

5.11 Noise

This chapter describes vehicle noise costs, including general information on how noise is quantified, the noise emissions of various types of vehicles, and estimates of noise cost values.

Definition

Noise refers to unwanted sounds and vibrations. Motor vehicles cause various types of noise, includes engine acceleration, tire/road contact, braking, horns and vehicle theft alarms.¹ Heavy vehicles can cause vibration and infrasound (low frequency noise).

Measuring Noise²

Noise is measured in *decibels* (dB), a logarithmic scale. A 10 dB increase represents a doubling in noise level. *Decibels A-weighted*, (indicated “dB(A)”) units emphasize the frequency sensitivities of human hearing, and correlate well with subjective impressions of loudness. Common noise levels range from 30 to 90 dB(A). Decibels are an instantaneous measurement, so various indexes are used to measure noise over a period of time:

- *Leq* represents the equivalent continuous sound level in dB(A) for a specific time period. *Leq* (8 hours) is used in many traffic noise standards established by OECD and WHO.
- *L₁₀* represents the dB(A) level that is exceeded 10 percent of a time period (often one hour). Analogous measurements, *L₀₁*, *L₀₅*, *L₅₀*, refer to noise levels exceeded 1, 5 and 50% of the time period. *L₁₀* (18 hours) is the mean of the hourly values taken over an 18-hour period, which, is typically from 6 a.m. to midnight. *L₁₀* is often used to define traffic noise in the U.S. and other countries.
- *MNL* (*Maximum Noise Level*) is the loudest noise during a certain period. This index is considered by some researches to correlate with noise annoyance better than *Leq* and *L₁₀*, but does not address the number of noise events, and is not widely used.

According to an OECD report, “*Transport is by far the major source of noise, ahead of building or industry, with road traffic the chief offender.*”³ Motorcycles, trucks and buses are major contributors to traffic noise.⁴ At low speeds most noise comes from vehicle engine and drivetrain, at higher speeds aerodynamic and tire/road noise dominate.⁵

¹ *Indicators of the Environmental Impacts of Transportation*, Office of Policy and Planning, USEPA (Washington DC; www.itre.ncsu.edu/cte), 1999.

² BTCE & EPA, “The Costing and Costs of Transport Externalities: A Review,” *Victorian Transport Externalities Study*, Vol. 1, Environment Protection Authority (Melbourne, Australia), 1994.

³ *Environmental Policies for Cities in the 1990s*, OECD (Paris), 1990, cited in Poldy, p.29.

⁴ MacKenzie, Dower & Chen, *The Going Rate*, World Resources Institute (www.wri.org), 1992, p. 21.

⁵ Homburger, Kell and Perkins, *Fundamentals of Traffic Engineering, 13th Edition*, Institute of Transportation Studies, UCB (Berkeley), 1992, p.31-3.

Discussion

Several factors affect the amount of noise emitted by traffic, and its costs:

- *Type of vehicle.* Motorcycles, heavy vehicles (trucks and buses), and vehicles with faulty exhaust systems tend to produce high noise levels.
- *Traffic speed, stops and inclines.* Lower speeds tend to produce less engine, wind and road noise. Engine noise is greatest when a vehicle is accelerating or climbing an incline. Aggressive driving, with faster acceleration and harder stopping, increases noise.
- *Pavement condition and type.* Rougher surfaces tend to produce more tire noise, and certain pavement types emit less noise.⁶ “Quiet Pavement” research indicates that *open-graded friction course* (OGFC) and *porous friction courses* (PFC) asphalts, and *whisper grinding* and *longitudinal tining* produce less traffic noise.⁷
- *Barriers and distance.* Walls and other structures, trees, hills, distance and sound-resistant buildings (e.g., double-paned windows) tend to reduce noise impacts.

