# Transport for NSW Economic Parameter Values 

This document applies to all agencies within the NSW Transport cluster
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## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose

This document recommends economic parameter values for common benefits and costs in transport cost-benefit analysis (CBA). By providing best-practice approaches and economic parameter values, this document supports the consistent application of CBA across the NSW Transport cluster.

This document is targeted at CBA practitioners and also includes accompanying Excel tools.

### 1.2 How to use this document

This document provides recommended economic parameter values to be used in the CBA of initiatives within the NSW Transport cluster. Recommendations begin with bold text for ease of use. However, it is not intended to enforce strict compliance with a particular approach where it does not support sensible analysis.
Parameter values that are not recommended in this document may still be used. This may occur when project-specific information points to more relevant parameters, or when the relevant parameter value is not available within this document. If parameter values are used which are not recommended, they should be accompanied by evidence to support their validity. Good practice would involve calculating results with recommended and preferred parameters and explaining the difference.
This document should be read with the Transport for NSW Cost-Benefit Analysis Guide (the Guide), which provides overarching guidance for undertaking CBA and Transport for NSW (TfNSW) recommended approaches.

### 1.3 What has changed?

This document was previously Appendix 4 of the Principles and Guidelines:
Economic Appraisal of Transport Investments and Initiatives (Principles and Guidelines). The Principles and Guidelines is in the process of being updated to reflect recent research, and will be split into a suite of products targeted at various audiences.
Since the 2018 edition, the values in this document have been adjusted to reflect data available as of August 2019 and updated to reflect new information where available. Some additional information from other guidance documents has been included in this version for the first time.

The format of this document has also changed. The recommended parameter values are at the beginning of each section.

This document has three accompanying Excel tools:

- Economic Parameter Values in Excel
- this tool provides all the tables in this document in Excel
- this tool also includes parameter values for use with the Public Transport Project Model (PTPM), which are included in Appendix C. PTPM is a demand model that is often used to evaluate projects in Greater Sydney.
- Rural Vehicle Operating Cost and Fuel Consumption Excel tool
- parameter values for rural vehicle operating costs in rural areas can be calculated using this tool rather than the look-up tables in Appendix D.
- Urban Vehicle Operating Cost Excel tool
- parameter values for urban vehicle operating costs in urban areas can be calculated using this tool.
Updated recommendations in this version are summarised in Table 1.
Table 1 Updated recommendations in the 2019 version

| Section | Updated recommendations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Value of <br> travel time <br> (Section 2) | Recommended values of time for light commercial vehicles (LCV) and heavy <br> commercial vehicles (HCV) in urban areas are: |
|  | • Urban LCV $=\$ 36.30$ per vehicle hour |
|  | Urban HCV = \$60.88 per vehicle hour. |
| These are to be used where project-specific data is not available. |  |

Source: Evaluation \& Assurance, TfNSW (2019).

Table 2 Appendices in the 2019 version

| Appendices | Title | New / existing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Value of travel time -additional information | Existing |
| B | Vehicle classification | New |
| C | Parameters for use with strategic demand models | New |
| D | Rural VOC tables | Existing |
| E | Key indices | Existing |

Source: Evaluation \& Assurance, TfNSW (2019).

### 1.4 Urban and rural parameters

This document includes parameters that are valued differently depending on whether the impacts occur in urban or rural areas. For the purposes of CBA of NSW Transport cluster projects, 'urban' tends to refer to:

- Sydney
- Newcastle
- Wollongong
- Other town centres in NSW where the posted road speed limit is equal to or less than 80 kilometres per hour.

Other areas are generally considered to be rural, especially where road traffic is free-flowing. However, it is good practice to consider whether urban or rural parameters are appropriate on a case-by-case basis for projects, and whether project-specific parameters may need to be estimated.

### 1.5 Changes to come

The field of transport economics is constantly evolving. TfNSW is currently working to update the content of this document to reflect the most up-to-date research.

Comments or questions should be directed to EconomicAdvisory@transport.nsw.gov.au

## 2 Travel time savings

TfNSW recommends the following values of travel time (VTT) for CBA:

- VTT (private) $=\$ 17.72$ per person hour
- VTT (business) = $\$ 57.48$ per person hour.

VTT (business) should only be applied for travel between two business locations. Commuting to and from work should use the private value of travel time.
The VTT per hour of vehicle travel can be calculated from the occupancy rate, value per occupant and value of freight (Table 3). An overall value, referred to as 'vehicle hour', can be estimated by weighing total traffic by vehicle composition (Table 4 and Table 5).

The values in Table 3 are based on average weekly earnings of private travellers and the cost of wages for business travellers (Australian Transport Assessment and Planning, 2016). It is assumed that the VTT for occupants is the same for both urban and rural roads. If available, values derived from project specific surveys can replace the occupancy rates from Table 6 and Table 7.
Many strategic transport demand models report travel time for light commercial vehicle (LCV) and heavy commercial vehicle (HCV). Where detailed commercial vehicle data is available (e.g. by vehicle type), specific values of travel time can be derived using the data outlined in Table 3.
If detailed commercial vehicle data is not available, TfNSW recommends the following values of time be used in CBA for urban areas:

- VTT of urban LCV $=\$ 36.30$ per vehicle hour
- VTT of urban HCV $=\$ 60.88$ per vehicle hour.

Detailed commercial vehicle data should be used in CBA for rural areas. This is because the vehicle mix on rural roads differs significantly depending on its location, particularly on key freight routes and corridors across NSW. Figures in Table 5 can be used where the assumed commercial vehicle mix is not likely to have a material impact on the CBA results.

### 2.1 Actual and perceived travel time

Travellers make travel decisions based on their perception of the total perceived cost of travel, including travel time, as well as a number of other quality and service factors such as comfort, reliability, security and cleanliness.

Travellers may perceive one mode of transport as better than another even after these tangible benefits have been accounted for. For example, light rail can be preferred over bus even when accounting for travel time and vehicle quality attributes.

In strategic demand models, in-vehicle time weights are often applied to different public transport modes in order to correctly predict travel behaviour. This reflects that travellers may perceive their travel time to have reduced when they switch to a preferred mode, such as from bus to light rail. TfNSW recommends that these 'intrinsic mode preference' impacts are assessed and reported separately from travel time savings (e.g. using the approach outlined in Section 11.5).
In addition, TfNSW requires that benefits estimated using perceived travel time must clearly report the proportion of travel time savings that are actual versus perceived.

