | 83 | 62 | 1,459 | 162 | 83 | 1,85 |
| Share of trafic | 4\% | 3\% | 79\% | 9\% | 4\% | 100\% | 4\% | 3\% | 79\% | 9\% | \% | 100\% |
| Business trips, \% | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 39 | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 39 |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips, | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Leisure trips, \% | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 52 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 5 |

B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation.
C. Deciding on relevant impacts

```
V Vehicle operating costs
    x 位Travel time
    \ Accidents
    \: Accidents
    * Noise
```

MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS


Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 5 (Straight Regional Other) roads
2. Measurement of impacts

## D. Impact function

D1. Vehicle operating costs
VOC running cost models from EEM Table A5.11 for speed and grade (adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time = link length/free speed of traffic flow (flat straight roads only; adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)
D3a. Accidents

| Injury accidents before $=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{IB}}$ | Average speed before $=v_{B}$ Average speed after $=v_{A}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Exponent | Value |  |
| Fatal accidents | $n_{n_{\text {A }}}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) F^{*} n_{\text {l }}$ | F | 4.1 | Rural highwayfrieeway exponent estimates |
| Serious injury accidents | $n_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) S * n_{1}$ | s | 2.6 | trom Cameron and Eluk (2010), Table 8 |
| Other injury accidents | $\mathrm{C}_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) \mathrm{O} * \mathrm{n}_{1}$ | o | 1.1 |  |

D4. Air pollutant emission coefficients

|  | 89.4 | 88.5 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 87.7 |  | 70 | 70 | 80 | 80 | 70 |  | HC: g/km from 2000 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | At initial speed, $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{km}$ |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  | Flat road 80 kmh 90 kmh |  |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average |  |  |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 2.99 | 2.99 | 8.97 | 8.97 | 2.98 | 8.2 | 2.8 | 2.85 | 5.54 | 5.5 | 2.8 | 5.20 |  |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.4 | 0.50 | 0.3 | 0.32 | 0.3 | 0.37 | 0.3 | 0.37 | 678 | 739 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 10.36 | 10.27 | 1.71 | 1.71 | 10.1 | 2.7 | 8.3 | 8.36 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 8.36 | 1.9 |  |  |
| Particles PM | 1.75 | 1.72 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 1.7 | 0.267 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 0.0 | 0.04 | 1.3 | 0.20 |  |  |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 2485.0 | 5675.5 | 236.8 | 275.3 | 1075.4 | 562.1 | 2133.9 | 4971.0 | 218.8 | 244.0 | 945.7 | 499.9 |  |  |




|  | At initial speed, g/km |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV |  |
| o | 1.130 | 1.130 | 1.421 | 1.421 | 1.130 | 1.025 | 1.025 | 1.121 | 1.121 | 1.025 |  |
| c | 1.109 | 1.109 | 1.337 | 1.337 | 1.109 | 1.022 | 1.022 | 1.104 | 1.104 | 1.022 |  |
|  | 1.136 | 1.136 | 1.449 | 1.449 | 1.136 | 1.026 | 1.026 | 1.127 | 1.127 | 1.026 |  |
| м | 1.068 | 1.068 | 1.218 | 1.218 | 1.068 | 1.009 | 1.009 | 1.060 | 1.060 | 1.009 |  |
|  | Adjusted through VOC adjustments for stops and curves |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Source: MASTER Work App. D, p. D-6

Emission coefficients for HC not available by vehicle type, only for mix of traffic close to mix outined here CO2: EEM function of VOC from row $59+$ row 70

## D5. Noise pollution

No impact function available; noise pollution assumed small because of negligible human population living in vicinity of rural roads considered


| F4d. Accident costs | Before policy, k \$/year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, $\mathbf{k \$ / y} \mathbf{y}$ ear |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Fatal accident | 21,081 | 15,811 | 184,259 | 21,866 | 21,081 | 264,099 | 7,732 | 6,045 | 88,381 | 10,488 | 8,366 | 121,012 |
| Serious injury accident | 7,837 | 5,878 | 114,637 | 13,997 | 7,837 | 150,185 | 4,149 | 3,195 | 71,943 | 8,784 | 4,361 | 92,431 |
| Minor injury accident | 2,614 | 1,960 | 48,421 | 5,297 | 2,614 | 60,906 | 1,997 | 1,515 | 39,758 | 4,349 | 2,040 | 49,659 |
| Total casualty accidents | 31,532 | 23,649 | 347,317 | 41,160 | 31,532 | 475,190 | 13,878 | 10,754 | 200,082 | 23,622 | 14,767 | 263,103 |

