Assessing the overall health benefits/dis-benefits of cycling

PODIUM DISCUSSION: Velo-city Vienna 2013
The purpose of this study was to update the evidence on the health benefits of cycling. A systematic review of the literature resulted in 16 cycling-specific studies. Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies showed a clear positive relationship between cycling and cardiorespiratory fitness in youths. Prospective observational studies demonstrated a strong inverse relationship between commuter cycling and all-cause mortality, cancer mortality, and cancer morbidity among middle-aged to elderly subjects. Intervention studies among working-age adults indicated consistent improvements in cardiovascular fitness and some improvements in cardiovascular risk factors due to commuting cycling. Six studies showed a consistent positive dose–response gradient between the amount of cycling and the health benefits. Systematic assessment of the quality of the studies showed most of them to be of moderate to high quality. According to standard criteria used primarily for the assessment of clinical studies, the strength of this evidence was strong for fitness benefits, moderate for benefits in cardiovascular risk factors, and inconclusive for all-cause mortality, coronary heart disease morbidity and mortality, cancer risk, and overweight and obesity. While more intervention research is needed to build a solid knowledge base of the health benefits of cycling, the existing evidence reinforces the current efforts to promote cycling as an important contributor for better population health.
Unfortunately...

- Cycling (in urban environment) is more than only physical activity
  - cycling is also related to:
    - *bicycle accidents*: cyclists incur higher crash risks than motorists (in particular car drivers) in terms of accidents per distance (BRSI, 2009; Elvik, 2009)
    - *air pollution*: exposure cyclist >> car driver (Int Panis, 2010)
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Cost–benefit analysis

Available studies: e.g.

→ de Hartog et al., 2010: all-cause mortality
→ Rojas-Rueda et al., 2011: all-cause mortality
→ Holm et al., 2012: DALY (mortality & morbidity)
→ Ralb & de Nazelle, 2012: Economic cost: mortality
→ Cavill, 2010 (Review): Economic cost: infrastructure
→ Gotschi, 2011: Economic cost: infrastructure
→ Aertsens & de Geus, 2010: Economic cost: accidents
500,000 people make a transition from car to bicycle for short trips on a daily basis in the Netherlands
all-cause mortality

Do the Health Benefits of Cycling Outweigh the Risks?

Jeroen Johan de Hartog,¹ Hanna Boogaard,¹ Hans Nijland,² and Gerard Hoek¹

CONCLUSIONS: On average, the estimated health benefits of cycling were substantially larger than the risks relative to car driving for individuals shifting their mode of transport.

Holm et al., 2012
- 33% trips in Copenhagen by bicycle → 50% car trips 2–10 km & 33% car trips 10–15 km to cycling ➔ cyclists to 42%

**DALY**

- Policy, programme or project
- Health determinants
  - Physical inactivity
  - Traffic accidents
  - Air pollution
- Health outcomes
  - Ischaemic heart disease, ischaemic stroke, type II diabetes, breast and colon cancer
  - Injuries
  - Cardiopulmonary disease and lung cancer
- Aggregated effect
  - Change in burden of disease in the study population
Proposed increase in cycling could reduce the burden of disease in the study population by 19.5 DALY annually:

- (+) physical inactivity: 76.0 DALY
- (-) air pollution: 5.4 DALY
- (-) traffic accidents: 51.2 DALY
Economic cost: mortality

- Rabl & de Nazelle (2012)
  - Shift car → bicycling: commute of 5 km (one way) 5 days/week 46 weeks/yr
  - evaluating 4 effects:
    - health benefit by PA
    - public health benefit due to reduced pollution
    - individual exposure to ambient air pollution
    - individual risk of accidents

→ Mortality → €€
Estimated mortality costs and benefits per individual switching from car to bicycle for work trips* in large European cities

* 2x5km daily roundtrip, 5 days per week, 46 weeks per year

Error bars represent upper and lower (%%) confidence intervals.
Economic cost: infrastructure

- Cavill et al., 2008 (review)
  - transport infrastructure and policy + walking and/or cycling and health effects
  - median benefit–cost ratio (BCR): 5:1
Economic cost: infrastructure

- Gotschi (2011)
  - Calculations made for Portland (US)
  - Outcome:
    - health care cost savings
    - value of statistical life savings
Economic cost: infrastructure

- By 2040, investments $138 to $605 million will result:
  - health care cost savings of $388 to $594 million
  - fuel savings of $143 to $218 million
  - savings in value of statistical lives of $7 to $12 billion.

- BCR for health care and fuel savings: 3.8:1 – 1.2:1
- order of magnitude larger when value of statistical lives is used.
Costs bicycle accidents

- Costs (Belgium):
  - I. minor (<24 hrs hospital) bicycle accidents (Aertsens, 2010)
  - II. major (>24 hrs hospital) bicycle accidents (de Geus, (in prep))

- Cost of illness approach
  → estimate ≠ different cost categories (US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, 2006))

Composition of the total cost for society related to illnesses and injuries, based on EPA (2006).
I. Minor accidents

- average total cost:
  - €841 (95% CI: 579–1205) / 1 accident
  - €0.125 / 1 kilometre cycled

- What does this imply for society?
  - estimate total cost of minor bicycle accidents:
    - €88–183 million/year
II. Major accidents

- Direct costs:
  - calculated per victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>€</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>MINOR</th>
<th>% MAJ/MIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctor visits</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirurgical</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,618</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Major accidents

- Indirect costs:
  - calculated per victim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>€</th>
<th>MAJOR Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>MINOR</th>
<th>% MAJ/MIN Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,437</td>
<td>44,425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation work disability</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>7,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>12,636</td>
<td>13,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2833</td>
<td>61,812</td>
<td>64,633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic costs: accidents

- Veisten et al. (2007)
  - hospitals in Norway in the period 1990–1997
  - economic costs of (all) bicycle injuries
    \[ \approx €300 \text{ million} / \text{year} \]
Summary

I don't ride a bike to add days to my life.
I ride a bike to add life to my days!
Positive or negative €€ balance?

