A Call for Action: 10 key measures to get more people cycling more often in Europe

ECF Manifesto for the European Parliament election 2014 – Long version

ECF gratefully acknowledges financial support from the European commission. Nevertheless the sole responsibility of this publication lies with the author. The European Union is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Rue Franklin, 28 1000 Brussels, Belgium Phone: +32 2 880 92 74 Fax: +32 2 880 92 75
www.ecf.com

Introduction

This ECF manifesto has been published on the occasion of the European Parliament elections in May 2014. It lists 10 areas where ECF recommends that EU institutions take decisive action within the next European Parliament term 2014 – 2019. A summary table can be found at the end of this manifesto.

Why cycling? Because it just makes sense!

Cycling produces a long list of environmental, economic and social co-benefits. Some of these co-benefits can be quantified in monetary terms, and the figures are impressive: the benefits linked to cycling are more than €200bn a year for the EU.[1] That is more than the annual Danish Gross Domestic Product. What's more: the average Benefit-Cost-Ratio (BCR) of cycling investments is very high compared to other transport infrastructure investments.[2] This is good news for authorities in times of tight budgets.

But cycling is more than that. Aside from the financial figures, cycling just makes sense! Many towns and cities in Europe are set to continue to grow, putting additional pressure on scarce resources – public space, road space, parking facilities – in our urban centres. Here the bicycle is second to none compared to all other transport modes: quick and reliable, accessible, equitable, affordable, space-efficient, healthy and environmentally friendly, all at the same time. With the increasing popularity of pedelecs, cargo bikes and better cycle infrastructure, distances of 20km and more become a realistic commuter distance by bike. Regarding freight transport, CycleLogistics, an EU-funded project, has found that up to 50 % of all small goods within cities could be moved by bicycles. The potential for modal shift is tremendous!

No wonder thousands of European cities – big and small – have rediscovered the bicycle. While historically it has been student towns that have been successful cycling cities for obvious reasons, including in countries that typically are not associated with a strong daily cycling culture, it's the 'giants' that have woken up over the past few years: London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Budapest… Even Madrid, a traffic-choked city par excellence, has recently announced a major plan to overhaul the city centre and reclaim space for pedestrians, cyclists and public transportation.[3] The transport paradigm of the 'car first' is a paradigm of the past. Forward-looking cities that want to make sure they are economically successful and liveable in the future, all embrace cycling.

About 250 million Europeans do cycle, thereof 61 million "at least once a day", 86 million "a few times a week", and 101 million "a few times a month or less often".[4] ECF's central mission is to get more people cycling more often. By 2020, we want to see a doubling of cycling in Europe to a 15 % mode share[5], using 2010 as a baseline. [6]

Implementing the actions in the 10 key areas ECF is recommending will make an important contribution in achieving this objective.

---

[1] Read further on in section on "Bigger than Denmark: Economic benefits of cycling in the EU-27."

[2] The UK Department of Health in 2010 concluded that "…the economic justification for investments to facilitate cycling and walking has been undervalued or not even considered in public policy decision-making. Yet, almost all of the studies report economic benefits which are highly significant, with benefit to cost ratios averaging 13:1 (UK and non- UK)." 4 In comparison, UK government guidance on the evaluation of major projects says that a 'medium' value-for-money project will have a BCR of between 1.5 – 2, and a 'high' value-for money project a BCR of at least 2.5 http://assets.dft.gov.uk/publications/value-for-money-assessments-guidance/vfmguidance.pdf

[3] http://eltis.org/index.php?ID1=5&id=8&home=1&news_id=4433

[4] Special Barometer 406: http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/doc/ump/flash-eurobarometer-ump-2013.pdf

[5] ECF Vision 2020, adopted at the ECF Annual General Meeting in Vienna, March 30, 2012. http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/121004_ECF-Vision-2020_final_version_agm_vienna_2012.pdf

[6] Eurobarometer 312: Future of Transport. Analytical report (2011) 30, Brussels http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_312_en.pdf

Co-benefits of cycling

The bicycle is more than just a means of transportation. It can be part of the solution to many societal challenges, be they environmental, economic or social.

Environmental:

- Cycling is a (virtually) CO2-free means of transportation. ECF published in 2011 a study "Cycling more often to cool down the planet: quantifying CO2 savings of cycling", estimating that a doubling of cycling from 2010 to 2020 would save up to 24 million tons of CO2e.[7] The ECF report is backed up by a comprehensive analysis on the "Potential of Cycling to Reduce Emissions in Road Transport"[8] which was done in Germany, in the context of their 2nd National Master Plan Cycling.
- A modal shift to silent means of transportation such as cycling can help to meet EU air quality and noise standards.
- A 4m wide street (or lane) can handle 7 times more bicycles than cars. A modal shift can reduce transport's land-use consumption.
- A bicycle weighs on average about 19.9 kg, compared to 1,100 kg - 1,600 kg for a car[9]. A modal shift can reduce waste considerably.

Economic:

- Daily cycling by individuals allows them to meet WHO minimum requirements for physical activity, thus contributing to EU's goals for citizens' health and well-being. The direct health benefits of cycling are in the region of €0.30 and €1.30 per km cycled, applying the WHO Health Economic Assessment Tool for Cycling[10]. This sums up to well over €110bn annually, as explained further on. These are considerable individual savings but also savings for the national health care systems of the EU Member States. EU businesses would also greatly thrive from the higher productivity and less absenteeism of increased numbers of daily cyclists compared to non-cyclists.[11]
- A modal shift to cycling reduces urban congestion.[12]
- Cycle tourism is a dynamic business, with an annual turnover of 44bn Euro in the EU.[13]
- A study from the German Environment Agency has estimated that a modal shift to sustainable transport modes will contribute to higher economic growth (against a BAU modal) and to the creation of more jobs than potentially being lost in the automotive industry.[14]

---

[7] Blondel, Benoit et al (2011): Cycling more often to cool down the planet: quantifying CO2 savings of cycling. ECF, Brussels http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/ECF_BROCHURE_EN_planche.pdf

[8] Gerd-Axel Ahrens et al (2013): Potential of Cycling to Reduce Emissions in Road Transport. Study commissioned by the Federal Environment Agency, Germany.