Hedonic price surveys are used to measure traffic noise costs ([Chapter 4](#)). This involves estimating residential property traffic noise exposure, and measuring the reduced value of homes with noise levels above a threshold, all else being equal. Such studies are criticized on several grounds. Their noise level thresholds tend to be arbitrary, the data used are often incomplete (for example, they do not usually indicate how features such as hills or double-glazed windows affect noise exposure), and they do not account for non-residential impacts (noise costs to businesses and pedestrians). Most U.S. noise cost models measure the marginal cost of an additional highway vehicle, and so are not appropriate for evaluating surface street traffic noise or total noise costs. Verhoef concludes that such estimates of traffic noise represent only 1/8th of the total cost⁸ and Bein interprets Sælensminde’s research to imply that hedonic noise surveys identify only about 1/6th of total motor vehicle noise costs.⁹

Several studies show residential property values typically decline about 0.5% for each unit change in Leq.¹⁰ These results are used to develop general property value depreciation indexes.¹¹ The OECD recommends a noise depreciation index of 0.5% of property value per decibel increase if noise levels are above 50 dB(A) Leq (24 hours).¹² Lee estimates traffic noise costs at \$21 annually per housing unit per decibel increase.¹³

⁶ Bill Wilson, “New Noise Solution Research Shows Promise And An Enthusiastic Effort,” *Roads & Bridges*, Vol. 43 No. 2 (www.roadbridges.com), February 2005.

⁷ FHWA, *Quiet Pavement Pilot Program* (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/qpppe.html), 2005.

⁸ Erik Verhoef, “External Effects and Social Costs of Road Transport,” *Trans. Research*, Vo. 28A, 1994, p. 286.

⁹ Peter Bein, *Barnet Hastings Benefit Cost Analysis*, BC Ministry of Transport and Highways (Victoria), 1994.

¹⁰ From Pearce and Markandya, *Environmental Policy Benefits: Monetary Valuation*, OECD (Paris), 1989.

¹¹ Based on Weatherall 1988; Quinet 1990; and Steeting 1990 as cited in BTCE & EPA, “The Costing and Costs of Transport Externalities: A Review,” *Victorian Transport Externalities Study*, Vol. 1, Environment Protection Authority (Melbourne), 1994.

¹² M. Modra, *Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Application of Traffic Noise Insulation Measures to Existing Houses*, EPA (Melbourne), 1984, cited in Poldy, 1993.

¹³ Douglass Lee, “Efficient Highway User Charges,” USDOT, as cited in MacKenzie.

One study found that traffic volume increases of a few hundred motor vehicles per day reduced adjacent residential property values by 5-25%.¹⁴ Assuming 150 residences per mile of urban residential street, with average values of \$100,000 per residence, this represents an annualized cost of approximately \$1 million (5% discount rate over 25 years). Assuming 500 additional vehicles per day cause average property values to decline by 10%, and that noise represents one-third of this cost (reduced safety and privacy are other possible costs), such traffic noise costs average 18¢ per vehicle mile.¹⁵

The number of residences impacted by traffic noise is significant in most developed countries. A.L. Brown and K.C. Lam estimate that approximately 25% of Australian urban dwellings are located on roads with over 2,000 vehicles per day and higher traffic speeds. Over 12% of dwellings in Australia directly front roadways carrying 8,000 or more vehicles per day. In addition, 8% of houses on low volume (<1,000 vehicles per day) are located close enough to a high traffic road to experience traffic noise exceeding 68 dB. Thus, approximately 1/3 of houses experience significant traffic noise.¹⁶

Table 5.11-1 shows estimates of total national transportation noise costs as a percentage of GDP. Some research indicates that property value depreciation due to noise is non-linear, and increases from 0.5% per dB(A) unit increase in the range of 50 to 60 dB(A), rising to 0.8% per unit increase above 65 dB(A).¹⁷

Table 5.11-1 Selected Estimates of Total Transport Noise Costs¹⁸

Country	Percent of GDP
France	0.24
Germany	0.20
Norway	0.23
United Kingdom	0.50
United States,	0.06 - 0.21
Japan	0.20
OECD, Average	0.15

¹⁴ Gordon Bagby, "Effects of Traffic Flow on Residential Property Values," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 46, No. 1, January 1980, pp. 88-94. Also see William Hughes and C.F. Sirmans, "Traffic Externalities and Single-Family House Prices," *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1992, pp. 487-500.

¹⁵ \$2.8 million x 10% ÷ 3 ÷ 365 days per year ÷ 500 vehicles per day

¹⁶ A. L. Brown and K.C. Lam, "Can I Play on the Road, Mum? - Traffic and Homes in Urban Australia," *Road and Transport Research*, Vol. 3, No. 1, March 1994, p. 12-23.

¹⁷ BTCE & EPA, 1994, Table 3.4, based on Weatherall, 1988.