Table 3 Value of travel time - urban and rural roads

| Vehicle type | All | Non-urban |  | Urban |  | Non-urban |  | Urban |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Value per occupant (\$/ person-hour) | Occupancy rate (persons /vehicle) | Freight (\$/vehiclehour) | Occupancy rate (persons /vehicle) | Freight (\$/vehiclehour) | Value per occupant (\$/km) | Freight (\$/vehicle-km) | Value per occupant (\$/km) | Freight (\$/vehicle-km) |
| Cars (all types) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cars - Private | 17.72 | 1.70 |  | 1.41 |  | 0.20 |  | 0.35 |  |
| Cars - Business | 57.48 | 1.30 |  | 1.06 |  | 0.64 |  | 1.15 |  |
| Utility vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courier van utility | 30.04 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.33 |  | 0.60 |  |
| 4WD mid-size Petrol | 30.04 | 1.50 |  | 1.50 |  | 0.33 |  | 0.60 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Light Rigid | 30.04 | 1.30 | 0.83 | 1.19 | 1.63 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.60 | 0.03 |
| Medium Rigid | 30.40 | 1.20 | 2.25 | 1.19 | 4.43 | 0.34 | 0.03 | 0.61 | 0.09 |
| Heavy Rigid | 30.96 | 1.00 | 7.72 | 1.19 | 15.17 | 0.34 | 0.09 | 0.62 | 0.30 |
| Articulated trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 Axle | 31.69 | 1.00 | 16.59 | 1.19 | 32.69 | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| 5 Axle | 31.69 | 1.00 | 21.16 | 1.19 | 41.68 | 0.35 | 0.24 | 0.55 | 0.73 |
| 6 Axle | 31.69 | 1.00 | 22.82 | 1.19 | 44.94 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.55 | 0.79 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 32.15 | 1.00 | 32.62 | 1.19 | 67.31 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.56 | 1.18 |
| B-Double | 32.15 | 1.00 | 33.62 | 1.19 | 69.36 | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.56 | 1.21 |
| Twin steer + 5 Axle Dog | 32.15 | 1.00 | 31.52 | 1.19 | 65.07 | 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.56 | 1.14 |
| A-Double | 33.07 | 1.00 | 44.14 | 1.19 | 91.10 | 0.37 | 0.49 | 0.58 | 1.59 |
| B-Triple | 33.07 | 1.00 | 45.06 | 1.19 | 92.98 | 0.37 | 0.50 | 0.58 | 1.62 |
| A B combination | 33.07 | 1.00 | 54.27 | 1.19 | 111.99 | 0.37 | 0.60 | 0.58 | 1.96 |
| A-Triple | 33.63 | 1.00 | 65.07 | 1.19 | 134.26 | 0.37 | 0.72 | 0.59 | 2.35 |
| Double B-Double | 33.63 | 1.00 | 65.81 | 1.19 | 135.80 | 0.37 | 0.73 | 0.59 | 2.37 |
| Buses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Heavy Bus (Driver) | 30.40 | 1.00 |  | 1.19 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.53 |  |
| Heavy Bus (Passenger) | 17.72 | 20.00 |  | 20.00 |  | 0.20 |  | 0.31 |  |

Source: Values are based on ATAP 2016 PV3 Road Parameter Values pg. 16-19, except Urban occupancy rates which are estimated from the 2014/15 Household Travel Survey (5 years pooled unlinked trips dataset provided by Transport Performance and Analytics, TfNSW). Values per occupant are indexed from May 2013 Average Weekly Earnings (AWE) to May 2019 AWE (ABS Series ID A84994877K). Freight values are indexed from June 2013 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2314058K).
Notes: To obtain values per km (last 4 columns), the following speeds were assumed: Non-urban - 90km/h; Urban (Cars, Utility vehicles, Rigid trucks) - $50 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$; Urban (All other vehicle types) - $57 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.

Table 4 Average hourly value of travel time by vehicle type - urban

| Period | Time + Freight <br> value (\$ per <br> vehicle) | Default <br> yearly <br> hours | Proportion of <br> AM peak <br> hourly volume |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Peak hours | 30.95 | 2,000 | 1.00 |  |
| Peak shoulders | 30.95 | 800 | 0.75 |  |
| Business hours | 32.07 | 3,450 | 0.62 |  |
| Other hours | 24.80 | 3,310 | 0.17 |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| Average hourly value (\$ per vehicle hr, weighted by vehicle type and annual average kilometres travelled) |  |  |  |  |
| Car | 8,760 | 29.61 |  |  |
| Light commercial vehicle (LCV) | 36.30 |  |  |  |
| Heavy commercial vehicle (HCV) |  | 60.88 |  |  |
| Bus (including driver and average of 20 passengers) | 390.64 |  |  |  |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Values have been indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A84994877K).

Table 5 Average hourly value of travel time by vehicle type - rural

| Vehicle type | \% of vehicle type in vehicle fleet | Occupancy | VTT for occupants |  | VTT for freight (\$/vehiclehr) | Total VTT (\$/vehicle-hr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | \$/personhr | \$/vehiclehr |  |  |
| Private car | 62.56 | 1.7 | 17.72 | 30.12 |  | 30.12 |
| Business car | 8.79 | 1.3 | 57.48 | 74.73 |  | 74.73 |
| Utility vehicle* | 15.84 | 1 to 1.5 | 30.04 | 36.30 |  | 36.30 |
| Heavy commercial** | 11.14 | 1 and 1.3 | 31.05 | 32.98 | 11.52 | 44.50 |
| Combination vehicles*** | 3.95 | 1 | 34.78 | 32.22 | 34.78 | 67.00 |
| Bus | 0.77 | 21 | 48.12 | 384.78 |  | 384.78 |
| Average hourly value (\$ per vehicle hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Car |  |  |  |  |  | 35.62 |
| Light commercial vehicle (LCV) |  |  |  |  |  | 36.30 |
| Heavy commercial vehicle (HCV) |  |  |  |  |  | 51.90 |
| Bus (including driver and average of 20 passengers) |  |  |  |  |  | 384.78 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Values have been indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A84994877K).
Vehicle composition is estimated using the ABS Survey of Motor Vehicle Use 2018. Split of private and business car trips estimated using BTS Household Travel Survey data 2014/15.
*Light commercial/courier van utility and 4WD mid-size petrol.
**Heavy commercial vehicles include rigid trucks and articulated trucks (4 axle, 5 axle and 6 axle).
***Combination vehicles include B-Double + Road Trains.

### 2.2 Additional information: Value of travel time

This section is intended to aid in the application of the figures in Table 3.
Table 7 present vehicle occupancy and vehicle composition for cars on urban roads, respectively. Figures are categorised by the time of day:

- peak hours are trips arriving from 7:00AM to 10:00AM and 4:00PM to 7:00PM
- business hours refer to trips arriving from 10:00AM to 4:00PM
- other hours refers to all other times.

Table 6 Vehicle occupancy - urban

| Hours | Private car | Business car | Commercial |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Light | Heavy |
| Peak hours | 1.41 | 1.07 | 1.21 | 1.19 |
| Business hours | 1.43 | 1.06 | 1.17 | 1.19 |
| Other | 1.39 | 1.07 | 1.16 | 1.19 |
| All | 1.41 | 1.06 | 1.19 | 1.19 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW using the 2014/15 Household Travel Survey (5 years pooled unlinked trips dataset provided by Transport Performance and Analytics, TfNSW).

Table 7 Vehicle composition - urban

| Hours | Private car \% | Business car \% | Commercial |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Light \% | Heavy \% |
| Peak hours | 71 | 9 | 16 | 4 |
| Business hours | 66 | 11 | 16 | 7 |
| Other | 67 | 9 | 18 | 6 |
| All | 68 | 10 | 16 | 6 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW using the 2014/15 Household Travel Survey (5 years pooled unlinked trips dataset provided by Transport Performance and Analytics, TfNSW).
Note: Proportions are based on the number of trips by vehicle type, weighted by average trip length.

### 2.3 Value of access, waiting, transfer and unexpected delay time

TfNSW recommends the multipliers in Table 8 to be applied for access / egress walking, waiting times and unexpected delays.

When travel times are unreliable, travellers will include buffer times to their journey. TfNSW recommends additional buffer time built into a journey (because of travel time variability) be treated equally as costly as the time spent traveling.
Table 8 Access, waiting, transfer and unexpected delay time multipliers

| Category | ATAP recommended | TfNSW recommended |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Access / egress walking | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Waiting time | 1.4 | 1.4 |  |
| Bus stop/rail platform waiting time | 1.5 | 1.5 |  |
| Transfer waiting time |  |  |  |
| Unexpected delay time | 6.4 | 3.2 |  |
| Departure delay time | 2.9 |  |  |
| Arrival on vehicle delay waiting | 2.3 |  |  |
| Non-specific delay waiting | 3.2 |  |  |
| Average delay waiting |  |  |  |

Source: Australian Transport Council (ATC) Guidelines Public Transport Parameter Review Report by Douglas Economics, October 2015.

Parts of a journey are less comfortable than others. For example, waiting times, egress walking and unexpected delays are less comfortable to the traveller than on-board time.
TfNSW recommends applying the multipliers provided in Table 8 which convert less comfortable parts of a journey into equivalent on-board time. For example, 1 minute walking time is equivalent to 1.5 minutes on-board train time, and a 1 minute train-delay is equal to 3.2 minutes of on-board train time.