## F5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, thear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 446 | 334 | 23,512 | 2,612 | 445 | 27,351 | 425 | 319 | 14507 | 1612 | 425 | 17,288 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 61 | 45 | 1,356 | 151 | 60 | 1,672 | 47 | 35 | 981 | 109 | 47 | 1,219 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOx | 1,546 | 1150 | 4,468 | 496 | 1,522 | 9,182 | 1,247 | 936 | 2801 | 311 | 1247 | 6,543 |
| Particles PM | 261 | 193 | 160 | 18 | 255 | 886 | 201 | 151 | 101 | 11 | 201 | 666 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 370,896 | 635,327 | 620,453 | 80,150 | 160,517 | 1,867,344 | 318,504 | 556,460 | 573,294 | 71,023 | 41,147 | 1,660,427 |

F5b. Air pollution costs


F5c. Noise pollution

G. Non-quantified impacts

Noise pollution
Summary of quantified impacts

|  | Before policy, ks/year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, $\mathbf{k s / y y}$ ar |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Total monetary impact | 365,595 | 528,071 | 1,748,906 | 240,351 | 205,893 | 3,088,817 | 332,214 | 479,512 | 1,653,892 | 228,520 | 90,139 | 2,884,277 |

## MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

## Application of the MASTER framework Ver. 01/99

Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds on Category 5 (Straight Regional Other) roads


H2. Monetary impacts

| k\$lyear | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Consumer surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  | (N. A.) $)$ |
| Vehicle operating costs | $1,507,661$ | $1,350,977$ | -156685 | $-10.4 \%$ |
| Time costs | $1,027,661$ | $1,201,077$ | 173416 | $16.9 \%$ |
| Crash costs | 475,190 | 263,103 | $-212,087$ | $-44.6 \%$ |
| Air pollution costs | 78,304 | 69,120 | $-9,184$ | $-11.7 \%$ |
| Noise costs (not valued) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 , 0 8 8 , 8 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 8 8 4 , 2 7 7}$ |  |  |
| Change | $-204,540$ | $\mathbf{- 6 . 6} \%$ |  |  |

H3. Summary of monetary impacts for each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 1,328,366 | 1,352,386 | 1,386,985 | 1,429,042 | 1,492,454 | 1,563,186 | 1,641,669 | 1,724,360 | 1,810,984 | 1,901,297 | 1,995,080 | 2,092,138 | 2,192,292 |
| Time costs |  | 1,322,062 | 1,239,870 | 1,168,962 | 1,109,288 | 1,061,111 | 1,023,040 | 994,018 | 970,054 | 950,404 | 934,435 | 921,605 | 911,439 | 903,521 |
| Crash costs |  | 191,716 | 234,600 | 284,979 | 343,776 | 411,971 | 490,608 | 580,790 | 683,683 | 800,512 | 932,567 | 1,081,199 | 1,247,824 | 1,433,918 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 68,243 | 69,663 | 71,738 | 74,203 | 78,180 | 82,671 | 87,750 | 92,702 | 97,937 | 103,443 | 109,213 | 115,239 | 121,513 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 2,910,387 | 2,896,519 | 2,912,664 | 2,956,309 | 3,043,716 | 3,159,505 | 3,304,228 | 3,470,800 | 3,659,837 | 3,871,742 | 4,107,097 | 4,366,639 | 4,651,244 |

## ,

| $1,001,865$ | $1,009,455$ | $1,030,252$ | $1,060,725$ | $1,115,583$ | $1,179,584$ | $1,251,172$ | $1,329,955$ | $1,416,395$ | $1,510,673$ | $1,613,012$ | $1,723,673$ | $1,842,954$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Cars \& light comm. vehs