[9] Blondel (2011).

[10] WHO. Health Economic Assessment tool for cycling http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org/

[11] Hendriksen, Ingrid: Reduced sickness absence in regular commuter cyclists (2009). TNO Quality of Life. Prevention and healthcare, Leiden http://www.vcl.li/bilder/518.pdf

[12] Europe's Most Congested Cities Don't Cycle: ECF News watch http://www.ecf.com/news/europes-most-congested-cities-dont-cycle-ecf-newswatch/

[13] Bigger than Denmark: Economic benefits of cycling (2013). European Cyclists Federation, Brussels http://www.ecf.com/news/bigger-than-denmark-economic-benefits-of-cycling-in-the-eu-27/

- The EU road transport sector is highly dependent on oil (nearly 100%).[15] A growing share of EU oil consumption is to be imported from outside the EU[16], and increasingly from geopolitically instable regions. In 2011, the EU spent at some point more than €1bn a day on oil imports.[17] Cycling cuts the oil bill considerably, thereby contributing to EU energy efficiency objectives and underpinning EU citizen's purchasing power.

Social:

- Cycling is affordable for everyone. Figures taken from Germany in 2009 show that the average sales price of a bicycle was €446, the average catalogue price of a new car was €21.430 Euro.[18] Cycling contributes to equity and social cohesion.
- Cycling can provide for independent mobility needs and ensure accessibility for a very large part of the population, including children (e.g. cycling to school) and elderly. A transport system based on car mobility is not properly taking their needs into account.
- High volumes of cars and high vehicle speeds increase the perception of unsafe roads. Cycling is a much less intrusive mode of transportation. Since motorization, children have lost a great deal of independent mobility and the freedom to play outside. This in turn contributes to long term physical, mental and social ills.
- In many European cities, the public realm is still dominated by motorized transport. Main road arteries are in fact physical barriers in residential neighborhoods, reducing the mobility of residents and social interaction. In streets with high volumes of cars, social interaction is at a much lower level compared to traffic-calmed neighborhoods.

[14] Claus et al. Economic aspects of non-technical measures to reduce traffic emissions (2013). Study commissioned by the Federal Environmental Agency, Germany
http://www.umweltbundesamt.de/sites/default/files/medien/461/publikationen/texte_11_2013_summary1.pdf
[15] Report of the European Expert Group on Future Transport Fuels (2011)
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/cts/doc/2011-01-25-future-transport-fuels-report.pdf
[16] Eurostat: Energy production and imports
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/statistics_explained/index.php/Energy_production_and_imports
[17] BBC http://www.bbc.co.uk/democracylive/21142595
[18] ECF News.
http://www.ecf.com/news/ever-considered-buying-a-bike-with-a-golden-handlebar-cycling-is-a-luxury-activity-says-the-european-automobile-manufacturer%e2%80%99s-association-acea/

Bigger than Denmark: The economic benefits of cycling in the EU

In 2013, ECF published a report with a calculation of the economic benefits of cycling in the EU-27[19]. We came to the conclusion that the total benefit of the level of cycling can be estimated to be in the region of € 205.2 – 217.3bn.

Table 1: Internal and external economic benefits of cycling at 7.4 % cycling mode share in EU-27 (2010)

Type of benefit	In € for 2010
1 Health benefits: reduced mortality	€ 114 – 121 bn
2 Congestion-easing	€ 24.2 bn
3 Fuel savings at US$ 100/ barrel	€ 2.7 – 5.8 bn
4 Reduced CO2 emission	€ 1.4 – 3.0 bn
5 Reduced air pollution	€ 0.9 bn
6 Reduced noise pollution	€ 0.3 bn
Total	**€ 143.2 – 155.2 bn**

Aside from the direct benefits of cycling, Table 2 shows to what extent the tourism industry as well as the bicycle industry benefits from cycling.

Table 2: Annual economic impact on European businesses related to cycling in EU-27

Type of industry	In € for 2010/2011
1 Tourism industry	€ 44 bn
2 Bicycle industry	€ 18 bn
Total	**€ 62 bn**

[19] ECF (2013): Bigger than Denmark: Economic benefits of cycling in the EU-27. http://www.ecf.com/news/bigger-than-denmark-economic-benefits-of-cycling-in-the-eu-27/ and http://www.ecf.com/news/bigger-than-denmark-economic-benefits-of-cycling-in-the-eu-27/

The European Parliament in 2014 – 2019: ECF recommended action in 10 key areas

1. EU funds for cycle projects

ECF recommendation: During the current EU Financial period 2014 – 2020, €6 billion, i.e. 10 % of all EU transport budgets, should be earmarked for cycling.

Justification:

Better provisions for cycling will encourage more people to cycle more often and all the associated benefits that come with that. ECF believes therefore that 10% of all transport budgets should be earmarked for cycling. In the EU, this would translate into €6bn investments for cycle projects for the period 2014 - 2019.

During the previous EU Financial period (2007 – 2013), approximately €600m was earmarked for cycling infrastructure from its €82bn fund for transport infrastructure. This is a tiny 0.7 % of EU co-funding. Further, the co-funding rule causes a multiplier effect in that this money leverages greater national investment. In other words, current European transport funding policy in itself favours less sustainable projects, and stimulates a similar investment policy by the Member States.