The value of waiting time can be used to evaluate initiatives which change frequency. An increase in service frequency would reduce waiting time. The unexpected delay time multiplier is used for valuing unexpected service delays, e.g. as a result of incidents.
Unexpected delays are more costly to the traveller compared to expected delays. Travellers are likely to build a buffer into their journey consistent with expected delays, which is unlikely to disrupt the rest of their day. However, an unexpected delay is more costly to the traveller, as this is unlikely to have been planned for.

### 2.4 Value of transfers

Changing vehicles during a journey is inconvenient. Consequently, a traveller attaches a disutility to a transfer. TfNSW recommends the equivalent in-vehicle times (IVT) for vehicle transfers in Table 9. For example, a bus-to-bus transfer is equivalent to 14.8 minutes of IVT. These figures were derived from a stated preference study commissioned by TfNSW (Douglas Economics, 2014).

## Table 9 Value of transfer

| Mode | TfNSW recommended (1) <br> (IVT min / transfer) |  | ATAP recommended (2) <br> (IVT min / transfer) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Bus | 13.7 |  |  |
| Train* | 7.2 | 14.8 | 3.8 | Same mode transfer: 6 <br> Bus |
| Light Rail |  |  | 5.2 | Different mode transfer: 10 |

Sources: (1) Douglas Economics, 2014. TfNSW values sourced from Passenger service quality values for bus, LRT and rail in inner Sydney, report to Bureau of Transport Statistics, TfNSW. (2) ATAP values sourced from ATC Guidelines Public Transport Parameter Review Report by Douglas Economics, October 2015.
Note: *The train-to-train penalty is higher than the value estimated by RailCorp Economic Unit in 2011, which
recommended a transfer penalty equivalent to an IVT of 6 min . IVT of 7.2 is preferred as the stated preference surveys used to calculate this figure are more recent.

## 3 Road vehicle operating costs

TfNSW recommends using an approach for estimating VOC that is outlined in Transport for NSW Technical Note on Calculating Road Vehicle Operating Costs. For a copy of this document, please email EconomicAdvisory@transport.nsw.gov.au.

TfNSW recommends the use of a depreciation-adjusted version of the ATAP PV2 VOC model for estimating vehicle operating cost (VOC) benefits for urban project CBA. For rural projects, TfNSW recommends use of the ATAP PV2 uninterrupted flow VOC and fuel consumption models.
For urban vehicle operating cost models, TfNSW recommends treating kilometres travelled at speeds below $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ as travelling at $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ for the purpose of calculating VOC. This is because VOC models produce high per-kilometre values at speeds below $5 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$, which may be inappropriate for inclusion in CBAs when applied to outputs from strategic demand models.

Table 10 Urban vehicle operating cost models: low speed resource costs (\$/km)

| Vehicle operating cost model | Speed (km/h) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| TfNSW depreciation adjusted VOC model (2019) - medium car |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VOC model value | 5.04 | 2.61 | 1.80 | 1.39 | 1.15 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.71 | 0.65 |
| TfNSW recommended value | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 1.15 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.71 | 0.65 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Estimates based on the coefficients in Table 11 then indexed from June 2013 to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2326616R).

Three types of costs are discussed in this section:

- Resource costs: should be used in a CBA. Resource costs represent the value of a resource to society, which is often estimated as the market price excluding taxes and subsidies. Taxes and subsidies are transfers between individuals and government and do not reflect the underlying value of a resource.
- Perceived costs: should be used for travel demand modelling, as well as in CBA which assesses the impacts of induced demand. This is the cost perceived by drivers. TfNSW recommends the values used in Table 13 or in the transport model be used in CBA. The values in Table 13 reflects the mix of costs perceived by private vehicle users and the full financial costs perceived by commercial vehicle operators.
- Financial costs: are used in a financial appraisal. It only includes the direct effect on an individual's or organisation's finances and uses accounting concepts. The financial cost will include market costs, including taxes and subsidies. These values should not be used in CBA.


### 3.1 Urban vehicle operating cost models

The VOC model used determines the parameter values that are used in the benefit equation. VOC models are generally used to calculate the resource cost of travel. For urban project CBAs, interrupted flow VOC models reflect the change in operating costs with speed (in kilometres per hour) and the difference between driving in free-flow or stop-start traffic.

### 3.1.1 TfNSW depreciation adjusted VOC model

The depreciation adjusted VOC model for private vehicles uses the base formula from ATAP PV2 (2016), with an additional depreciation adjustment.

Equation 1 VOC model for private vehicles, stop-start model

$$
c=A+\frac{B}{V}+\left(D \times \frac{60}{V}\right)+E
$$

Source: TfNSW Evaluation \& Assurance (2020)
Equation 2 VOC model for private vehicles, free-flow model

$$
c=C_{0}+C_{1} V+C_{2} V^{2}+D+E
$$

Source: TfNSW Evaluation \& Assurance (2020)

## Where:

- c represents VOCs (cents/km)
- Vrepresents journey speed (km/h)
- A, B, $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{0}}, \mathbf{C}_{1}$, and $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{2}}$ are model coefficients, as listed in Table 11 below.
- D and $\mathbf{E}$ are adjustments to remove HDM-4 depreciation estimates, and to add the use-based component of depreciation back into the VOC model, respectively. Coefficient $D$ is multiplied by $\mathbf{6 0 / V}$ for the stop-start model, removing an adjustment made in ATAP PV2 to account for reduced utilisation in lower journey speed environments.

Table 11 Depreciation-adjusted VOC model coefficients

| Vehicle Type | Stop-start model |  | Free-flow model |  |  | Depreciation adjustment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | D | E |
| Cars |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small Car | 13.3475 | 893.4041 | 27.4909 | -0.1335 | 0.0011 | -7.2945 | 1.6848 |
| Medium Car | 13.4831 | 1401.9961 | 37.3509 | -0.1866 | 0.0013 | -15.2457 | 3.6508 |
| Large Car | 15.3783 | 1959.3314 | 49.2120 | -0.2367 | 0.0015 | -21.8147 | 5.2239 |
| Utility vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courier Van-Utility | 17.0281 | 1450.1832 | 41.1315 | -0.1966 | 0.0015 | -9.8032 | 1.2244 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 22.4914 | 1419.9117 | 43.3391 | -0.1646 | 0.0014 | -16.1181 | 1.8397 |
| Rigid trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Light Rigid | 36.2991 | 1649.3983 | 55.0413 | -0.2651 | 0.0027 | -12.2342 | 1.4239 |
| Medium Rigid | 38.2589 | 2414.8697 | 66.9773 | -0.3208 | 0.0028 | -25.5155 | 3.1336 |
| Heavy Rigid | 61.0795 | 2731.3507 | 87.9327 | -0.5904 | 0.0057 | -30.2617 | 3.5267 |
| Heavy Bus | 68.9837 | 4949.7869 | 133.2524 | -0.6910 | 0.0050 | -44.4406 | 5.1376 |
| Articulated trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Articulated 4 Axle | 90.3703 | 3550.8738 | 119.3189 | -0.7736 | 0.0077 | -37.0309 | 4.2054 |
| Articulated 5 Axle | 97.3792 | 3941.5427 | 128.1211 | -0.7266 | 0.0071 | -40.8365 | 4.6375 |
| Articulated 6 Axle | 105.4576 | 4264.9639 | 137.5122 | -0.7350 | 0.0071 | -44.2721 | 5.0277 |
| Combination vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 130.9546 | 3985.6067 | 145.4988 | -0.6842 | 0.0069 | -38.6538 | 4.3897 |
| B-Double | 131.4257 | 4907.0762 | 161.8582 | -0.7724 | 0.0073 | -50.5418 | 5.7397 |
| Twin steer + 5 Axle | 135.9194 | 4680.3125 | 160.2120 | -0.7385 | 0.0072 | -47.1008 | 5.3489 |
| A-Double | 153.8668 | 6082.3124 | 196.1207 | -0.8901 | 0.0079 | -63.8098 | 7.2465 |
| B-Triple | 159.6593 | 7623.6772 | 228.8270 | -1.0555 | 0.0087 | -83.0071 | 9.4266 |
| A B combination | 182.0005 | 6686.9568 | 223.0189 | -0.9635 | 0.0085 | -69.5421 | 7.8974 |
| A-Triple | 203.7212 | 7624.1800 | 253.3243 | -1.0826 | 0.0092 | -79.9724 | 9.0820 |
| B-Double | 213.2552 | 7454.6907 | 255.0945 | -1.0560 | 0.0092 | -50.5418 | 5.7397 |

