



MINUTES OF MEETING

Project: HEATCO - Harmonised Approaches for Transport Costing and Project Appraisal

Type meeting: Final WP-meeting	Meeting no.: Las Palmas - Gran Canaria	Date: 19 – 20 January -2006
Meeting Place: University of Las Palmas Gran Canaria (ULPGC)	Minutes taken by: Yngve Trædal	Next meeting:

Participants:

Alexander Gressmann,
Alistair Hunt
Alberto Longo
Ståle Navrud
Yngve Trædal
Raquel Espino
Carmelo Leon
Jorge Araña (Friday)

Initials:

Company:

University of Stuttgart, IER, Germany
University of Bath, UK
University of Bath, UK
SWECO Grøner, Norway
SWECO Grøner, Norway
ULPGC, Spain
ULPGC, Spain
ULPGC, Spain

Apologies:

Ferenc Meszaros
Rita Markovits-Somogyi
Adam Torok
Elisabet Idar Angelov

BUTE, Hungary
BUTE, Hungary
BUTE, Hungary
SIKA, Sweden

Distribution List:

HEATCO Website

SWECO GRØNER

Postboks 400
1327 LYSAKER
Telephone: 67 12 80 00
Fax: 67 12 58 40

Yngve Trædal

Direct Line: 67128080
Direct Fax: 67125840

SWECO Grøner AS

Reg. No.: NO-967 032 271 MVA
Member of the SWECO group
www.sweco.no
e-mail: yngve.tredal@sweco.no



THURSDAY 19 JANUARY

Welcome and round the table

Carmelo opened the meeting with welcoming all. Carmelo introduced Raquel to the group. She has organised the meeting and been the key person in carrying out the Spanish survey.

Status of WP5

Yngve started out informing the group about the situation of E-CO Tech being sold to the SWECO group. All email addresses and contact information will be changed (except for phone numbers) and will apply from 01.03.06. This will however not influence E-COs work in the project, and all members in the E-CO staff will continue in a similar division and work with the same projects in the new firm. Further information at about the new company is available at www.sweco.no.

Yngve informed about the work package status. Due to the delay of the German and Spanish survey results, a draft deliverable was submitted in mid October 1, 5 month later then the actual submitting date. This was done on advice from the consortium and the project coordinator, after a discussion at the last plenary Heatco meeting in Leeds 15 – 16 September 2005. Due to the missing results, first preliminary results were only drawn from a pooled analysis based on Hungary, Sweden, UK and Norway data. The Commission officially rejected the deliverable 28th of November 2005. The Commission requested that a final deliverable should be submitted due mid February where following comments should apply:

- The Spanish and German case studies should be included
- The presentation should be more user friendly, i.e. keeping in mind the policy makers and policies.
- The results of different countries should be compared and differences reasoned.
- A comparison of state of the art should be provided.

All comments were regarded reasonable, and will be included in the final version of deliverable four (D4). Yngve informed about the time scheme for the rest of the work. All data collection is completed, and the final deliverable should be submitted within time.

All presentations at this meeting will be collected at by Alexander, who will make all make them available at the HEATCO website (now completed).

Survey results Hungary

Yngve presented experiences from the Hungarian surveys, in Rita's absence including both the original case study, and the additional aircraft noise study based on Rita's and Adam's preparations. Alberto commented that some of the results were different from his draft findings for the Hungarian dataset, which will be checked in the final pooled analysis. Rita will prepare the results in a separate chapter in D4.

Survey results Germany

Alexander presented experiences from the German case study, focusing on evaluation of the process, experience from the focus group, pre-test and main survey, specific issues and remarks (availability of noise cards and software) and estimation of a L_{dn} value from day and night noise levels. The presentation is available at the HEATCO website.

Survey results Norway

Yngve presented the experiences and key figures from the Norwegian survey focusing on the sampling procedure and noise databases and maps. A study concerning socio-economic

neighbourhood factors, related to noise exposed areas was mentioned (Klæbo og Nordbakke (2005)). The study indicated that noise exposed areas often are related to negatively social, environmental and health standards. Hence, this could have a secondary effects influencing WTP in our survey.

Survey results Sweden

Yngve has spoken to Petter Hill at SIKI. Elisabet is on parental leave, but had however informed about her main comments for the Swedish survey. She stated that phone interviews might have worked better as data collection method. She also pointed out that she had found the time schedule somewhat tight, to be able to complete all interviews within time.