To ensure that adequate funding for sustainable transportation is made available in the years to come, ECF is targeting the EU to spend €6bn on cycling projects during the new financial period through the relevant European funding programmes, such as the European Regional Development Fund, Cohesion Fund, European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the Connecting Europe Facility.

Potential cycling schemes that could be co-financed by the EU broadly fit into the following categories:

- Development of European, national, regional and local cycling route networks;
- Bicycle parking and storage;
- Campaigning, promotion and education;
- Services for cyclists;
- Public Bicycle Sharing Systems;
- Monitoring, usage monitoring and impact assessment.

Here you can read more about ECF's €6bn campaign: http://www.ecf.com/advocary/eu-funding-2/how-you-can-help-get-e6-billion-for-cycling/

2. Support EuroVelo, the European cycle route network

ECF recommendations:
- Complete EuroVelo by 2020
- Secure TEN-T funding for EuroVelo routes
- The EU should provide financial and technical assistance for the coordination, promotion and communication of the network on the European level

Justification:

EuroVelo, the European cycle route network, is a network of 14 long-distance cycle routes that connect the entire continent. Wherever possible the routes are based on existing or planned national routes and the aim therefore is to connect these existing national routes across borders and fill in the missing sections where they do not currently exist. It is estimated that approximately 45,000 km are already in place but when complete the entire network will total over 70,000 km. EuroVelo routes do not necessarily need to be located on separated cycle infrastructure. Under the right conditions (low traffic speeds and volumes) it is often acceptable to sign the routes on public roads. Indeed, over 70% of the network is currently located on public roads and only 14% consists of separated bicycle paths or lanes.

EuroVelo is coordinated on the European level by ECF with a network of National EuroVelo Coordination Centres organising the realisation of the routes at a national level. These organisations are working together to complete the network by 2020. The EuroVelo routes provide key connections between and within urban areas, as well as proving vital transport links in rural areas. In addition to the mobility benefits, cycle tourism is a booming business and strongly supports rural and regional economies. According to a study commissioned by the European Parliament in 2012, the total estimated economic impact of the EuroVelo Network when complete will be almost €7 billion direct revenue annually.[20]

Completing the network

In 2013, references to EuroVelo were included in the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T) Guidelines providing an opportunity to fund EuroVelo routes where they connect with parts of the core and comprehensive network. The wording stopped short of the full integration of EuroVelo network into the TEN-T; however, there remains a need to secure funding to complete the final sections of the network. The completion of EuroVelo would considerably improve the mobility of European citizens, in a sustainable, energy-efficient and environmentally-friendly manner.

Central coordination and promotion

Some EU countries have integrated the EuroVelo network into their official transport network; allocated significant financial resources for cycling infrastructure; and provided coordination between their transport development agency, relevant NGOs and local governments. At a European level though, the network is still coordinated by an NGO. ECF therefore calls on the EU to take a more active role by providing financial and technical assistance for the coordination, promotion and communication of the network at the European level.

For more information about EuroVelo, the European cycle route network, ECF has created two websites: www.EuroVelo.org for professionals working on the routes and www.EuroVelo.com for the public.

[20] The European cycle route network EuroVelo, 2012. http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/studiesdownload.pdf

3. Safer motorised vehicles for pedestrians and cyclists

ECF recommendations:

- Recommend Member States to make 30 km/h rather than 50 km/h the default speed limit in built-up areas
- Fit commercial vehicles with Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA), rather than the current speed limiters, and all new cars with at least a warning ISA; eventually fit all cars with active ISA
- Improve the cabin design of heavy goods vehicles

Justification:

30 km/h default speed limit

The default road speed in European built-up urban areas is limited to 50 km/h. This is based on the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic from 1968. However, many towns and cities in Europe have introduced 30km/h speed limits throughout large parts of their road network as a measure to increase road safety and improve liveability in residential neighbourhoods. ECF thinks it is time that this 30km/h default speed was introduced throughout Europe.

About half of all fatal accidents in urban areas involve pedestrians and cyclists.[21] Speeding is the main killer, contributing to as much as one third of all fatal accidents.[22] Recent analysis of cycle deaths in London[23] found that virtually all fatal collisions occurred on roads with a speed limit of 48km/h (30mph) or higher. Reducing speeds of motor vehicles in urban areas is crucial in getting more people to use bicycles. Not only does this decrease the real danger but it also decreases the perceived danger that novice or those interested in taking up cycling feel.

Results from a study by the Norwegian Institute of Transport Economics[24] have also shown that "…there is a strong statistical association between speed and road safety. As an example, it can be estimated that a 10% reduction in the mean speed of traffic will result in a 37.8% reduction of the number of fatalities." To put this in perspective it was estimated that a 10% reduction in 'Exposure to darkness' and 'Drink-driving' gives a reduction in fatalities of 1.7% and 1.0% respectively.

The European Parliament has already supported 30 km/h. In its Road Safety Resolution it called for "…the responsible authorities to introduce speed limits of 30 km/h in residential areas and on all one-lane roads in urban areas which have no separate cycle lane, with a view to protecting vulnerable road users more effectively."[25]

---

[21] European Commission Staff Working Document, Targeted action on urban road safety, SWD(2013) 525 final.
[22] ETSC, Managing Speed: Towards Safe and Sustainable Road Transport, 2008. http://www.etsc.eu/documents/Managing%20Speed%20Towards%20Safe%20and%20Sustainable%20Road%20Transport.pdf
[23] Analysis of police collision files for pedal cyclists in London, 2001 – 2006, TFL http://www.trl.co.uk/online_store/reports_publications/trl_reports/cat_road_user_safety/report_analysis_of_police_collision_files_for_pedal_cyclists_in_london_2001___2006.htm
[24] Elvik, R et al (2004) Speed and road accidents: an evaluation of the Power Model
[25] European Parliament Report on European road safety 2011-2020 (2010/2235(INI)) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A7-2011-0264+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN

Enforcing speed limits with Intelligent Speed Assistance

However, introducing a 30 km/h speed limit in itself is not sufficient; it also has to be properly enforced. The European Transport Safety Council (ETSC) found that as many as 80% of drivers exceed speed limits in urban areas[26]. They claim that if average driving speeds dropped by only 1 km/h on all roads across the EU, more than 2,200 road deaths could be prevented each year. ECF believes that Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA) can play a crucial role in bringing speed limits under control across Europe. ISA can either warn the driver that the car is travelling faster than the given speed limit or actually physically limit the car to the local speed limit, street by street. We would like to see commercial vehicles fitted with ISA (rather than the current speed limiters), and all new vehicles fitted with at least a warning ISA, while eventually being fitted with active ISA that limits the car's speed.