H4. Monetary impacts for cars and LCVs at each cruise speed

| kA\$lyear | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 693,297 | 703,260 | 715,907 | 731,623 | 751,341 | 774,605 | 802,701 | 832,135 | 862,673 | 894,103 | 926,230 | 958,879 | 991,886 |
| Time costs |  | 1,037,500 | 972,790 | 916,515 | 868,637 | 828,976 | 797,129 | 773,049 | 752,940 | 736,222 | 722,406 | 711,070 | 701,847 | 694,414 |
| Crash costs |  | 152,317 | 185,224 | 223,704 | 268,427 | 320,107 | 379,501 | 447,412 | 524,685 | 612,210 | 710,922 | 821,800 | 945,870 | 1,084,202 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 25,408 | 25,791 | 26,286 | 26,897 | 27,709 | 28,686 | 29,894 | 31,085 | 32,336 | 33,638 | 34,985 | 36,371 | 37,788 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 1,908,522 | 1,887,065 | 1,882,412 | 1,895,584 | 1,928,133 | 1,979,921 | 2,053,055 | 2,140,845 | 2,243,441 | 2,361,069 | 2,494,086 | 2,642,966 | 2,808,290 |

H5. Monetary impacts for heavy vehicles at each cruise speed

| kA\$/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 635,069 | 649,127 | 671,078 | 697,419 | 741,113 | 788,581 | 838,969 | 892,225 | 948,311 | 1,007,194 | 1,068,850 | 1,133,258 | 1,200,406 |
| Time costs |  | 284,562 | 267,080 | 252,447 | 240,652 | 232,135 | 225,911 | 220,970 | 217,115 | 214,181 | 212,029 | 210,535 | 209,593 | 209,107 |
| Crash costs |  | 39,399 | 49,376 | 61,275 | 75,349 | 91,865 | 111,107 | 133,378 | 158,997 | 188,302 | 221,645 | 259,399 | 301,954 | 349,715 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 42,835 | 43,872 | 45,452 | 47,306 | 50,471 | 53,985 | 57,856 | 61,617 | 65,601 | 69,805 | 74,228 | 78,868 | 83,725 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 1,001,865 | 1,009,455 | 1,030,252 | 1,060,725 | 1,115,583 | 1,179,584 | 1,251,172 | 1,329,955 | 1,416,395 | 1,510,673 | 1,613,012 | 1,723,673 | 1,842,954 |

## CATEGORY 6 - WINDING REGIONAL CONNECTOR \& DISTRIBUTOR ROADS

managing speeds of traffic on european roads
Application of the MASTER framework (see separate instructions)
Ver. 01/99
LINK-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACTS OF A SPEED MANAGEMENT POLICY
Name of applier: Max Cameron
Institution: Monash University Accident Research Centre

1. Outlining
A. Policy test Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds (not less than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) on Category 6 (Winding Regional Other) roads
A1. Length of link $\quad 1117.6 \mathrm{~km}$

A2. Flow characteristics

| Traffic attributes | Before policy |  |  |  |  |  | After policy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total/ Avera | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total Aver |
| Cruise speed, km/h | 74.9 | 74.4 | 79.7 | 79.7 | 73.9 | 79.1 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70.0 |
| Average of all speeds on link | 69.4 | 68.5 | 74.1 | 73.7 | 69.4 |  | 66.1 | 65.7 | 67.1 | 66.9 | 66.6 |  |
| AADT* | 82 | 62 | 1,480 | 164 | 82 | 1,870 | 82 | 62 | 1,480 | 164 | 82 | 1,870 |
| Share of trafic | 4\% | 3\% | 79\% | 9\% | 4\% | 100\% | 4\% | 3\% | 79\% | \% | 4\% | 100\% |
| Business trips, \% | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 39 | 85 | 85 | 30 | 55 | 85 | 39 |
| Pers. bus. and commuting. trips | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| Leisure trips, \% | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 52 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 40 | 10 | 52 |

B. Link/network level analysis

This workbook is best suited for link analysis. However, elastic travel demand can be assumed, for the workbook contains formulas for consumer surplus calculation.
C. Deciding on relevant impacts

```
V Vehicle operating costs
    x 位Travel time
    \ Accidents
```



```
    Noise
```

MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS
Application of the MASTER framework
Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds (not less than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) on Category 6 (Winding Regional Other) roads
2. Measurement of impacts

## D. Impact function

D1. Vehicle operating costs
VOC running cost models from EEM Table A5.11 for speed and grade (adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)