Source: TfNSW Evaluation \& Assurance (2020) based on ATAP (2016). Coefficients produce VOC estimates in June 2019 prices

Table 12 Urban vehicle operating costs: resource cost (cents/km)

| Vehicle type | TfNSW depreciation adjusted VOC model |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Car (all types) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small car | 37.82 | 30.22 | 26.43 | 24.15 | 22.63 | 21.54 | 20.73 | 20.10 | 19.59 | 19.18 |
| Medium car | 41.50 | 33.38 | 29.32 | 26.88 | 25.25 | 24.09 | 23.22 | 22.55 | 22.01 | 21.56 |
| Large car | 53.12 | 42.28 | 36.86 | 33.61 | 31.44 | 29.89 | 28.73 | 27.83 | 27.11 | 26.52 |
| Utility vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courier Van-Utility | 61.35 | 46.99 | 39.80 | 35.49 | 32.62 | 30.57 | 29.03 | 27.83 | 26.87 | 26.09 |
| 4WD Petrol | 46.97 | 39.43 | 35.65 | 33.39 | 31.88 | 30.80 | 29.99 | 29.36 | 28.86 | 28.45 |
| Rigid trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Light Rigid | 83.49 | 68.23 | 60.61 | 56.03 | 52.98 | 50.80 | 49.16 | 47.89 | 46.88 | 46.04 |
| Medium Rigid | 85.59 | 70.86 | 63.49 | 59.07 | 56.12 | 54.02 | 52.44 | 51.21 | 50.23 | 49.43 |
| Heavy Rigid | 10.39 | 95.13 | 87.50 | 82.92 | 79.87 | 77.69 | 76.05 | 74.78 | 73.76 | 72.93 |
| Heavy Bus | 188.29 | 150.23 | 131.21 | 119.79 | 112.18 | 106.74 | 102.66 | 99.49 | 96.95 | 94.88 |
| Articulated trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Articulated 4 Axle | 161.03 | 138.88 | 127.80 | 121.16 | 116.73 | 113.56 | 111.19 | 109.34 | 107.87 | 106.66 |
| Articulated 5 Axle | 176.58 | 151.73 | 139.30 | 131.84 | 126.87 | 123.32 | 120.66 | 118.59 | 116.93 | 115.57 |
| Articulated 6 Axle | 190.92 | 164.11 | 150.70 | 142.66 | 137.30 | 133.47 | 130.59 | 128.36 | 126.57 | 125.11 |
| Combination vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rigid+5 Axle Dog | 218.66 | 190.89 | 177.00 | 168.67 | 163.12 | 159.15 | 156.17 | 153.86 | 152.01 | 150.49 |
| B-Double | 230.89 | 199.65 | 184.03 | 174.66 | 168.41 | 163.94 | 160.60 | 157.99 | 155.91 | 154.21 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle | 233.98 | 203.08 | 187.62 | 178.35 | 172.17 | 167.76 | 164.45 | 161.87 | 159.81 | 158.13 |
| A-Double | 273.80 | 236.24 | 217.46 | 206.19 | 198.68 | 193.31 | 189.28 | 186.15 | 183.65 | 181.60 |
| B-Triple | 301.25 | 257.19 | 235.17 | 221.95 | 213.14 | 206.85 | 202.13 | 198.46 | 195.52 | 193.12 |
| A B combination | 315.62 | 273.71 | 252.76 | 240.19 | 231.81 | 225.82 | 221.33 | 217.84 | 215.04 | 212.76 |
| A-Triple | 354.09 | 307.00 | 283.45 | 269.32 | 259.90 | 253.17 | 248.13 | 244.20 | 241.06 | 238.49 |
| B-Double | 230.89 | 199.65 | 184.03 | 174.66 | 168.41 | 163.94 | 160.60 | 157.99 | 155.91 | 154.21 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Estimates based on the coefficients in Table 11
TfNSW recommends using the behavioural VOC used in the transport forecasting approach if using a constant perceived VOC per kilometre. For variable perceived costs, TfNSW recommends the parameters in in Table 13.
Perceived VOC are the sum of all operating costs that are considered by travellers in making travel decisions. The perceived VOC parameters shown in Table 13 differ from resource cost parameters because:

- travellers take into account taxes and subsidies, such as GST, fuel excise and rebates, which are transfers to and from the government and not economic costs
- travellers do not perceive or misperceive some costs when making travel decisions, such as the impacts of additional travel on maintenance, engine oil, and tyre costs
- travel costs are paid for by other parties, so the perceived vehicle operating cost is zero for some travellers
- some travellers incorrectly allocate other costs as part of the marginal cost of travel, for instance, insurance or time-based depreciation costs
- some travellers may not perceive that VOC are higher during congested conditions, and lower when travelling at high speeds. Travellers may instead perceive VOC as a constant cost per kilometre.

Table 13 Urban vehicle operating costs: perceived cost (cents/km)

| Vehicle type | TfNSW perceived VOC model |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Car (all types) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Small car | 42.78 | 36.97 | 34.07 | 32.33 | 31.17 | 30.34 | 29.72 | 29.24 | 28.85 | 28.53 |
| Medium car | 53.36 | 44.30 | 39.78 | 37.06 | 35.25 | 33.95 | 32.98 | 32.23 | 31.62 | 31.13 |
| Large car | 66.37 | 53.65 | 47.30 | 43.48 | 40.94 | 39.12 | 37.76 | 36.70 | 35.85 | 35.16 |
| Utility vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courier Van-Utility | 71.93 | 55.50 | 47.29 | 42.37 | 39.08 | 36.73 | 34.98 | 33.61 | 32.51 | 31.62 |
| 4WD Petrol | 59.98 | 50.20 | 45.31 | 42.37 | 40.41 | 39.01 | 37.97 | 37.15 | 36.50 | 35.96 |
| Rigid trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Light Rigid | 88.74 | 72.94 | 65.03 | 60.29 | 57.13 | 54.87 | 53.18 | 51.86 | 50.81 | 49.95 |
| Medium Rigid | 93.77 | 78.44 | 70.78 | 66.18 | 63.12 | 60.93 | 59.29 | 58.01 | 56.99 | 56.15 |
| Heavy Rigid | 126.59 | 109.33 | 100.70 | 95.52 | 92.07 | 89.61 | 87.76 | 86.32 | 85.17 | 84.23 |
| Heavy Bus | 204.30 | 163.77 | 143.51 | 131.35 | 123.24 | 117.45 | 113.11 | 109.73 | 107.03 | 104.82 |
| Articulated trucks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Articulated 4 Axle | 180.54 | 156.67 | 144.74 | 137.58 | 132.80 | 129.39 | 126.84 | 124.85 | 123.26 | 121.95 |
| Articulated 5 Axle | 197.70 | 170.95 | 157.57 | 149.55 | 144.19 | 140.37 | 137.51 | 135.28 | 133.49 | 132.03 |
| Articulated 6 Axle | 214.00 | 185.14 | 170.70 | 162.05 | 156.27 | 152.15 | 149.06 | 146.65 | 144.73 | 143.16 |
| Combination vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rigid+5 Axle Dog | 245.82 | 215.74 | 200.70 | 191.67 | 185.66 | 181.36 | 178.14 | 175.63 | 173.62 | 171.98 |
| B-Double | 259.84 | 226.16 | 209.32 | 199.22 | 192.48 | 187.67 | 184.06 | 181.25 | 179.01 | 177.17 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle | 263.06 | 229.69 | 213.01 | 203.00 | 196.32 | 191.55 | 187.98 | 185.20 | 182.97 | 181.15 |
| A-Double | 307.08 | 266.81 | 246.67 | 234.59 | 226.54 | 220.78 | 216.47 | 213.11 | 210.43 | 208.23 |
| B-Triple | 335.91 | 289.06 | 265.64 | 251.59 | 242.22 | 235.53 | 230.51 | 226.60 | 223.48 | 220.92 |
| A B combination | 354.00 | 309.11 | 286.66 | 273.19 | 264.21 | 257.80 | 252.99 | 249.25 | 246.26 | 243.81 |
| A-Triple | 396.42 | 346.12 | 320.97 | 305.88 | 295.82 | 288.63 | 283.24 | 279.05 | 275.70 | 272.95 |
| B-Double | 259.84 | 226.16 | 209.32 | 199.22 | 192.48 | 187.67 | 184.06 | 181.25 | 179.01 | 177.17 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW
Note: Private vehicle perceived costs have been estimated by Evaluation and Assurance based on (Shiftan \& Bekhor, 2002). LCV and HCV perceived costs have been estimated by Evaluation \& Assurance based on resource costs plus taxes and subsidies.