Safer lorries

Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) make up 3% of the European vehicle fleet and 7% of driven kilometres, yet they are involved in 18% of fatal accidents, costing over 7000 lives across the EU in 2008[27]. In 2011, the European Parliament adopted Written Declaration 81 on heavy goods vehicle collisions, calling, among other things, for higher safety standards of HGVs.[28] The vast majority of trucks are designed to maximise the load space that can be achieved within the legally permitted maximum dimensions. These dimensions are laid down in Directive 96/53 which is currently under review for amendment. This means that the 'brick' shaped cab above the engine is virtually universal across the EU. ECF believes that the current dimensions play a part in the serious cycling injuries and fatalities that we see on European roads. There are many safety problems with the current lorry dimensions including

- The lack of direct vision at the front and front/side of the cab because of the poor shape, the high position of the cab and lack of sensible windscreen and side door coverage;
- The box shape tends to knock cyclists/pedestrians over and then into the path of the wheels rather than deflecting away from the vehicle;
- There are no absorption qualities at the front of the HGV for impacts with other road users;

In order to bring about safer designs of HGVs with respect to unprotected road users we would like to see the amendment of Directive 96/53 accommodate

- Better direct vision from the cab;
- A better, lower seated position for the driver;
- A safer shape for physical collision with unprotected road user deflection;
- There should also be work towards direct vision requirements for HGVs at UNECE for all EU HGVs; related to this we would also like to see some change with how the front and side windows are placed, positioned and sized.

Picture: Example from Mercedes Benz

[26] http://www.etsc.eu/documents/ETSC_2011_PIN_Report.PDF and http://www.etsc.eu/documents/05.05%20-%20PIN%20Flash%2016.pdf
[27] TRL 2010 for EC DG Enterprise and Industry
[28] http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7_TA(2011)0102&language=EN

4. A level playing-field for cycling with other transport modes

ECF recommendations:

- The EU should issue strong recommendations to Member States calling for cycling to have a level playing-field with other transport modes in financial incentives and other support for home-work travel
- The EU should allow Member States to introduce a reduced VAT rate on bicycle sales

Justification:

The European Commission finds that "many European towns and cities suffer from chronic traffic congestion which is estimated to cost 80 billion Euros annually."[29] Peak hours are particularly affected by congestion. As a means of addressing the issue, a number of EU Member States have therefore introduced in recent years fiscal incentives for commuting to work by bicycle such as km allowance and company bicycles. Additionally, schemes for employers have been set up, such as the possibility to deduct fiscally investments in company bicycles, parking facilities, showers, etc.

As welcome as financial incentives for cycling to work may be to individuals, at a macro-economic level these schemes are negligible compared to company car support. One figure illustrates the scale of the phenomenon of company cars in Europe: Company cars account for roughly 50 % of all new car sales in the EU. Company Car Taxation[30], a paper commissioned by European Commission's DG TAXUD, concludes: "It encourages car ownership and affects the choice of car model, as well as driving habits, and in this way aggravates the environmental problems caused by the transport sector. In fact, evidence from Belgium and the Netherlands suggests that pure business use represents only 20-30 % of company car use, the rest being private use."[31]

Other key findings of the Company Car Taxation paper are:

- Under-taxation of company cars is the norm in the EU: therefore direct revenue losses may approach 0.5 % of GDP (=€54bn for the EU);
- Welfare losses from distortions of consumer choices equal to 0.1 to 0.3 % of GDP (€12 – 37bn);
- Fuel consumption is up by 4 to 8 %.

"The considerable tax losses, distortions in consumer choices and adverse impact on the environment make company car taxation an evident candidate for a reform."[32] The European Commission's White Paper on Transport drew a similar conclusion.[33]

---

[29] European Commission, Together towards competitive and resource-efficient urban mobility, COM(2013) 913 final.
[30] Naess-Schmidt, Sigurd. Winiarczyk, Marcin. Company Car Taxation: subsidies, welfare and environment. Working paper 22 (2010). Taxation papers, Copenhagen Economics for DG Taxaud, European Commission, Brussels http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/resources/documents/taxation/gen_info/economic_analysis/tax_papers/taxation_paper_22_en.pdf
[31] ibd
[32] ibd
[33] White Paper: Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area – Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system COM (2011) 144 final. European Commission, Brussels http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/strategies/2011_white_paper_en.htm: White Paper on Transport has stated as objective 39 on "Smart pricing and taxation", Phase I (up to 2016): Revise company car taxation to eliminate distortions and favor the deployment of clean vehicles.

A way of reforming the current system would be to introduce a *mobility budget* for all employees, regardless of the mode of transport and distance to be covered from home to work. A Belgian pilot project commissioned by the Flemish Ministry of Transportation arrived at the conclusion that "mobility budget works": commuting by car was down from 80 % to 50 %; cycling up from 10 % to 22%; use of public transport up from 8 % to 24 %. In its policy recommendations the authors advise to change the tax system: reduce labour taxes while increasing taxes in consumption; remove all fiscal incentives for work-home travel altogether, or, alternatively, pay a given amount to every employee regardless of mode of transport, combined with road charging for internalizing the external costs.[34]

As part of the European Semester[35], the Council gives annual Country Specific Recommendations to Member States based on the European Commission's review of each Member State's economic and social performance. The ECF would like the European Semester to make recommendations on reviewing their fiscal schemes in home-work travel.