D2. Travel time
Function: travel time $=$ link length/free speed of traffic flow (flat straight roads only; adjustment for stops and curves based on EEM Tables 5.24-33)
D3a. Accidents

| Injury accidents before $=\mathrm{n}_{1 B}$ <br> Injury accidents after $=n_{\mathrm{IA}}$ | Average speed before $=\mathrm{v}_{\text {B }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average speed after $=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | Exponent | Value |  |
| Fatal accidents |  | F | 4.1 | Rural highway/freeway exponent estimates |
| Serious injury accidents | $n_{1 A}=\left(v_{A} / v_{B}\right) S * n_{1}$ | s | 2.6 | from Cameron and Elvik (2010), Table 8 |
| Other injury accidents |  | o | 1.1 |  |

## D4. Air pollutant emission coefficients

Source Source.
MASTER Working
Paper R12 App. D, p. D-6

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Base emissions functions (g/vkt) from EEM table in Appendix A9.3 } \\
& \text { Carbon monoxide CO Oxides of nitrogen } \mathrm{NO}_{x} \quad \text { Particles PO10 }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{lllllllll}
\text { HV } & 0.000647 & -0.11 & 7.31 & 0.002040 & -0.275 & 17.4 & 0.000382 & -0.0455 \\
& 2.65
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

| Cruise speed, km/h | 74.9 | 74.4 | 79.7 | 79.7 | 73.9 |  | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |  | HC: 9 g/km from 2000 A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | At initial speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, g/km |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emission factors* | HC | HCV2 | Car | Lcv | MCV | Average | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Average | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Flat } \\ 80 \mathrm{kmh} \end{array}$ |  |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 2.72 | 2.7 | 5.55 | 5.55 | 2.74 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 2.81 | 5.03 | 5.03 | 2.81 | 4.77 |  |  |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0.33 | 0.32 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.32 | 0.37 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 678 | 739 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\mathrm{NO}_{\mathrm{x}}$ | 8.32 | 8.31 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 8.30 | 1.94 | 8.22 | 8.22 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 8.22 | 1.76 |  |  |
| Particles PM | 1.39 | 1.38 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.38 | 0.201 | 1.34 | 1.34 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 1.34 | 0.192 |  |  |
| Carbon dioxide $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ | 2715.2 | 6977.2 | 221.8 | 246.6 | 1107.6 | 594.6 | 2621.8 | 6800.2 | 212.6 | 230.0 | 1078.1 | 574.6 |  |  |



CO, Nox, PM: EEM functions with Ding adiustment factors

## 5. Noise pollution

No impact function available; noise pollution assumed small because of negligible human population living in vicinity of rural roads considered



|  | Before policy, $\mathrm{k} \$ 1 \mathrm{year}$ |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, k\$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Fatal accident | 5,350 | 4,013 | 48,047 | 5,702 | 5,350 | 68,463 | 4,054 | 3,125 | 28,222 | 3,349 | 4,284 | 43,035 |
| Serious injury accident | 1,989 | 1,492 | 29,893 | 3,650 | 1,989 | 39,012 | 1,668 | 1,273 | 21,332 | 2,605 | 1,727 | 28,60 |
| Minor injury accident | 663 | 498 | 12,626 | 1,381 | 663 | 15,832 | 616 | 465 | 10,947 | 1,197 | 625 | 13,850 |
| Total casualty accidents | 8,003 | 6,002 | 90,566 | 10,733 | 8,003 | 123,307 | 6,338 | 4,864 | 60,501 | 7,151 | 6,636 | 85,490 |

F5a. Air pollution

| Emissions | At initial speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, t/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | CV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 91 | 69 | 3,349 | 372 | 92 | 3,972 | 94 | 70 | 3040 | 338 | 94 | 3,636 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 11 | 8 | 226 | 25 | 11 | 281 | 10 | 8 | 188 | 21 | 10 | 237 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NOX | 279 | 209 | 646 | 72 | 278 | 1,482 | 275 | 206 | 528 | 59 | 275 | 1,344 |
| Particles PM | 47 | 35 | 23 | 3 | 46 | 153 | 45 | 34 | 20 | 2 | 45 | 146 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 90,883 | 175,153 | 133,897 | 16,544 | 37,075 | 453,551 | 87,757 | 170,709 | 128,344 | 15,426 | 36,086 | 438,323 |