Survey results for UK

Alistair presented experiences from the UK survey. The survey sample was recruited by a survey company and employed out of short-list of three criteria. These were

- Sample size target of 1,100; over-recruit by 10%; final sample size of 1049
- Ideal: equal split between rural and urban
- Actual: selection criteria determined by:-
 - i) noise database availability;
 - ii) < 50 m from major road/rail line

Alistair presented also feedback from the Survey Company and which challenges he met combining noise databases with address lists.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Road

Alberto presented the very first preliminary results. The main preliminary conclusions were the following:

For road sample:

1. High number of respondents with WTP=0
2. High number of protesters in the UK (50%) and Norway (54.7%)
3. WTP depends
 - on annoyance levels in Sweden
 - on high levels of annoyance in the UK and Hungary on annoyance (but not different levels of annoyance) in Norway
4. Germany does not have significant positive WTP for noise annoyance reduction
5. Mixed results for Urban Vs Rural:
 - WTP for Urban is less than for Rural in UK, Sweden, Hungary.
6. Pooled results conforms with economic theory

For rail sample:

1. High number of WTP=0
2. Rail noise WTP < Road noise WTP, except for Germany
3. High number of protesters: UK 45%, Norway 56%, Hungary 38%, Germany 42%, Spain 35%
4. WTP depends
 - on annoyance levels in Germany
 - on high levels of annoyance in Norway
5. WTP does not depend on levels of annoyance in the UK, Hungary, Spain
6. Mixed results for Urban Vs Rural:
 - WTP for Urban is less than for Rural in Spain
 - WTP for Urban is more than for Rural in Germany
7. Pooled data confirm that WTP does not depend on annoyance levels

For the travel time survey:

- High number of respondents with WTP=0
- Many protesters in UK (43%) and Hungary (66%)
- WTP increases with time saving, as economic theory suggests
- Germany has low WTP compared to other countries

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The group decided to go for the least strict definition for protest answers to be excluded. Some questions were raised about the Hungarian average income data and the Spanish zero-answers. Yngve will check these questions. Surprisingly many German respondents did also state to be divorced.

The group discussed if the recommended WPTs should be presented directly linked to the decibel level, which in that case could create even greater deviations from expected results. Ståle suggested that the decibel levels should rather be presented as a function of the annoyance levels, in which the group agreed.

Ståle suggested that the report should calculate sample mean for each annoyance category for each country. A list of variables that have to be tested for correlations with wtp questions should be prepared. Ståle/Yngve will send out this the following week after the meeting.

The pooled data were more as expected regarding correlations between annoyance levels and WTP. Ståle pointed out that it is important to check for income effects and socio-economic factors.

It was concluded that the sampling procedure had been carried out successfully concerning the recruitment criteria and preferred sample distribution. Ståle highlighted that only the core results should be presented in the report, while other tables should be presented in the appendix.

Carmelo asked about how interesting it is to analyse a CV survey with such high degree of zero answers as we have experienced for the value of travel time questions. Ståle answered that many people were sceptical towards the high value used for travel time savings in CBAs today, and that the survey could bring new insight to the fact that many people do not value very low travel time savings. However, reasons for both positive and zero WTP-answers will be crucial to analyse for this survey.

Yngve/Ståle will distribute an action list for the group, which will include input to Alberto on which aspects he should include in his analysis.

USE OF RESULTS FROM WP5 IN OTHER WORK PACKAGES

Alistair presented aspects on the use of the WP5 survey results.

Noise chosen for valuation since was most pressing gap in transport CBA work identified in WP2 & WP3. Results feed into WP 4.1 and WP 4.4

- To test recommendations regarding benefit transfer procedures (WP 4.1) e.g. Re: income elasticities, cultural differences
- to enlarge the basis of consistent European values, both in terms of geography and content (WP 4.4) (Important trend in EU policy)

Results could also feed into WP 6 Case studies (Currently being undertaken). The survey could also be useful to obtain Methodological developments like;

- Use of noise level change to “not annoyed” level
- Relates objective measure (dB(A)) to subjective value (WTP)

One of the main uses will however be the aim of creating new national values for domestic project/policy applications

Ståle pointed out that the case studies have to be comprehensive with our results. We need annoyance levels (noise models) for the case studies. Alistair will check this issue with Peter.

FRIDAY 20TH OF JANUARY:

Ståle presented the draft outline of final report and topics for journal articles. Yngve will write up this draft and send it to the group the week after the meeting (first priority) and later include it in the minutes (will be finished when the deliverable is submitted).

Ståle suggested a draft outline for the deliverable, and the group decided on the following structure of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Chapter	Comments	Responsibility	Due
1. Decision makers summary	2 – 3 pages with main results and summary of constructed pooled EU-values	Ståle and Yngve (input from Alistair and Alberto)	08.02.06
2. Introduction	Background and aim	Ståle and Yngve	08.02.06
3. Selection of topics for valuation studies	Summary of position paper	Ståle and Yngve	08.02.06
4. Selection of valuation method	Scientific introduction to valuation approach	Ståle and Yngve	08.02.06
5. Construction of SP survey	Focus group, pre-test, final questionnaire, sampling procedure, data handling	Ståle and Yngve	08.02.06
6. Description of individual country samples	Number of observation for noise and time, statistics for selection of communities covered for urban and rural compared to average from national statistical offices	Alberto and Alistair (Information about national statistics received from all partners)	08.02.06
7. Main results	7.1: Main results (road noise, rail noise and VTTS) for each country and pooled analysis. Results presented in user friendly tables and bar-charts(details in appendix)	Alberto and Alistair	08.02.06
	7.2: Main results aircraft survey. Results presented in user friendly tables and bar-	Rita	08.02.06