Reduced VAT for bicycle sales

EU law already stipulates that Member States can introduce reduced rates of Value Added Tax (VAT) on minor repairs of bicycles.[36] Given the tremendous co-benefits of cycling, the purchase of a bicycle should be stimulated by allowing Member States to charge a reduced VAT rate on bicycle sales. This is a principle of fairness, in particular in countries where authorities support fiscally the sale of less polluting cars or e-cars.

[34] Christiaens, Jan. De Witte, Freek. Vanderbeuren, Roel. Mobiliteits Budget Werk (2013). Bond Beter Leefmilieu. http://www.bondbeterleefmilieu.be/dl.php/403/1/.pdf

[35] http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/making-it-happen/index_en.htm

[36] Council Directive 2009/47/EC amending of 5 May 2009 amending Directive 2006/112/EC as regards reduced rates of value added tax

5. Better air quality in Europe

ECF recommendation:

- Adopt stricter air quality standards in the EU based on WHO guidelines;
- Improve the knowledge base of links between transport modal split and ambient air quality;
- Analyse systematically what contribution investments in cycling projects can make in meeting air quality standards;
- Prioritise active mobility over individual motorized transportation in towns and cities;
- Make motorised vehicles as clean as possible.

Justification:

Poor air quality is having a huge toll on the health of European citizens. The European Commission estimates that "air pollution caused over 400 000 premature deaths in 2010. The external costs were between €330-940 billion per year in 2010. Among these are significant direct impacts on the economy: 100 million lost workdays each year, with a direct cost of about €15 billion in lost productivity. Bad air also adds €4 billion to our healthcare costs because of hospitalisation." [37]

Despite this huge toll, emission limits set by European air quality legislation are often not being respected, mainly due to a lack of law enforcement and because legislation does not protect human health in a way it should be.

New evidence from the World Health Organisation (WHO) shows that the effects of air pollutants are much worse than originally thought. Diesel engine exhaust causes lung cancer, the WHO concluded in 2012.[38] The problem is particularly urgent in urban areas, where most people live and where 90 % of inhabitants are exposed to one of the most damaging air pollutants at levels deemed harmful to health by the WHO.[39] (Ultra)fine particles and ozone are in particular dangerous to human health.

ECF therefore wants the EU to strengthen its ambient air limits by aligning the Ambient Air Quality directive (AAQD) with the WHO guidelines on air pollutants. In order to meet the standards, Europe must be ambitious and make sure that in particular motorised vehicles driving in urban settings – powered two- and three wheelers, cars, vans, trucks – are as clean as possible, not only during type approval, but also in real life.

However, technology alone will not solve the problem, certainly not in the short-run. Therefore in particular local authorities are asked in prioritising active mobility (walking and cycling) over individual motorised transportation, supported by regional, national and European authorities. Air quality measurements during the European Mobility Week have shown that air quality can improve significantly when motorised transport is restricted, in particular during car-free days. The EU should therefore support research on establishing links between the transport modal split and ambient air quality in general and the impact of specific investments in cycle projects (bike networks, bike-sharing schemes, etc) on improving local air quality in particular.

---

[37] http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-822_en.htm

[38] International Agency for Research on Cancer, *Diesel Engine Exhaust Carcinogenic*, 2012. http://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/pr/2012/pdfs/pr213_E.pdf

[39] European Environmental Agency, *Air quality in Europe,* 2013 http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/air-quality-in-europe-2013

6. Transport and health: The benefits of cycling in health policy and the health dimension in transport appraisal

ECF recommendations:

- The EU should recommend that Member States integrate the benefits of cycling in health policy
- The EU should recommend that Member States integrate the public health dimension into transport appraisal
- If the EU is to co-fund transport projects, the health dimension should be included in transport appraisal

Justification:

Transport and public health are intricately linked. Lack of physical activity is the greatest risk for major lifestyle diseases and the most important cost driver for European health care systems. Active mobility can reduce these costs considerably as prevention is much cheaper than treatment. Similar, cost-benefit analysis in transport appraisal has shown that investing in cycling delivers higher benefit-cost ratios than investing in individual motorised transport, mainly due to the health benefits of cycling.

The benefits of cycling in health policy

The World Health Organisation (WHO) recommends that adults have "at least 150 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity throughout the week or at least 75 minutes of vigorous activity or an equivalent combination of moderate and vigorous activity"[40] for a number of physical and mental health reasons. However, over two thirds of the adult population (69%) of the European Union does not meet the minimum requirements[41]. Motorized (=passive) mobility is a key reason why minimum levels of physical activity are not met by a substantial part of the population. The lack of physical activity is the biggest risk for non-communicable chronic diseases and the most important cost driver for European health care systems. Yearly costs for Type 2 Diabetes and obesity are around €50bn in Germany alone. Active mobility can reduce these costs considerably: Prevention is much cheaper than treatment!

There are several ways for the health sector to stimulate daily cycling:

- Health insurance schemes could offer discounts to those members who maintain a healthy life-style, e.g. through daily cycling;
- Health insurance and transport departments should invest in cycling infrastructure and promotion projects. This could take the form of a nationwide investment fund which is used to co-fund local and regional cycle projects. This would address the dilemma where health benefits are reaped by the national health care system while the local and regional authorities are the main investors in cycling infrastructure.

The health dimension in transport appraisal

Environmental Impact Assessment (EU Directive 2011/92/EU) as well as Strategic Environmental Assessment (EU Directive 2001/42/EC) require the valuation of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. National laws complement these two EU Directives.