¹⁸ BTCE & EPA, "The Costing and Costs of Transport Externalities: A Review," *Victorian Transport Externalities Study*, EPA (Melbourne), 1994, based on Bouladon 1991 and Quinet 1990.

Estimates

All values are in U.S. dollars unless otherwise indicated.

- Table 5.11-2 summarizes marginal highway noise costs for various vehicles estimated by the US Federal Highway Administration. This reflects the marginal cost of an additional vehicle on major highways, and does not reflect noise exposure on surface streets, where the vehicle noise impact costs are likely to be higher.

Table 5.11-2 Estimated Highway Noise Costs (1997 Cents Per Vehicle Mile)¹⁹

	Rural Highways			Urban Highways			All Highways		
	High	Med.	Low	High	Med.	Low	High	Med.	Low
Automobile	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.30	0.11	0.03	0.20	0.06	0.02
Pickup & Van	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.27	0.10	0.03	0.17	0.06	0.02
Buses	0.35	0.13	0.04	4.55	1.72	0.48	2.79	1.06	0.30
Single Unit Trucks	0.27	0.10	0.03	3.14	1.19	0.33	1.85	0.70	0.20
Combination Trucks	0.68	0.26	0.07	9.86	3.73	1.05	4.24	1.61	0.45
All Vehicles	0.08	0.03	0.01	0.64	0.24	0.07	0.42	0.16	0.05

- Apogee Research estimated noise costs in Boston, MA and Portland, ME for several modes at high, medium and low densities. Totals are shown in Table 5.11-3.

Table 5.11-3 Noise Costs in Two Cities (Cents Per Passenger Mile)²⁰

	Automobile		Comm. Rail		Rail Transit		Bus	
	Expwy	Non-Expwy	Peak	Off-P	Peak	Off-P	Peak	Off-P
Boston								
High	0.3	0.6	0.4	1.1	n/a	n/a	0.5	1.3
Medium	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.5
Low	<0.1	<0.1	0.1	0.1	n/a	n/a	<1.0	0.1
Portland								
High	0.2	0.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1.1	1.0
Medium	0.1	0.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.2	0.2
Low	<0.1	<0.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.1	0.1

- Bagby compared property values in two similar residential neighborhoods, one of which had unrestricted traffic flow, while the other had various traffic management strategies that significantly reduced traffic volumes. The results show that residential property values are highly sensitive to traffic on adjacent streets. Reducing traffic volumes by a few hundred motor vehicles per day increased adjacent residential property values by 5-25%.²¹ Other studies found similar results.²²

¹⁹ 1997 Federal Highway Cost Allocation Study, USDOT (www.fhwa.dot.gov/policy/hcas/summary/index.htm), Table V-22.

²⁰ Apogee Research, *The Costs of Transportation*, Conservation Law Foundation (Boston), 1994, p. 161.

²¹ Gordon Bagby, "Effects of Traffic Flow on Residential Property Values," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 46, No. 1, January 1980, pp. 88-94.

²² William Hughes and C.F. Sirmans, "Traffic Externalities and Single-Family House Prices," *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 1992, pp. 487-500.

- An comprehensive study by Bateman, et al, indicates that that each decibel increase in traffic noise decreases residential property price in Scotland by 0.20%, with a standard error indicating that there is a 95% chance that the coefficient is greater than -0.04% and less than -0.37%.²³ The study also indicates that aircraft noise has a similar effect, and that views of roads also reduces residential property values.
- Research by the B.C. Ministry of Transportation and Highways indicates that noise costs average \$1,000-1,500 (Canadian dollars) or more per affected person per year (residents of homes near busy streets and highways).²⁴
- Delucchi and Shi-Ling Hsu calculate marginal noise costs per 1,000 miles traveled for five vehicle classes on six urban roadway types, as indicated in Table 5.11-4. Their model takes into account the impacts of traffic noise above a threshold on residential property values, scaled up 27% to include non-residential exposures.²⁵

Table 5.11-4 Base-Case Marginal Noise Costs in Urban Areas (1991\$/1000 VMT)²⁶

	Interstate	Other Freeways	Principle Arterials	Minor Arterials	Collectors	Local Roads
Light Automobiles	2.96	4.25	1.18	0.57	0.07	0.00
Medium Trucks	8.50	13.20	7.02	5.37	1.05	0.00
Heavy Trucks	16.69	30.80	20.07	29.93	4.93	0.00
Buses	6.36	9.77	7.18	6.42	1.22	0.00
Motorcycles	17.15	27.03	8.71	4.67	0.56	0.00

²³ Ian Bateman, Brett Day, Iain Lake and Andrew Lovett, *The Effect of Road Traffic on Residential Property Values: A Literature Review and Hedonic Pricing Study*, Scottish Executive Development Department (www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/housing/ertpv.pdf), January 2001.