	charts(details in appendix)		
	7.3: Regression models (also for showing validity and reliability of CV study)	Alberto and Alistair	08.02.06
	7.4: Generalisation / Transferability – EU values (This is basically the results from the pooled sample. Put up values based on different assumptions)	Alberto and Alistair (Input from Ståle and Yngve)	08.02.06
8. Comparison with previous studies	8.1: Road and rail noise	Ståle and Yngve	08.02.06
	8.2: Value of Travel Time Savings (VTTS)	Ståle and Yngve (input from Raquel)	08.02.06
9. Conclusions and recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish average EU values Policy use of EU values vs. national values 	Alberto and Alistair (input from Ståle and Yngve)	08.02.06
Appendix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WTP distributions for individual countries for road, rail and aircraft noise and VTTS Final questionnaire (in English) and cards used (incl. all payment cards in all countries) Econometric modelling and descriptive statistics 	Alberto and Alistair (input from Ståle and Yngve)	08.02.06

The following action list of immediate tasks was also suggested:

IMMEDIATE TASKS:

Task	Due	Responsibility	Check
Check relation between L_{den} and L_{night} , and inform Alistair	ASAP	Yngve	
Check payment cards for Sweden (noise annoyance) and Spain (VTTS) and inform Alberto	ASAP	Yngve and Raquel	
Prepare a list of variables that have to be tested for relevance for regression models	ASAP	Ståle and Yngve – comments from all	
Check if VTTS data is only from the Canary Island, and inform Alberto	ASAP	Raquel	
Statistical analyse: Income elasticity for noise annoyance and VTTS	ASAP	Alberto	

Check with Peter that the case studies are comprehensive with our results. Hence, noise annoyance levels (noise models) for the case studies should be available, making use of survey results possible.	ASAP	Alistair	
Find country information from your national statistical office for socio-economic variables, and email Alberto Areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country level (for your respective country) • Urban level (choose 2 - 3 (larger) cities included in your sample) • Rural level (choose 2 - 3 rural counties included in your sample) Data needed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year of the data • Personal income from net or gross income (with tax level) • Number of inhabitants • Gender • Education level (% University degree) • Unemployment rate • Age • Martial status 	03.02.06	All teams	
Draft D4 circulated within group for comments	10.02.06	Ståle and Yngve	
Final D4 submitted	17.02.06	Ståle and Yngve	

PUBLICATIONS:

The group discussed topics for potential papers, completed after the final HEATCO-deliverable is submitted. It was agreed that one main paper for road and rail noise should be the first one published, followed by analysis of the national data. A list of possible topics for papers will be passed around and included in the later minutes (see below). Ståle highlighted the importance of always citing the project name, contract number and acknowledge financial support. All WP5-partners should be acknowledged in the two first papers, while this is not required for the later publications. 1 and 2 should preferably be completed before the end of the project. Yngve will make a time table for the papers.

TOPICS FOR PAPERS:

	Name	Due	Assign for main author or contributor
1.	MAIN PAPER: ROAD AND RAIL NOISE - POOLED ANALYSIS AND TRANSFER TESTS	MAY 2006	
2.	MAIN PAPER: VTTS - POOLED ANALYSIS AND TRANSFER TESTS	MAY 2006	
3.	PAPERS BASED ON NATIONAL DATA (PUBLISHED AFTER 1 AND 2, AND MAKE REF. TO 1 AND 2)	DECEMBER 2006	
4.	DOSE-RESPONSE FUNCTIONS NOISE LEVELS AND ANNOYANCE (NEED TO SORT OUT LEQ VS. LDEN)	DECEMBER 2006	
5.	VTTS – COMPARE CV-STUDY (VALUED AFTER NOISE WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES USING CE IN INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES)	DECEMBER 2006	
6.	HETEROGENEITY IN PREFERENCES – MIXED MODELS	DECEMBER 2006	
7.	PROTEST BEHAVIOUR IN CV-STUDIES OF NOISE. WHAT EXPLAINS PROTEST BEHAVIOURS AND HOW TO TREAT PROTEST RESPONSES	DECEMBER 2006	
8.	BAYESIAN ANALYSIS; OUT-OF-SAMPLE EXTRAPOLATION	DECEMBER 2006	
9.	COMPARISON OF HP RESULTS VS. CV FOR NOISE IN BIRMINGHAM	DECEMBER 2006	

Deadlines: February 10th is the deadline for the draft report. This version will be circulated between partners for comments. The final version should be submitted 15th of February 2006.