[40] http://www.euro.who.int/en/what-we-do/health-topics/disease-prevention/physical-activity/facts-and-figures/physical-activity-tostay-healthy

[41] European Commission (2010). Sport and Physical Activity: Special Eurobarometer 334 / Wave 72.3 – TNS Opinion & Social. http://ec.europa.eu/sport/news/eu-physical-activity-guidelines_en.htm (Accessed December 2011). And E.g. Techniker Krankenkasse, Beweg Dich, Deutschland, 2013. http://www.tk.de/tk/aktionen/jahr-der-gesundheit/tkbewegungsstudie/571006;

ECF proposes to include the health dimension (through Health Impact Assessment) into transport appraisal as well. Using the WHO Health Assessment Tool (HEAT) for Cycling, ECF has calculated that health benefits of cycling in the EU are between €114 – 121bn in reduced mortality costs only. Cost-benefit analysis shows that cycling investments generate much higher benefit-cost ratios than providing for motorised transport. ECF concludes that if the health dimension was systematically included in transport appraisal, investments in cycle projects, e.g. cycle highways, would be favoured over motorised transport projects. The EU should therefore recommend that Member States integrate the public health dimension into transport appraisal. If the EU is to co-fund transport projects in Member States, the health dimension must be included in transport appraisal.

Case study from the City of Copenhagen:

On behalf of the City of Copenhagen, COWI carried out cost-benefit analyses for two specific cycle infrastructure projects. The results of the two case studies show that bicycle projects are likely to yield a positive economic return for society. The bicycle projects gave rates of return of 8% and 33% respectively.[42] The table below shows average costs per kilometer for cycling, compared to car transportation.

	Cycling (16 km/h)			For reference: Car (50 km/h) in city			
	Inter-nalized	External	Total	Inter-nalized	External	Duties	Total
Time costs (travel time, non-work)	5.00	0	5.00	1.60	0	0	1.60
Vehicle operating costs	0.33	0	0.33	2.20	0	-1.18	1.02
Prolonged life	-2.66	0.06	-2.59	0	0	0	0
Health	-1.11	-1.80	-2.91	0	0	0	0
Accidents	0.25	0.54	0.78	0	0.22	0	0.22
Perceived safety	*+ (?)*	*0*	*+ (?)*	?	?	0	?
Discomfort	*?*	*0*	*?*	?	?	0	?
Branding/tourism	0	-0.02	-0.02	?	?	0	?
Air pollution	0	0	0	0	0.03	0	0.03
Climate changes	0	0	0	0	0.04	0	0.04
Noise	0	0	0	0	0.36	0	0.36
Road deterioration	0	0	0	0	0.01	0	0.01
Congestion	0	0	0	0	0.46	0	0.46
Total	1.81	-1.22	0.60	3.80	1.13	-1.18	3.74

Table 3: Average costs per kilometre for cycling, DKK, 2008 prices. From: City of Copenhagen (2010), Economic evaluation of cycle projects.

[42] COWI (commissioned by City of Copenhagen) (2010), Economic evaluation of cycle projects - methodology and unit prices.
http://www.fietsberaad.nl/library/repository/bestanden/Economic%20evaluation%20of%20cycle%20projects.pdf

7. Cycling fully integrated in the multi-modal transport system

ECF recommendations:

- If the EU funds multi-modal journey planners and integrated ticketing systems, cycling must be part of it;
- On long-distance national and international train journeys, the carriage of complete bicycles should be allowed on all services.

Justification:

21st century Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) have given a strong boost to the sharing economy. More and more people are asking themselves: why have your own car when you only use it occasionally? Although bike- and car-sharing systems have been around for over 40 years, the last 10 years has seen the development of a new generation of schemes that have revolutionised urban transportation networks. In many major cities, they are now a main driver in a new (urban) mobility system.

In order to fully tap into the potential of the bicycle as part of mobility network, it needs to be properly integrated in multi-modal transport systems.[43]

i. Journey planners and integrated ticketing

ECF thinks that multi-modal journey planners should come with detailed and real-time information about bicycle networks, access to bike-sharing schemes, and bike parking. Likewise, bike parking and bike-sharing schemes should be fully part of integrated ticketing schemes. For, example, in the Netherlands, a single chip card has been introduced for all public transport systems (train, bus, trams, etc.) across the whole country. OV-fiets (Public transport bicycles) can be used with the same card.[44] If the EU is to fund such developments, cycling must be part of it.

ii. Bicycle carriage on public transport services

Integrating bicycles with public transport is a win-win situation. Public transport benefits as cycling dramatically increases its catchment area and by extension, customer base. Therefore, aside from adequate bicycle parking facilities at public transport stations, bicycle carriage in (sub-)urban and regional buses, trams, metros, etc., should be the default solution. Exemptions can be made if they are well justified, for example due to capacity problems during peak hours.

On long-distance national and international train journeys, the carriage of complete bicycles should be allowed on all services.[45] ECF asks the EU to amend the relevant Regulation EC 1371/2007 on passenger rights' and obligations accordingly.[46]

---

[43] Further reading: ECF factsheet (2012): Marrying Cycling and Public Transport. http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/Factsheet-ITF2012-PT.pdf

[44] http://www.ov-fiets.nl/ovfiets/ontdekovfiets/ontdekovfiets/faq

[45] Further reading: ECF position paper (2013): Bike carriage on long-distance trains: 7 basic services that give cyclists a smile. http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/130418_Bike-carriage-on-long-distance-trains_Good-practice_Final-ECF-paper.pdf

[46] Further reading: ECF position paper (2012): Bike and train: A European Odyssey. http://www.ecf.com/wp-content/uploads/Bike-and-Train_A-European-Odyssey_ECF-position-paper1.pdf

8. Statistics and data collection on cycle use

ECF recommendations:

- Convene expert groups and expert evaluation within the frame of Horizon 2020 to come up with a package of measures for cycle use
- Based on the expert group recommendations, the EU and Member States should be required to collect data on cycle use

Justification:

Data is politics. Most importantly, they are being used to justify political decisions on what investments in transport infrastructure are to be made ("predict and provide"). But they are also needed in setting meaningful modal split targets and in measuring the impact of implemented policies. A number of EU countries show that the collection of data on cycle use at national level is feasible, mainly through national traffic surveys and systematic collection of home-work travel data. However, other Member States do not collect any data on cycle use at national level at all.