²⁴ Dr. Peter Bein, *Monetization of Environmental Impacts of Roads*, Planning Services Branch, B.C. Ministry of Transportation and Highways (Victoria, www.th.gov.bc.ca/bchighways), 1997.

²⁵ Their conclusion that vehicles produce minimal noise costs on collectors and no noise costs on local roads is surprising since studies indicate that residential property values along low volume roads are quite sensitive to changes in traffic volume (Gordon Bagby, “Effects of Traffic Flow on Residential Property Values,” *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 46, No. 1, January 1980, pp. 88-94). This indicates that their “Base-Case” estimates are probably low.

²⁶ Mark Delucchi and Shi-Ling Hsu, “External Damage Cost of Noise Emitted from Motor Vehicles,” *Journal of Transportation and Statistics*, Vol. 1, No. 3, October 1998, pp. 1-24. Also see Mark Delucchi, “Environmental Externalities of Motor-Vehicle Use in the US,” *Journal of Transportation Economics and Policy*, Vol. 34, No. 2, May 2000, pp. 135-168.

- The Dutch Ministry of Environment publishes extensive research on transportation noise impacts, including formula and software for calculating impacts in specific conditions.²⁷ Their findings indicate that residents are more annoyed by aircraft and highway traffic than the same noise level produced by local traffic and railroads.²⁸
- Forkenbrock estimates noise pollution costs for large intercity trucks to average 0.04¢ per ton-mile of freight shipped.²⁹
- A Federal Transit Administration study indicates that as “Day-Night” sound level increases from 50 to 90 Ldn, the portion of residents who are highly annoyed by noise increases from approximately 0 to 100%.³⁰ This study indicates that at 50 feet, a 2-car LRT (Light Rail Transit) traveling at 25 mph produces about 52 dBA, a 4-car LRT at 25 mph produces about 60 dBA, and a RRT (Rapid Rail Transit) at 50 mph produces about 66 dBA (the equivalent noise of a heavy arterial traffic at 40 mph).
- Based on an review of available research, Gillen estimates that aviation noise reduces housing prices by 0.9% for each Noise Exposure Factor (NEF) decibel increase.³¹

²⁷ *Calculation of Road Traffic Noise*, Directorate for Noise and Traffic (Zoetermeer; www.xs4all.nl/~rigolett/ENGELS/index.html), 1995.

²⁸ *Response Functions for Environmental Noise in Residential Areas*, Ministry of Environment (The Hague), 1993.

²⁹ David Forkenbrock, “External Costs of Intercity Truck Freight Transportation,” *Transportation Research A*, Vol. 33, No. 7/8, Sept./Nov. 1999, pp. 505-526.

³⁰ Harris Miller & Hanson, Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, Federal Transit Administration (Washington DC), DOT-T-95-16, April 1995.

³¹ David Gillen, “The Economics of Noise,” *Handbook of Transport and the Environment*, Elsevier (www.elsevier.com), 2003, pp. 81-95.

- Table 5.11-5 shows estimated residential noise damage costs for travel on high-volume highways. Separate cost estimates are also provided for various weight trucks. They state that “As traffic volume on a particular road increases, the [marginal] noise damage contribution of a single vehicle decreases” which implies higher marginal costs for vehicle travel on low volume, local roads and streets.

Table 5.11-5 Costs Per Noise Passenger Car Equivalent (1993 Cents Per Mile)³²

mph:	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60
Urban, CBD	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.13	0.16	0.20	0.24
Urban Fringe	0.02	0.03	0.08	0.13	0.19	0.25	0.32	0.40	0.51
Urban, Outer CBD	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.08	0.10	0.12
Urban, Residential	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.13	0.16	0.19	0.23
Urban, Rural Character	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02
Rural, Sparse Development	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Rural, Dense Development	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.12	0.16	0.20	0.24	0.28

This table indicates estimated residential noise costs for motor vehicle travel on 110,000 average annual daily traffic highways.