Although the costs related to cycling accidents, road infrastructure, air pollution are high

Cost–benefits (ratio) of being physically active on a daily basis outweigh the ‘negative’ costs
On valorising the cycle user not the choice being made

John Parkin
Professor of Transport Engineering
London South Bank University
j.parkin@lsbu.ac.uk
Structure of talk

1. Some theory
2. Benefits of cycle use
   - Monetisation of benefits
   - Journey ambience
   - User benefits
3. Conclusion
   - Valuing the user not the choice
   - Value of time benefits
1 Some theory
Consumer Surplus = \((C_1 - C_2) \cdot T_1 + \frac{1}{2} \cdot (C_1 - C_2) \cdot (T_2 - T_1) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (T_1 + T_2)(C_1 - C_2)\)
2 Benefits of cycle use
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Basis of estimation</th>
<th>Source of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Change in average noise in decibels on ‘A’ weighted scale over 18 hour period.</td>
<td>Reduced motor traffic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local air quality</td>
<td>Change on emissions of particulate matter and nitrous oxides.</td>
<td>Reduced motor traffic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse gases</td>
<td>Change in fuel and energy consumption</td>
<td>Reduced motor traffic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer users remaining as car users</td>
<td>Change in journey times and costs (commute and other uses)</td>
<td>Reduced motor traffic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business users and providers remaining as car users</td>
<td>Change in journey times and costs</td>
<td>Reduced motor traffic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidents</td>
<td>Change in numbers of collisions based on willingness to pay to avoid death and injury plus other collision related costs</td>
<td>Cycle use (which reduces cycle accident rate because of ‘safety in numbers’) and reduced motor traffic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical fitness</td>
<td>Reduced mortality and work absenteeism</td>
<td>Cycle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey ambience</td>
<td>Change in time on routes of different levels of ambience</td>
<td>Cycle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer users</td>
<td>Change in journey times and costs (commute and other uses)</td>
<td>Cycle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business users and providers</td>
<td>Change in journey times and costs</td>
<td>Cycle use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Journey ambience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Value (2010 values and prices)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-road segregated cycle track</td>
<td>7.03p/min (€5.00/hour)</td>
<td>Hopkinson &amp; Wardman (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-road non-segregated cycle lane</td>
<td>2.97p/min (€2.11/hour)</td>
<td>Wardman et al. (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide nearside lane</td>
<td>1.81p/min (€1.29/hour)</td>
<td>Hopkinson &amp; Wardman (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared bus lane</td>
<td>0.77p/min (€0.55/hour)</td>
<td>Hopkinson &amp; Wardman (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure cycle parking facility</td>
<td>98.14p (€1.16)</td>
<td>Wardman et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing and shower facility</td>
<td>20.82p (€0.25)</td>
<td>Wardman et al. (2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Value of travel time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Value (2010 values and prices per hour)</th>
<th>Unit of account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-working time commute</td>
<td>£6.46 (€7.65)</td>
<td>Market price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-working time other</td>
<td>£5.71 (€6.76)</td>
<td>Market price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working time car driver</td>
<td>£28.35 (€33.59)</td>
<td>Resource Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working bus passenger</td>
<td>£21.69 (€25.70)</td>
<td>Resource Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working time rail passenger</td>
<td>£39.65 (€46.97)</td>
<td>Resource Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working time cycle user</td>
<td>£18.24 (€21.61)</td>
<td>Resource Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valorise the user

• Börjesson and Eliasson (2012) emphasis on intrinsic benefits of time savings not on reduced car traffic and health benefits

• Perverse that provision for cycling predicated on basis of benefits to other modes.

• Value the users of a system, avoid valuing the ‘choice’

• Such user valorisation will place user needs centre stage in planning
Is travel utilitarian?

- Transport time is assumed ‘non-productive’
- But ‘expenditure’ of travel time variable suggesting it may not be uniformly unproductive.
- Some travel ‘undirected’, some ‘utilitarian’ travel has ‘excess travel’ within it
- Hence, there are benefits other than arriving at the destination.
- There is meaning associated with travel beyond desire to arrive
Are savings ‘valuable’

- A travel time ‘saving’ useful only if:
  - it can be transferred to a more desirable activity
  - Savings are large enough to be non-negligible
  - Something else ‘more worthwhile’ may not exist
- Savings consumed as opportunity to travel further
Savings for cycle users

- What are the proxy benefits for cycle users?
- Potential greater variability in intrinsic value for a cycle user:
  - One extreme ‘worthless’
  - Other extreme (in poor environmental conditions) extremely valuable
- ‘Value’ in better understanding of bicycle travel time savings.
Call for papers for Research in transportation business and management

• Business and management themes connected with cycling, with focus on bringing into transport theories and practices from other disciplines.
  • 1. Governance structures
  • 2. Strategy and management
  • 3. Funding and investment
  • 4. Operation of public bicycle schemes
  • 5. Inter-modality management (including trains, taxis, buses, aviation and ferries)

• Please respond to j.parkin@lsbu.ac.uk by 28th June 2013.
Cycling and Sustainability
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