As a consequence, Eurostat does not publish any data on cycle use either. Its latest transport data publication entitled "Transport in figures. Statistical pocketbook in figures, 2013" ignores active mobility when describing the transport modal split (see Table 1). This approach of leaving out data on walking and cycling gets replicated in other EU publications, for example in the TERM 2013[47] report from the European Environmental Agency on urban mobility or in DG MOVE publications like "Road Transport: A Change of Gear" from 2012.[48]

MODAL SPLIT

%

	PASSEN-GER CARS	P2W	BUS & COACH	RAILWAY	TRAM & METRO	AIR	SEA
1995	73.3	2.3	9.3	6.5	1.3	6.5	0.8
1996	73.3	2.3	9.2	6.4	1.3	6.7	0.8
1997	73.3	2.3	9.1	6.3	1.3	7.0	0.8
1998	73.4	2.3	9.0	6.1	1.3	7.2	0.8
1999	73.5	2.3	8.8	6.1	1.3	7.3	0.7
2000	73.5	1.8	8.7	6.2	1.3	7.7	0.7
2001	73.9	1.9	8.6	6.2	1.3	7.5	0.7
2002	74.5	1.9	8.4	6.0	1.3	7.3	0.7
2003	74.5	1.9	8.4	5.8	1.3	7.5	0.7
2004	74.2	1.9	8.3	5.8	1.3	7.8	0.6
2005	73.4	2.0	8.3	6.0	1.3	8.4	0.6
2006	73.3	1.9	8.1	6.1	1.3	8.6	0.6
2007	73.1	1.8	8.2	6.1	1.3	8.8	0.6
2008	73.1	1.9	8.2	6.3	1.4	8.6	0.6
2009	74.2	1.9	7.9	6.1	1.4	8.0	0.6
2010	74.1	1.8	7.8	6.2	1.4	8.0	0.6
2011	73.4	1.9	7.8	6.2	1.4	8.8	0.6

Table 4: Eurostat, Transport in figures. Statistical pocketbook in figures, 2013, p.46.

The only available European comparable data on cycling is the Eurobarometer on transport which is an attitudinal survey (asking for the opinion of people) and not for actual cycling behaviour.[49] In the Flash Eurobarometer 312 published in March 2011 (Fieldwork October 2010)[50], 7.4 % of respondents said that cycling is their main mode of transportation for their daily activities (12.6 % walking).

In order to get good data on actual cycling behaviour, ECF recommends the European Commission to convene expert groups and expert evaluation within the frame of Horizon 2020 to come up with a package of measures for cycle use. Based on the expert group recommendations, the EU and Member States should be required to collect data on cycle use.

[47] http://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/term-2013?utm_source=EEASubscriptions&utm_medium=RSSFeeds&utm_campaign=Generic

[48] http://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/doc/broch-road-transport_en.pdf

[49] See also Study on harmonised collection of European Data and Statistics in the Field of Urban Transport and Mobility. MOVE/B4/196-2/2010, Final report 24/05/2013.

[50] http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_312_en.pdf

9. A European Master Plan for the promotion of cycling

ECF recommendation: The European Commission should adopt a European Master Plan for the promotion of cycling by 2019

Justification:

Cycling relates to a whole range of European policy fields: transport and mobility, health, environment, climate, energy, taxation and fiscal policies, tourism, technical standards, trade issues… This calls for a horizontal integration to overcome the current piecemeal approach by the different Commission DGs.

It is still a wide-spread belief among decision-makers that cycling policy is an exclusive local and regional responsibility. However, this view is changing rapidly. Looking at the national level, the past 10 years have seen a new approach to cycling policies: 11 EU Member States now have a current national cycling strategy in place, two more are developing one.[51] A number of these countries have also installed a "national cycling officer" within their administration.[52]

Beyond the national level, THE PEP[53] has been working since 2002 on the integration of transport, health and environment. A milestone of THE PEP work has been the development of the Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) for cycling.[54] THE PEP Draft Ministerial Declaration, to be adopted during the next High-level Meeting from April 14 – 16, 2014 in Paris, is committed to develop a "pan-European Master Plan for Cycling Promotion, supported by guidelines and tools to assist in the development of cycling promotion policies at national level."

In addition to integrating cycling policies, there would be more positive consequences of having a European strategy on cycling:

- A strong signal from the EU level to those Member States that have no cycling strategy in place to assume responsibility.
- Re-balancing of technology and behavioral change (modal shift) in EU transport policies. The White Paper on Transport has a strong emphasis on technology (e.g. the objective to phase out conventionally fuelled cars in cities by 2050), but lacks any concrete objectives regarding modal shift in passenger transport. It has such a recommendation on freight transport though. For addressing a number of challenges (climate change, air pollution, congestion, physical inactivity, etc.) a balanced mix between avoid/shift/improve scenarios is needed.

ECF will therefore ask the new Commission to embrace the idea of developing a European Master Plan on the promotion of cycling with all relevant stakeholders and to publish it at the latest by 2019.