- Hokanson developed the relative noise factors shown in Table 5.11-6.

Table 5.11-6 Automobile Noise Equivalents by Speed³³

MPH:	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60
Automobile	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium Truck	18	16	15	14	13	13	12	12	11
Heavy Truck	113	83	66	54	45	38	32	30	26

- Per Kågeson estimates motor vehicle noise costs in Europe at 0.6¢ per passenger mile (3.0 ECU/1,000 km).³⁴
- Theodore Keeler et al estimate the marginal noise cost of an added freeway vehicle mile at 0.1-0.2¢ in 1975 (0.2-0.4¢ current dollars), but offer no estimate for impacts on local streets, which they state would be considerably higher.³⁵

³² Daniel Haling and Harry Cohen, “Residential Noise Damage Costs Caused by Motor Vehicles,” *Transportation Research Record 1559*, 1997, pp. 84-93.

³³ Barry Hokanson and Martin Minkoff; *Measures of Noise Damage Costs Attributable to Motor Vehicle Travel*, Urban and Regional Research, University of Iowa (Iowa City), Technical Report #135, Dec. 1981.

³⁴ Per Kågeson, *Getting the Prices Right*, European Fed. for Transport & Env. (Bruxelles), 1993, p 102.

³⁵ *The Full Cost of Urban Transportation*, Institute of Urban and Regional Development (Berkeley), Monograph #21 1975, p. 52.

- David Maddison, et al, develop an estimate of noise costs for the U.K. as summarized in Table 5.11-7. They assume that heavy trucks produce 3 times, and buses and motorcycles twice, the noise costs of an average automobile.³⁶

Table 5.11-7 Noise Costs Per Kilometer

	Pence Per Passenger Km	1996 US\$ Per Passenger Mile
Car	0.41	\$0.018
Bus	0.097	\$0.004
Motorcycle	1.18	\$0.035
Heavy Goods Vehicle	1.96	\$0.053

- Peter Miller and John Moffet estimate noise costs at 0.14¢ to 0.23¢ per automobile mile and three times higher for buses.³⁷
- A study of car alarm noise impacts in New York City found that 91% of surveyed respondents said that car alarms reduced their quality of life, 76% said car alarms keep them awake at night, that only 5% of the respondents have responded to the sound of an alarm by calling the police about a possible theft, while 60% have called police to complain about car alarm noise.³⁸ The study also found that car alarms are not very effective at preventing thefts: 95-99% of all alarms are false, and cars with alarms are just as likely to be broken into those without.
- Quinet summarizes noise cost estimates by various European researchers, indicating an average estimate of approximately 0.7¢ per vehicle mile (U.S. dollars).³⁹
- In an example assuming \$1,000 per linear meter of highway noise barrier L.R. Rilett calculates that mitigation costs average about 3¢ per peak period vehicle kilometer, or about 1¢ for automobiles, 14¢ for medium trucks, and 43¢ for heavy trucks.⁴⁰
- Sælensminde uses previous studies to estimate noise costs for Norway, resulting in a range from \$88 to \$541 per capita annually, or about 1¢ to 5.4¢ per VMT.⁴¹

³⁶ David Maddison, et al, *The True Costs of Road Transport*, Earthscan (London), 1996, p. 95.

³⁷ *The Price of Mobility*, National Resources Defense Council (Washington DC), Oct. 1993, p.35.

³⁸ TA, *Alarmingly Useless: The Case for Banning Car Alarms in NYC*, Transportation Alternatives (www.tstc.org) and BanCarAlarms.Com (www.bancaralarms.org), 2003.

³⁹ Emile Quinet, “Full Social Cost of Transportation in Europe,” *The Full Costs and Benefits of Transportation*, Springer (Berlin), 1997, pp. 69-111, Table A1.

⁴⁰ L.R. Rilett, “Allocating Pollution Costs Using Noise Equivalency Factors,” *Transportation Research Record* 1498, 1995, pp. 102-107.