Fuel use parameters and VOC per stop on urban roads are provided in Table 14 and Table 15. TfNSW recommends using the values presented in Table 15 for projects that impact the number of vehicle stops rather than speed of travel, for example, intersection upgrades. These costs are already included in the ATAP 2016 VOC model.
Table 14 Fuel use parameters for cars

| Parameter | Value | Units |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fuel cost* | 75.92 | Cents/L |
| Fuel used per stop** | 0.04 | L |
| Fuel consumption*** | 9.0 to 12.0 | L/100km |

Sources: * Fuel cost is a resource cost and is based on 2018-19 average petrol price excluding GST and fuel excise Terminal Gate Prices (TPG) (Australian Institute of Petroleum).
** Fuel used per stop based on SCATS values.
*** Fuel consumption based on 2015 NGTSM, medium car.
Table 15 Vehicle operating cost per stop

| Vehicle | VOC/stop (excl. <br> fuel) (cents) | Fuel consumption <br> per stop (L) | Fuel cost (cents/L) | VOC/stop (incl. fuel) <br> (cents) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Car | 4.62 | 0.04 | 75.92 | 7.80 |
| Light truck | 10.7 | 0.22 | 82.61 | 29.20 |
| Heavy truck | 19.6 | 0.72 | 82.61 | 78.88 |

Source: Fuel consumption per stop is based on estimates of 0.42 stops per km (based on SCATES data). Fuel cost is a resource cost and is based on 2017/18 average fuel price TGP excluding GST and fuel excise (Australian Institute of Petroleum). Diesel fuel price used for Light and Heavy trucks (Australian Institute of Petroleum).

### 3.2 Rural vehicle operating cost model

### 3.2.1 Rural Evaluation System model

REVS is the model used in the CBA of NSW rural road projects. The system is based on the National Association of Australian State Road Authorities Improved Model for Project Assessment and Costing (NIMPAC) road planning model. ${ }^{1}$ The REVS model uses the economic parameters provided in Table 17.

The REVS is designed to be used on rural and outer urban roads because it assumes uninterrupted traffic flows. However, it can be used on roads in towns where traffic flow is predominantly uninterrupted. The REVS is also designed to handle small networks of interacting roads, where an improvement to a single road can affect traffic conditions on other roads in the network. In this situation a traffic survey would first be required to establish the redistribution of traffic. Stop/Give Way signs, traffic lights, pedestrian crossings and the like will reduce the applicability of REVS in an urban situation.

### 3.2.2 ATAP VOC model - rural

The functional form of the ATAP VOC model for rural areas is given by Equation 3. Estimated VOCs can be found in Table 82 to Table 97 in Appendix D. There is also an Excel tool to calculate Rural VOC and Fuel Consumption.

Equation 3 ATAP VOC model - rural

$$
V O C=B a s e V O C \times\left(k_{1}+\frac{k_{2}}{V}+k_{3} V^{2}+k_{4} I R I+k_{5} I R I^{2}+k_{6} G V M\right)
$$

Where:

- VOC = vehicle operating cost (cents/km)
- Base VOC = lowest VOC point in curve from raw HDM-4 output
- $\mathbf{V}=$ vehicle speed (km/hr)
- $\mathbf{I R I}=$ International Roughness Index ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{km}$ )
- GVM = gross vehicle mass (tonnes)
- $\mathbf{k}_{1}$ to $\mathbf{k}_{6}=$ model coefficients.

The International Roughness Index (IRI) is a scoring process for the roughness of the road surface. At low values the road surface is characterised as good or very good with little surface imperfections. A fair road is characterised with surface imperfections. Poor roads are characterised with frequent minor depressions and very poor roads with frequent shallow depressions or deep shallow depressions (Table 16) (Gillespie, et al., 2002).
Table 16 Description of road surface conditions

| Measure | Sealed road |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pavement condition | Very Poor | Poor | Fair | Good | Very Good |
| International Roughness Index (IRI) | $8+$ | $6-7$ | $4-5$ | 3 | $0-2$ |

Source: National Association of Australian State Road Authorities.
TfNSW recommends the rural ATAP fuel consumption model as presented in Australian Transport Assessment and Planning PV2 Road Parameter Values (2016). The functional form is described in Equation 4. Look up tables of estimated VOC values are provided in

[^0]Table 98 in Appendix D. Estimates can also be calculated using the Excel tool to calculate Rural VOC and Fuel Consumption.

Equation 4 ATAP fuel consumption - rural

$$
\text { Fuel consumption }=\text { Base Fuel } \times\left(k_{1}+\frac{k_{2}}{V}+k_{3} V^{2}+k_{4} I R I+k_{5} G V M\right)
$$

Where:

- Fuel consumption is in L/km
- Base Fuel = lowest fuel consumption point in curve from raw HDM-4 output
- $\mathbf{V}=$ vehicle speed (km/hr)
- IRI = International Roughness Index (m/km)
- GVM = gross vehicle mass (tonnes)
- $\mathbf{k}_{1}$ to $\mathbf{k}_{5}=$ model coefficients.

Table 17 Rural Evaluation System model economic parameters

| Parameters | Identifier | Units | Car | 2x-4ty Truck | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2x-6ty } \\ & \text { Truck } \end{aligned}$ | 3 Axle Truck | 4 Axle Truck | 5 Axle Semi | 6 Axle Semi | B-Double | B-Triple | Quad <br> Group <br> Semi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road user cost parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Petrol price | PETROL | cent/litre | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 | 75.9 |
| Diesel price | DIESEL | cent/litre | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 | 82.6 |
| Oil price | OIL | cent/litre | 782 | 474 | 474 | 474 | 474 | 474 | 474 | 474 | 474 | 474 |
| New tyre price | TYRE | \$ per tyre | 138 | 174 | 385 | 744 | 690 | 705 | 701 | 668 | 704 | 732 |
| Retread tyre price | RETRED | \$ per tyre | 69 | 88 | 196 | 250 | 250 | 241 | 247 | 253 | 280 | 259 |
| Repair and servicing cost | REPAIR | cents/km | 7.1 | 7.5 | 10.8 | 15.7 | 21.5 | 25.0 | 25.6 | 29.8 | 39.7 | 29.2 |
| New vehicle price | VEHCLE | \$ | 24,205 | 27,759 | 79,497 | 180,223 | 245,201 | 272,135 | 296,449 | 342,783 | 558,770 | 319,302 |
| Sales tax rate | TAX | \% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 |
| Time depreciation rate | TIMDEP | \%/ year | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Distance depreciation rate | DISDEP | \%/ 1000km | 0.224 | 0.311 | 0.311 | 0.205 | 0.155 | 0.137 | 0.137 | 0.137 | 0.137 | 0.0 |
| Time and crash parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial time value | COMMTIM | \$/ hr/ person | 57.48 | 30.04 | 31.45 | 38.67 | 48.29 | 52.85 | 54.52 | 65.77 | 78.14 | 78.14 |
| Commercial vehicle occupancy | COMMOCC | Persons/ vehicle | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Weighted average crash cost | UACCST | \$/ crash | Rural Urban | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \$ 313,536.13 \\ & \$ 144,284.44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private car occupancy | PRIVOCC | Persons/ vehicle | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Private time value | PRIVTIM | cents/ hr/ person | 17.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Values are indexed to June 2019 prices. The REVS model refers to its economic parameters inputs as the "SWIDE file".