F5b. Air pollution costs

| Emissions | At initial speed, $\mathrm{ks} / \mathrm{l}$ ear |  |  |  |  |  | At final speed, k \$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total |
| Carbon monoxide CO | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Hydrocarbons HC | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Oxides of nitrogen NO | 7 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 7 | 35 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 7 | 32 |
| Particles PM | 177 | 132 | 88 | 10 | 175 | 582 | 171 | 128 | 78 | 9 | 171 | 556 |
| Carbon dioxide CO 2 | 3,635 | 7,006 | 5,356 | 662 | 1,483 | 18,142 | 3,510 | 6,828 | 5,134 | 617 | 1,443 | 17,533 |
| Total | 3,819 | 7,143 | 5,462 | 674 | 1,665 | 18,763 | 3,688 | 6,961 | 5,226 | 627 | 1,621 | 18,124 |

F5c. Noise pollution

| No. of residents | Before <br> policy | After <br> policy | Change |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB |  |  | 0 |
| \#DV/0! |  |  |  |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB |  |  | 0 |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ |  |  | \#DV/O!! |


| F5d. Noise pollution costs | k\$/ year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Before } \\ \text { policy } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { After } \\ \text { policy } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Change |
| Noise zone 55 to 65 dB | 0 | - | 0 \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone 65 to 70 dB | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Noise zone $>70 \mathrm{~dB}$ | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 \#DIV10! |

G. Non-quantified impacts

Noise pollution
Summary of quantified impacts

|  | Before policy, $\mathrm{k} \$$ /year |  |  |  |  |  | After policy, k\$/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Total | HCV1 | HCV2 | Car | LCV | MCV | Tota |
| Total monetary impact | 92,079 | 144,612 | 437,319 | 59,768 | 50,788 | 784,565 | 89,508 | 14 | 420 | 5 | 49 | 759,3 |

MANAGING SPEEDS OF TRAFFIC ON EUROPEAN ROADS

Application of the MASTER framework
Reduction of cruise speeds to optimum speeds (not less than $70 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ) on Category 6 (Winding Regional Other) roads

| H. Net impacts |  |  | Cruise Speed (km/h) |  |  |  | Average speed on link (km/h) |  | Before | After |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Trucks (LCVI) | 74.9 | 70 |  |  |  | s (LCVI) | 69.4 | 66.1 |  |
| H1. Physical impacts |  | Cars | 79.7 70 |  |  |  | Cars |  | 74.1 | 67.1 |  |
|  |  | Before | After | Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total travel time on link, hours/day |  |  | 28,453 | 31,200 | 2,747 | 9.7\% | Increase/vehicle/100km (mins.) | Trucks: | 4.3 | Cars: | 8.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Saving p.a. Fatal: 5.9 | Serious Inj: | 22.5 | Other Inj: | 72.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## H2. Monetary impacts

| k $\$$ lyear | Before | After | Change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Consumer surplus | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |  | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs | 356,600 | 343,841 | -12759 | $-3.6 \%$ |
| Time costs | 285,895 | 311,916 | 26021 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Crash costs | 123,307 | 85,490 | $-37,817$ | $-30.7 \%$ |
| Air pollution costs | 18,763 | 18,124 | -640 | $-3.4 \%$ |
| Noise costs (not valued) | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 8 4 , 5 6 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 5 9 , 3 7 0}$ |  |  |
| Change |  |  |  |  |

H3. Summary of monetary impacts for each cruise speed

| kAS/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 343,841 | 353,249 | 367,159 | 383,878 | 407,163 | 432,722 | 460,672 | 490,067 | 520,831 | 552,899 | 586,208 | 620,704 | 656,333 |
| Time costs |  | 311,916 | 295,869 | 282,501 | 272,354 | 265,608 | 261,325 | 259,248 | 258,322 | 258,360 | 259,198 | 260,693 | 262,719 | 265,158 |
| Crash costs |  | 85,490 | 106,272 | 130,923 | 159,935 | 193,833 | 233,178 | 278,559 | 330,603 | 389,969 | 457,349 | 533,470 | 619,092 | 715,013 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 18,124 | 18,686 | 19,533 | 20,499 | 21,969 | 23,574 | 25,283 | 27,028 | 28,868 | 30,801 | 32,826 | 34,940 | 37,140 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 759,370 | 774,076 | 800,116 | 836,667 | 888,573 | 950,798 | 1,023,762 | 1,106,020 | 1,198,027 | 1,300,247 | 1,413,197 | 1,537,454 | 1,673,643 |
| of which: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy vehicles |  | 280,494 | 288,388 | 302,132 | 319,788 | 344,916 | 373,425 | 404,945 | 439,556 | 477,436 | 518,727 | 563,589 | 612,191 | 664,719 |
| Cars \& light comm. vehs. |  | 478,876 | 485,688 | 497,984 | 516,879 | 543,657 | 577,374 | 618,817 | 666,464 | 720,592 | 781,519 | 849,608 | 925,263 | 1,008,924 |