- Swedish researcher Ulf Sandberg finds that tire/road noise is a major portion of total traffic noise.⁴² He responds to the following “myths” concerning tire/road noise:
 - *Tyre/road noise has become a concern only during the last decades, say from the 1970s.* It is shown that tyre/road noise was already an important issue long ago.
 - *Tyre/road noise is an important part of vehicle noise at speeds above 50 km/h (70 for trucks).* The truth is that nowadays tyre/road noise dominates during almost all types of driving for cars and down to about 40 km/h for trucks (vehicles meeting EU requirements).
 - *Manufacturers have done a lot to reduce vehicle and tyre/road noise.* Yes, in some respects; however, it seems that vehicle noise has in some cases increased rather than decreased.
 - *Speed has great influence but it does not attract much very interest.* It is shown that there are unexpected relations between speed-related factors and that these can be useful in data presentation.
 - *Different road surfaces may give a large variation in noise levels.* True, the variation is very large, but the most common and useful surfaces are close together on the noise scale.
 - *Tyres do not differ very much in noise emission.* This is not true, the variation is large if a sufficient number of tyre types is included in the data set.
 - *Winter tyres are much more noisy than summer tyres.* This is a myth based on the past. Currently, winter tyres may be the “quiet” tyres.
 - *The width of the tyre is a very influential factor.* Essentially true: A noise-width relation covering the range from “tiny” bicycle tyres to large truck tyres is presented.
 - *Tyre/road noise from a heavy truck is far above that from a typical car.* Not true, one may find heavy trucks that emit lower tyre/road noise than some cars.
 - *Tyre/road noise is very broadband nowadays.* True and not true - current tyres emit noise very much concentrated within the 1 kHz octave. Tone correction may be considered.
 - *Quiet tyres are possible only if safety is sacrificed.* Recent results show that there is no tradeoff between low noise emission and high safety.
 - *We cannot afford to reduce tyre/road noise.* Calculation exercises are presented that suggest that low-noise tyres as well as low-noise road surfaces may be very cost effective.
 - *Tyre/road noise will be substantially reduced by the introduction of European Union noise emission limits.* Not true; the new tyre noise emission limits will be almost totally ineffective.

- The STAMINA model calculates relative noise costs of trucks and automobiles.⁴³

⁴¹ Kjartan Sælensminde, *Environmental Costs Caused by Road Traffic In Urban Areas - Results From Previous Studies*, Institute for Transport Economics (Oslo), 1992.

⁴² Ulf Sandberg, *Tyre/Road Noise – Myths and Realities*, Swedish National Road And Transport Research Institute (www.vti.se), 2001.

⁴³ L.R. Rilett, 1995.

- Transport 2021 estimates noise costs in the Greater Vancouver area equals 0.5¢ Canadian per km, or about 0.6¢ U.S. per mile.⁴⁴
- The Washington State Department of Transportation spends a maximum of \$5,500 to \$20,000 per exposed household to reduce highway traffic noise levels.⁴⁵ This effectively places a price on traffic noise.
- A U.K. study found significant concern about traffic vibration.⁴⁶ Along roads with 500 or more vehicles per hour during peak periods, over 50% of residents are bothered by traffic vibration. However, field studies and case studies showed only minimal and superficial structural damage caused by motor vehicle vibration

Variability

Noise impacts vary by vehicle type and condition, location and time. Automobiles are generally quieter than either buses or motorcycles. Electric vehicles produce moderate motor noise at low speeds, and the same level of wheel noises as a gasoline vehicle, which is the primary source of noise at higher speeds. Noise costs are higher in urban areas, where there are more human ears, but a single vehicle in rural areas has a greater cost than an additional vehicle added to urban traffic. Noise also impacts wildlife, which implies additional environmental costs in addition to impacts on humans.

Equity and Efficiency Issues

Noise is an external cost, and therefore inequitable and inefficient. It tends to be a particularly significant cost for urban residents, residents near busy highways, pedestrians and cyclists. Disadvantaged populations tend to be particularly exposed to this impact.

⁴⁴ *Cost of Transporting People in the British Columbia Lower Mainland*, GVRD (Vancouver), 1993.

⁴⁵ *Directive 22-22 Noise Evaluation Procedures for Existing State Highways*, WSDOT (Olympia), 1987.

⁴⁶ G.R. Watts, *Traffic Induced Vibrations in Buildings*, TRRL Report #246, (www.trl.co.uk), 1990.

Conclusions

Noise is one of the most obvious and often-mentioned negative impacts of motor vehicle traffic. Traffic noise can discourage outdoor activities and make some locations undesirable for housing or other land uses that require quiet. People often justify moving or visiting rural areas by explaining that they enjoy the “peace and quiet.” Motor vehicles, and sometimes air traffic, are dominant sources of noise in many areas.