Table 18 provides the proportion of vehicles in urban and rural areas used to calculate the heavy VOCs.

## Table 18 Mix of vehicles

| Vehicle type | \% Urban | \% Regional | \% Overall |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cars (all types) | 77.40 | 71.35 | 76.06 |
| Cars | 77.40 | 71.35 | 76.06 |
| Utility vehicles | 16.58 | 15.84 | 16.41 |
| Courier van utility | 9.66 | 9.23 | 9.56 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 6.92 | 6.61 | 6.85 |
| Rigid trucks | 3.62 | 5.00 | 3.93 |
| Light Rigid (previously LCV 2 axle-4tyre) | 0.58 | 0.80 | 0.63 |
| Medium Rigid (previously 2 axle-6 tyre) | 1.00 | 1.38 | 1.09 |
| Heavy Rigid (previously 3 axle) | 2.04 | 2.82 | 2.21 |
| Articulated trucks | 0.76 | 3.07 | 1.27 |
| 4 axle | 0.23 | 0.32 | 0.25 |
| 5 axle | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.14 |
| 6 axle | 0.46 | 2.36 | 0.88 |
| Combination vehicles | 0.77 | 3.95 | 1.45 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| B-Double | 0.70 | 3.60 | 1.34 |
| Twin steer + 5 Axle Dog | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| A-Double | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.02 |
| B-Triple | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| A B combination | 0.01 | 0.0 | 0.01 |
| A-Triple | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| B-Double | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.02 |
| Buses | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Bus | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.84 |
| Sare Estina |  | 2 |  |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW from ABS Survey of Motor Vehicle Use 2018.
Additional information on freight vehicle types, average payloads, and distance travelled can be found at the following sources:

- The Traffic Volume Viewer website, to identify relevant Permanent or Sample Classifiers. Requests for freight data by Austroad heavy vehicle class can be sent to Network \& Asset Intelligence.
- The Who Moves What Where report, available on the National Transport Commission website.
- ABS Category 2993.0 Road freight movements, 2014.

Table 19 contains commercial vehicle mixes for selected Traffic Volume Viewer Classifiers, sourced from Network \& Asset Intelligence.

Table 19 Commercial vehicle class mix: selected Sydney Classifiers

| Commercial vehicle class | Mobbs Lane, <br> Mobbs Hill | Daines Parade, <br> Beacon Hill | Newbridge Road, <br> Milperra | New Beach Road, <br> Rushcutters Bay |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rigid trucks | $6.36 \%$ | $6.67 \%$ | $8.01 \%$ | $5.34 \%$ |
| Two Axle Truck or Bus | $5.41 \%$ | $5.37 \%$ | $6.56 \%$ | $4.93 \%$ |
| Three Axle Truck or Bus | $0.63 \%$ | $0.84 \%$ | $1.14 \%$ | $0.28 \%$ |
| Four Axle Truck | $0.32 \%$ | $0.46 \%$ | $0.32 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ |
| Articulated trucks | $1.54 \%$ | $0.77 \%$ | $2.08 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ |
| Three Axle Articulated | $0.14 \%$ | $0.25 \%$ | $0.26 \%$ | $0.08 \%$ |
| Four Axle Articulated | $0.06 \%$ | $0.14 \%$ | $0.21 \%$ | $0.03 \%$ |
| Five Axle Articulated | $0.12 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $0.32 \%$ | $0.02 \%$ |
| Six Axle Articulated | $0.99 \%$ | $0.25 \%$ | $1.13 \%$ | $0.04 \%$ |
| B Double | $0.23 \%$ | $0.06 \%$ | $0.14 \%$ | $0.01 \%$ |
| Double Road Train | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.01 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| Triple Road Train | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

Source: Network \& Asset Intelligence (2019).

## 4 Urban road congestion cost

The marginal congestion cost includes the impacts from:

- extra travel time
- increased travel time variability
- increased VOC due to higher fuel consumption
- poorer air quality, as vehicles on congested roads emit more harmful pollutants compared to free-flowing traffic conditions.

TfNSW recommends not including the marginal cost of congestion in a CBA if the economic benefits of road user travel time savings, reliability, urban vehicle operating costs, or environmental impacts have been separately assessed; in order to avoid double counting benefits.

TfNSW recommends the marginal congestion costs presented in Table 20 to be used for the Greater Sydney Region. As the impacts of cars, freight vehicles and buses are different, VKT has been converted into Passenger Car Equivalent Units (PCU) kilometre travelled (PCU-km). Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) factors of buses and trucks are presented in Table 21.

Table $\mathbf{2 0}$ Marginal road congestion cost in Sydney

| Vehicle type | PCE factors | Marginal congestion cost in <br> Sydney (cents/vkt) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Passenger vehicles \& LCVs | 1.00 | 44.88 |
| Rigid trucks | 3.00 | 134.64 |
| Trailers | 6.00 | 269.28 |
| Articulated trucks | 5.00 | 224.40 |
| B doubles | 8.00 | 359.04 |
| Double road train | 8.00 | 359.04 |
| Triple road train | 10.00 | 448.80 |
| 2 axle buses | 2.00 | 89.76 |
| 3 axle buses | 3.00 | 134.64 |

Source: BITRE (2016) Estimating urban traffic and congestion cost trends in Australian cities. Working paper 74, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics Values indexed from June 2010 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).

### 4.1 Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) units

TfNSW recommends the use of the PCE factors in Table 21 which have been used to calculate the values in Table 20. The recommended values can be adjusted using the PCE range provided, considering:

- the terrain type
- the gradient of the road and the distance vehicles are traveling at that gradient (grade severity and length of grade)
- traffic mix.

These factors affect the performance of heavy vehicles and subsequently affect traffic flow.
Table 21 also presents the findings from a literature review on PCE.

Table 21 Passenger car equivalency factors

| Vehicle Type | NTC | ARRB |  | Mainroads Western Australia |  |  | USA | DfT UK | National Guidelines | TfNSW |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Urban | Rural | Flat terrain | Rolling terrain | Mountainous terrain |  |  |  | Range | Recommended |
| Passenger vehicles \& LCVs | 1.0 |  |  | 1.0 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.99-1.12 | 1.0-2.0 | 1.0 |
| Rigid trucks | 2.0 | 4.9 | 1.4-7.9 | 1.2-2.0 | 1.7-5.0 | 3.0-8.0 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.23-1.56 | 1.2-8.0 | 3.0 |
| Trailers | 2.0-3.0 | 6.5-8.7 | 1.7-13.0 |  |  |  | 2.0 |  |  | 1.7-13.0 | 6.0 |
| Articulated trucks | 3.0 |  |  | 2.5 | 5.0 | 10.0 |  | 2.9 | 1.78-1.89 | 2.5-10.0 | 5.0 |
| $B$ doubles | 4.0 | 8.8-22.3 | 1.9-15.6 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 16.0 |  |  | 2.22 | 1.9-16.0 | 8.0 |
| Double road trains | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 | 10.0 | 16.0 |  |  | 2.75-2.90 | 4.0-16.0 | 8.0 |
| Triple road trains | 5.0 | 9.7-24.0 | 4.2-25.7 | 9.0 | 22.0 | 35.0 |  |  | 2.82-3.38 | 4.2-35.0 | 10.0 |
| 2 axle buses | 1.0-2.0 |  |  | 1.2 | 1.7 | 3.0 |  |  |  | 1.0-3.0 | 2.0 |
| 3 axle buses | 3.0 |  |  | 1.7 | 3.5 | 6.0 |  |  | 1.59 | 1.7-6.0 | 3.0 |