---

[51] EU Member States with a current national cycling strategy: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland and Slovakia. Finland and Luxembourg have published a common strategy on active mobility, i.e. walking and cycling. Belgium's cycling strategy has not been officially adopted by the government but serves as a working document for the administration. The Netherlands and the UK used to have a national cycling strategy in the 1990s.

[52] Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany and Slovakia.

[53] THE PEP is the Transport, Health and Environment Pan-European Programme of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) in the WHO European Region.

[54] The HEAT tool is designed to help conduct an economic assessment of the health benefits of walking or cycling by estimating the value of reduced mortality that results from specified amounts of walking or cycling. http://www.heatwalkingcycling.org/

10. An EU transport modal split target for 2030

ECF recommendation: The EU should adopt an ambitious transport modal split target – at the latest for 2030

Justification:

The EU has set itself very concrete targets on many policy issues, including on urban air quality, Greenhouse gas emission reduction, energy efficiency, renewable energy production… Targets are important in building supportive coalitions of politicians, businesses and civil society; to take the adequate regulatory decisions; make the right investments; run the right marketing campaigns; measure failure and success at the end of the cycle.

Transport also sees a number of European Commission targets, including:

- Halve road fatalities by 2020, compared to 2010, and move close to zero fatalities by 2050;
- 30% of road freight over 300 km should be shifted to other modes such as rail or waterborne transport by 2030, and more than 50% by 2050;
- On urban mobility, halve the use of 'conventionally-fuelled' cars in urban transport by 2030; phase them out in cities by 2050; and achieve essentially CO2-free city logistics in major urban centres by 2030.[55]

While ECF welcomes the urban mobility targets, we think it is crucial to add to it a meaningful supplement: a transport modal split target. If today's 'conventionally-fuelled' cars in cities will be simply replaced by non-conventionally fuelled cars, e.g. e-cars, nothing will be gained in improving the quality of public space in urban areas or in increasing physical activity of EU citizens. As Europe's cities are set to continue to grow, this would also not address the problem of congestion or the lack of inner-city parking facilities.

Setting specific mode share objectives has become good practice in probably hundreds of European towns and cities. Also a number of EU Member States have adopted specific national targets on cycling and/or active mobility mode shares, including:

Austria:	10 % cycling mode share by 2015
Finland:	20 % increase of walking and cycling trips by 2020 (baseline: 2011)
France:	10 % cycling mode share by 2020
Germany:	15 % cycling mode share by 2020 (16% in urban areas, 13 % elsewhere)
Ireland:	10 % cycling mode share by 2020
Luxembourg:	25 % walking and cycling mode share by 2020

The Commission should follow the urban and national examples and adopt a transport modal split target at European level.

[55] COM(2011) 144 final, White Paper, Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area – Towards a competitive and resource efficient transport system, 2011.

Annex: Overview list of ECF recommendations

No	Subject	ECF recommendations
1	EU funds for cycle projects	During the current EU Financial period 2014 – 2020, €6billion, i.e. 10 % of all EU transport budgets, should be earmarked for cycling.
2	Support EuroVelo, the European cycle route network	■ Complete EuroVelo by 2020 ■ Secure TEN-T funding for EuroVelo routes ■ The EU should provide financial and technical assistance for the coordination, promotion and communication of the network on the European level
3	Safer motorised vehicles for pedestrians and cyclists	■ Recommend Member States to make 30 km/h rather than 50 km/h the default speed limit in built-up areas ■ Fit commercial vehicles with Intelligent Speed Assistance (ISA), rather than the current speed limiters, and all new cars with at least a warning ISA; eventually fit all cars with active ISA ■ Improve the cabin design of heavy goods vehicles
4	A level playing-field for cycling with other transport modes	■ The EU should issue strong recommendations to Member States calling for cycling to have a level playing-field with other transport modes in financial incentives and other support for home-work travel ■ The EU should allow Member States to introduce a reduced VAT rate on bicycle sales
5	Better air quality in Europe	■ Adopt stricter air quality standards in the EU based on WHO guidelines; ■ Improve the knowledge base of links between transport modal split and ambient air quality; ■ Analyse systematically what contribution investments in cycling projects can make in meeting air quality standards; ■ Prioritise active mobility over individual motorized transportation in towns and cities; ■ Make motorised vehicles as clean as possible.
6	Transport and health: The benefits of cycling in health policy and the health dimension in transport appraisal	■ The EU should recommend to Member States to integrate the benefits of cycling in health policy ■ The EU should recommend to Member States to integrate the public health dimension into

		transport appraisal ■ If the EU is to co-fund transport projects, the health dimension should be included in transport appraisal
7	Cycling fully integrated in the multi-modal transport system	■ If the EU funds multi-modal journey planners and integrated ticketing systems, cycling must be part of it; ■ On long-distance national and international train journeys, the carriage of complete bicycles should be allowed on all services.
8	Statistics and data collection on cycle use	■ Convene expert groups and expert evaluation within the frame of Horizon 2020 to come up with a package of measures for cycle use ■ Based on the expert group recommendations, the EU and Member States should be required to collect data on cycle use
9	A European Master Plan for the promotion of cycling	The European Commission should adopt a European Master Plan for the promotion of cycling by 2019
10	An EU transport modal split target	The EU should adopt an ambitious transport modal split target – at the latest for 2030

About ECF

Contact Person: Fabian Küster, Senior Policy Officer, f.kuester@ecf.com

The European Cyclists' Federation (ECF) represents the interests of bicycle users, is based in Brussels and has about 80 member organizations across 40 countries.

As well as advocating for better cycling policies and promoting cycling at the international level in general, ECF has a range of programs including EuroVelo, the European cycle route network, the global networks "Scientists for cycling" and "Cities for Cyclists", the Velo-city and Velo-city Global conference series.

ECF is a main partner in several EU funded projects such as Cyclelogistics, Bike2Work and BTrackB.