H4. Monetary impacts for cars and LCVs at each cruise speed

| kASlyear | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 159,745 | 163,257 | 167,423 | 172,558 | 179,251 | 186,866 | 195,743 | 204,941 | 214,391 | 224,027 | 233,792 | 243,627 | 253,481 |
| Time costs |  | 245,625 | 232,807 | 221,887 | 213,297 | 207,294 | 203,200 | 201,021 | 199,753 | 199,250 | 199,385 | 200,046 | 201,136 | 202,566 |
| Crash costs |  | 67,652 | 83,634 | 102,521 | 124,676 | 150,488 | 180,368 | 214,753 | 254,105 | 298,908 | 349,674 | 406,938 | 471,259 | 543,224 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 5,854 | 5,990 | 6,154 | 6,347 | 6,624 | 6,939 | 7,299 | 7,664 | 8,043 | 8,433 | 8,833 | 9,240 | 9,653 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 478,876 | 485,688 | 497,984 | 516,879 | 543,657 | 577,374 | 618,817 | 666,464 | 720,592 | 781,519 | 849,608 | 925,263 | 1,008,924 |

H5. Monetary impacts for heavy vehicles at each cruise speed

| S/year | km/h | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 90 | 95 | 100 | 105 | 110 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 130 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consumer surplus |  | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | (N. A.) | ( $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{A}$. | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) | (N. A.) |
| Vehicle operating costs |  | 184,095 | 189,991 | 199,737 | 211,320 | 227,911 | 245,855 | 264,929 | 285,125 | 306,440 | 328,871 | 352,417 | 377,076 | 402,852 |
| Time costs |  | 66,291 | 63,062 | 60,613 | 59,057 | 58,313 | 58,125 | 58,226 | 58,568 | 59,109 | 59,813 | 60,647 | 61,582 | 62,592 |
| Crash costs |  | 17,838 | 22,638 | 28,402 | 35,259 | 43,346 | 52,810 | 63,806 | 76,498 | 91,061 | 107,675 | 126,532 | 147,833 | 171,788 |
| Air pollution costs |  | 12,270 | 12,697 | 13,380 | 14,152 | 15,345 | 16,634 | 17,984 | 19,364 | 20,825 | 22,368 | 23,993 | 25,699 | 27,487 |
| Noise costs (not valued) |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 280,494 | 288,388 | 302,132 | 319,788 | 344,916 | 373,425 | 404,945 | 439,556 | 477,436 | 518,727 | 563,589 | 612,191 | 664,719 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ This analysis was based on 435 km of Motorways primarily centred around Auckland and Wellington and divided four-lane Expressway roads primarily located in north Waikato. It is important to note that this finding is based on "free-flow" speeds where traffic volumes allow. Higher traffic volumes around major centres would be unlikely to sustain such high speeds, particularly in peak periods.

[^1]:    Source: Economic Evaluation Manual (Volume 1) (NZTA 2010)

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ This analysis was based on 435 km of Motorways primarily centred around Auckland and Wellington and divided four-lane Expressway roads primarily located in north Waikato. It is important to note that this finding is based on "free-flow" speeds where traffic volumes allow. Higher traffic volumes around major centres would be unlikely to sustain such high speeds, particularly in peak periods.

[^3]:    冈 Vehicle operating costs
    

    | x | Accidents |
    | :--- | :--- |
    | x | Air pollution |
    |  |  |


    | x Air pollutio |
    | :--- |
    | Noise |

    - Noise

[^4]:    64 Report prepared by Max Cameron, PhD of Camcomp Partners Pty Ltd