## 3 axle buses

ource:
(1) NTC - National Transport Commission, Heavy vehicle charges - Report to the Standing Council of Transport and Infrastructure, February 2012.
(2) ARRB - ARRB Consulting, Review of passenger car equivalency factors for heavy vehicles, October 2007.
(3) Mainroads Western Australia - Mainroads Western Australia, Policy and guidelines for overtaking lanes, December 2011.
(4) USA - US Highway Capacity Manual \& Al-Kaisy, A. (2006) Passenger car equivalents for heavy vehicles at freeways and multilane highways: some critical issues, ITE Journal, March 2006.
(5) DfT UK - UK Department for Transport, Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG).
(6) NGTSM update 2015.

### 4.2 Additional information: urban road congestion cost

### 4.2.1 Marginal and average congestion cost

The marginal congestion cost is the incremental congestion delay an individual traveller imposes when entering traffic. The average congestion cost is the total congestion delay per VKT. The marginal congestion cost increases at a faster rate that the average congestion cost as the volume of traffic increases. By joining the congested traffic flow, the additional traveller adds to the congestion, and causes a small increase in the delay experienced by each of the other users.

Marginal cost varies at different levels of congestion. When congestion is low, marginal cost is close to average cost. When congestion is high, marginal cost is higher than average cost (Figure 1).
Figure 1 Average and marginal congestion costs


Source: BITRE (2007)
In Figure 1, the net increase in costs from the increased traffic congestion is therefore equal to area VBRU less area BAQ, which given the geometry of the marginal cost curve, is equal to area PAQ. Where:

- VBRU is an increase in total travel costs for all existing users (due to the higher congestion at point A)
- BAQ is an increase in consumer surplus amount for extra travellers (whose overall utility improves).

The congestion cost in Sydney was estimated by the Bureau of Infrastructure Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE) at $\$ 3.53$ billion in 2005 and projected to increase to $\$ 7.76$ billion by $2020 .{ }^{2}$ An update to the BITRE report was released in 2016, which estimated the cost of congestion in Sydney as $\$ 6.12$ billion as at 2015,

[^1]and projected 2020 congestion costs of $\$ 9.63$ billion, an increase on the 2005 forecast. ${ }^{3}$

Table 22 presents 2016 BITRE estimates of the average social costs of congestion in Australian capital cities.
Table 22 Average congestion costs: Sydney and Australian capital cities

| Year | Sydney <br>  <br>  <br> Total congestion <br> cost (\$b) |  |  | Unit cost of <br> congestion <br> (cents/PCU km) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Original estimate in 2010 prices |  |  |  | Total congestion <br> cost (\$b) |
| 2020 | $\$ 8.04$ | 15.75 | Unit cost of <br> congestion <br> (cents/PCU km) |  |
| 2021 | $\$ 8.40$ | 16.07 | $\$ 16.45$ | 10.69 |
| 2022 | $\$ 8.74$ | 16.30 | $\$ 17.51$ | 11.14 |
| 2023 | $\$ 9.08$ | 16.55 | $\$ 18.56$ | 11.53 |
| 2024 | $\$ 9.40$ | 16.75 | $\$ 19.77$ | 11.97 |
| Indexed to June 2019 prices |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | $\$ 9.63$ | 18.88 | $\$ 21.02$ | 12.38 |
| 2021 | $\$ 10.07$ | 19.25 | $\$ 19.71$ | 12.81 |
| 2022 | $\$ 10.47$ | 19.54 | $\$ 20.98$ | 13.35 |
| 2023 | $\$ 10.87$ | 19.83 | $\$ 22.24$ | 13.82 |
| 2024 | $\$ 11.26$ | 20.08 | $\$ 23.69$ | 14.34 |

Source: BITRE (2016) Estimating urban traffic and congestion cost trends in Australian cities. Working paper 74, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics Values indexed from June 2010 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).

Estimating changes in congestion costs between two years can be used as a proxy for the marginal congestion cost. ${ }^{4}$ This is done using the BITRE forecast of the social cost of congestion and projections of total metropolitan vehicle kilometres travelled in passenger car unit equivalents (PCU) from 1990-2020. ${ }^{5}$
Total metropolitan vehicle kilometres are represented in PCUs to take into account the impact of differing vehicle class such as cars, light commercial vehicles, rigid trucks and articulated trucks.

The marginal social cost of congestion is calculated by dividing the change in the social cost of congestion between 2 consecutive years by the change in PCU kilometres travelled. This value is then indexed from 2005/06 prices to June 2019 prices using CPI (Sydney). The estimated marginal congestion cost is $\$ 0.46$ per vkt in 2020 as shown in Table 24. This is a marginal value representing the social cost of congestion imposed by each additional passenger car to all other vehicles on the road.

[^2]Table 23 Marginal congestion cost by road type in Sydney

| Road category | Marginal congestion cost (cents/vkt) <br> in 1996 dollars | Marginal congestion cost (cents/vkt) <br> indexed to June 2019 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Freeways | 13.00 | 22.49 |
| CBD streets | 62.00 | 107.25 |
| Arterial roads (inner) | 21.00 | 36.33 |
| Arterial roads (outer) | 7.00 | 12.11 |

Source: Traffic congestion and road user charges in Australian capital cities, Report 92, Bureau of
Transport and Communications Economics, 1996. Values indexed from June 1996 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

Table 24 Marginal congestion cost over time, Sydney-wide

| Cost | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Social Cost (\$billion) | 8.04 | 8.40 | 8.74 | 9.08 | 9.40 | 9.72 |
| Change in Social Cost <br> (\$billion) | 0.41 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.34 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Billion pcu-km | 45.45 | 46.56 | 47.70 | 48.81 | 49.91 | 51.00 |
| Change in pcu-km | 1.07 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.11 | 1.10 | 1.09 |
| MSC in 2005/6 dollar (\$/pcu- <br> $\mathrm{km})$ | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.30 | 0.29 |
| MSC in 2019 dollar (\$/pcu- <br> $\mathrm{km})$ | 0.46 | 0.40 | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.35 |

Source: BITRE (2016) Estimating urban traffic and congestion cost trends in Australian cities. Working paper 74, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics Values indexed from June 2010 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).

## 5 Road safety benefits

TfNSW recommends that road safety benefits be estimated based on the Inclusive Willingness-to-Pay (WTP) values in Table 26. Where detailed crash data is not available, the average crash costs by road type in Table $\mathbf{2 5}$ can be used to estimate the economic benefit.

Table 25 Average crash costs by road type, WTP values - urban

| Road type | Average crash cost (\$/mvkt) |  | Cas crashes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | All crashes | 141,376 | 87,581 |
| Local/sub-arterial | 87,690 | 103,217 | 63,745 |
| Arterial | 63,854 | 32,037 | 19,900 |
| Freeway | 19,900 | 115,791 | 71,617 |
| Weighted average | 71,727 |  |  |

Source: TfNSW estimate. Indexed from June 2014 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

Detailed road safety analysis can be undertaken using the Road User Movement (RUM) codes, and Inclusive WTP costs. The Safer Roads team in the Centre for Road Safety maintains a model that calculates road safety benefits and costs for road infrastructure projects. The Safer Roads team also maintains the Crash Reduction Factor matrix that records the literature based crash reduction or increase factors of individual road safety countermeasures, by RUM code.

For details, please contact saferroads@transport.nsw.gov.au.