Several studies monetize traffic noise costs, but most of these were developed to identify the marginal cost of an additional vehicle on a major highway and so are not sensitive to urban street traffic noise, where a few additional daily vehicle trips can significantly affect ambient noise and property values. Such models do not account for non-residential impacts, and incorporate arbitrary thresholds of traffic volumes and distance between homes and streets at which noise is considered a “problem.” For these reasons, such studies appear to undervalue traffic noise costs, particularly on urban surface streets.

Most studies place average automobile noise costs at 0.1¢ to 2¢ per vehicle mile, but actual noise costs are probably much higher. Automobile noise costs are estimated here at 1¢ per mile on urban roads and rural 0.5¢ on rural roads, based on existing cost estimates increased to take into account non-residential and residual costs. Electric cars are estimated to produce 30% of the noise cost of an automobile under urban conditions, and 60% during higher speed rural driving. Diesel bus noise is estimated to be 5 times greater than an automobile. Electric bus and trolley noise are estimated to be 3 times greater than an automobile, and motorcycles are estimated to be 10 times greater than an automobile. Rideshare passengers, bicycling, walking and telecommuting impose no noise costs.

Estimate Noise Costs (1996 U.S. Dollars per Vehicle Mile)

Vehicle Class	Urban Peak	Urban Off-Peak	Rural	Average
Average Car	0.010	0.010	0.005	0.008
Compact Car	0.010	0.010	0.005	0.008
Electric Car	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Van/Light Truck	0.010	0.010	0.005	0.008
Rideshare Passenger	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Diesel Bus	0.050	0.050	0.025	0.04
Electric Bus/Trolley	0.030	0.030	0.015	0.024
Motorcycle	0.100	0.100	0.050	0.08
Bicycle	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Walk	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Telecommute	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Automobile Cost Range

These are based on estimates cited above.

Minimum
\$0.002

Maximum
\$0.06

Information Resources

Resources listed below provide information on traffic noise impacts, costs and reduction techniques.

Ian Bateman, Brett Day, Iain Lake and Andrew Lovett, *The Effect of Road Traffic on Residential Property Values: A Literature Review and Hedonic Pricing Study*, Scottish Executive Development Department (www.scotland.gov.uk/library3/housing/ertpv.pdf), January 2001.

Calculation of Road Traffic Noise, Directorate for Noise and Traffic (www.xs4all.nl/~rigolett/ENGELS/index.html), 1995.

Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory (www.evri.ca) is a searchable storehouse of empirical studies on the economic value of environmental benefits and human health effects.

FHWA, *Highway Traffic Noise*, (www.nonoise.org/library/highway/traffic/traffic.htm), 1980; and *Highway Traffic Noise in the US; Problem And Response*, (www.nonoise.org/library/highway/probresp.htm), 1997, Federal Highway Administration.

FHWA, *The Environmental Guidebook*, Federal Highway Administration, FHWA-99-005 (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/guidebook/index.htm), 1999.

FHWA, *Highway Traffic Noise*, Planning, Environment and Real Estate, Federal Highway Administration (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/htnoise.htm).

Richard T.T. Forman, et al, *Road Ecology: Science and Solutions*, Island Press (www.islandpress.com), 2003.

INFRAS and IWW, *External Costs of Transport – Update Study*, Community of European Railway Companies (www.cer.be) and the International Union of Railways (www.uic.asso.fr), 2004.

Noise Pollution Clearinghouse (www.nonoise.org).

SYLVIE (German for “Systematic Noise Abatement in Inner City Residential Areas”) (www.sylvie.at) is developing practical methods to evaluate and alleviate urban noise.

Ulf Sandberg, *Tyre/Road Noise – Myths and Realities*, Swedish National Road And Transport Research Institute (www.vti.se), 2001.

USEPA, *Indicators of the Environmental Impacts of Transportation*, Office of Policy and Planning, USEPA (www.itre.ncsu.edu/cte), 1999.

WHO, *Guidelines for Community Noise*, World Health Organization (www.who.int/peh/noise/guidelines2.html), 1999.

WHO, Carlos Dora and Margaret Phillips (eds), *Transport, Environment and Health*, World Health Organization, European Series, No. 89 (www.euro.who.int/document/e72015.pdf), 2000.