### 5.1 Inclusive Willingness-to-Pay

The Inclusive WTP approach represents the individuals WTP to avoid death or injury; as well as the cost to society due to the crash, such as emergency costs. The WTP values are derived from a stated preference survey. The rationale for incorporating these additional costs is that individuals do not factor costs that are not incurred by the individual.

The Inclusive WTP approach is recommended by the Australian Government Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development (DITCRD) and has been adopted by ATAP. The values are a combination of WTP values with some additional vehicle, emergency and other crash related costs.

Table 26 Costs per casualty and per crash - Inclusive WTP approach

| Accident type |  |  | Urban |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Inclusive WTP costs per casualty |  | $\$ 7,425,549$ | $\$ 8,130,381$ |
| Fatality | $\$ 7,752,786$ |  |  |
| Serious injury (injury requiring hospitalisation) | $\$ 445,526$ | $\$ 589,855$ | $\$ 495,874$ |
| Moderate injury (attendance at an emergency <br> department) | $\$ 68,550$ | $\$ 87,906$ | $\$ 77,472$ |
| Minor injury (not requiring attendance at an <br> emergency department or hospital) | $\$ 68,550$ | $\$ 87,906$ | $\$ 77,472$ |
| Unknown injury type | $\$ 196,095$ | $\$ 250,420$ | $\$ 216,079$ |
| Inclusive WTP costs per crash |  |  |  |
| Fatal crash (at least one person killed) | $\$ 7,808,768$ | $\$ 9,242,523$ | $\$ 8,586,767$ |
| Serious injury crash (at least one person <br> hospitalised, but no fatalities) | $\$ 507,553$ | $\$ 700,151$ | $\$ 574,265$ |
| Moderate injury crash (at least one person <br> attended emergency, but no serious injuries or <br> fatalities) | $\$ 85,296$ | $\$ 112,608$ | $\$ 97,512$ |
| Minor injury crash (at least one person received <br> a minor injury, but no moderate / serious <br> injuries or fatalities) | $\$ 78,389$ | $\$ 103,484$ | $\$ 89,314$ |
| Unknown injury type crash | $\$ 177,264$ | $\$ 243,098$ | $\$ 210,809$ |
| Property damage only | $\$ 10,338$ | $\$ 10,338$ | $\$ 10,338$ |

Source: Values from the Economic Valuation of Safety Benefits, Serious Injuries, Final Report,
PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC) for the former Roads and Traffic Authority and indexed from December 2007 to June 2019 (ABS Series ID A2325846C).
Notes: Unknown injury type crash is non-fatal casualty crash where injury severity is unknown.
Definitions:

- A fatality occurs when a person dies within 30 days of a crash, from injuries due to the crash.
- A fatal crash is a road traffic crash on public roads in which at least one person in the crash dies within 30 days from injuries received in that crash.
- A serious injury is when a person is admitted to hospital as a result of a road traffic crash on public roads who does not die within 30 days as a result of those injuries.
- A serious injury crash is a road traffic crash on public roads in which at least one person was admitted to hospital as a result of the crash, and in which there were no fatalities as a result of that crash.
- A moderate injury is when a person attends an emergency department following a road traffic crash on public roads but is not subsequently admitted to hospital.
- A moderate injury crash is a road traffic crash on public roads in which at least one person attends an emergency department following that crash but is not subsequently admitted to hospital. There were no serious injuries or fatalities from that crash.
- Minor injury occurs when a person injured from a road traffic crash on public roads that does not attend an emergency department and is not admitted to hospital.
- A minor injury crash is a road traffic crash on public roads in which at least one person injured from that crash does not attend an emergency department and is not admitted to hospital. There were no moderate injuries, serious injuries or fatalities from that crash.
- Urban refers to Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong metropolitan areas, and town centres where the speed limit is up to and including $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.
- Rural refers to areas outside the Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong metropolitan areas, where the speed limit is more than $80 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$.


### 5.2 Crash rates

Crash rates for NSW roads were estimated by Austroads for a range of single and combined attributes. A selection of crash rate tables are included below, with more information available at the Austroads website.
Table 27 NSW Crash rates - single attribute

| Attribute | 100m <br> VKT <br> (5 years) | Fatal | Fatal crash rate | Injury | Injury crash rate | All crashes | Total crash rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carriageway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Divided | 905.88 | 339 | 0.37 | 17,386 | 19.19 | 24,990 | 27.59 |
| Single | 947.45 | 763 | 0.81 | 19,902 | 21.01 | 26,823 | 28.31 |
| Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural | 791.00 | 625 | 0.79 | 9,518 | 12.03 | 21,657 | 27.38 |
| Urban | 1,194.65 | 642 | 0.54 | 34,446 | 28.83 | 82,964 | 69.45 |
| Surface |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asphalt concrete | 1,151.24 | 623 | 0.54 | 32,097 | 27.88 | 77,699 | 67.49 |
| Concrete | 183.34 | 83 | 0.45 | 2,521 | 13.75 | 6,361 | 34.69 |
| Spray seal | 647.71 | 559 | 0.86 | 9,322 | 14.39 | 20,525 | 31.69 |
| Unsealed | 3.35 | 2 | 0.60 | 24 | 7.16 | 36 | 10.75 |

Source: Road Safety Engineering Risk Assessment Part 7: Crash Rates Database, AP-T152-10,
Austroads 2010.
Notes: Contact Economic Advisory for more detail on road class if required for a CBA.
Table 28 NSW crash rates - rural and urban by carriageway

| Attribute | 100 m <br> VKT (5 <br> years) | Fatal | Fatal <br> crash <br> rates | Injury | Injury <br> crash <br> rates | All <br> crashes | Total <br> crash <br> rates |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rural by carriageway | 174.14 | 72 | 0.41 | 1,782 | 10.23 | 4,632 | 26.6 |  |
| Divided | 616.86 | 553 | 0.9 | 7,736 | 12.54 | 17,025 | 27.6 |  |
| Single |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban by carriageway | 755.21 | 335 | 0.44 | 18,982 | 25.13 | 46,715 | 61.86 |  |
| Divided | Single | 439.44 | 307 | 0.7 | 15,464 | 35.19 | 36,249 | 82.49 |

Source: Road Safety Engineering Risk Assessment Part 7: Crash Rates Database, AP-T152-10, Austroads 2010.

### 5.3 Additional information: crash values

For additional information, the breakdown of the WTP values and the additional costs are provided in Table 29 and Table 30, respectively. The calculations for average crash costs also draw on the average number of persons killed and injured per crash, as presented in Table 31.
Table 29 and Table 30 are not intended to be directly used in CBA for road projects. The WTP values may be used in CBA of maritime, railway and other initiatives where the inclusive costs are not applicable.

Table 29 Value per casualty and per crash - willingness to pay approach

| Accident type | Urban | Rural | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WTP value per casualty |  |  |  |
| Value of fatality risk prevention | \$7,261,155 | \$7,965,987 | \$7,588,392 |
| Value of serious injury risk prevention (requiring hospitalisation) | \$261,947 | \$406,276 | \$312,295 |
| Value of moderate injury risk prevention (attendance at emergency department) | \$55,151 | \$74,506 | \$64,073 |
| Value of minor injury prevention | \$55,151 | \$74,506 | \$64,073 |
| Value of unknown injury type prevention | \$128,463 | \$182,788 | \$148,447 |
| WTP value per crash |  |  |  |
| Fatal crash (at least one person killed) | \$7,571,245 | \$8,981,595 | \$8,333,309 |
| Serious injury crash (at least one person hospitalised, but no fatalities) | \$302,651 | \$486,727 | \$366,226 |
| Moderate injury crash (at least one person attended emergency, but no serious injuries or fatalities) | \$68,623 | \$95,443 | \$80,647 |
| Minor injury crash (at least one person received a minor injury, but no moderate / serious injuries or fatalities) | \$63,067 | \$87,710 | \$73,866 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Values indexed from December 2007 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

Table 30 Vehicle and general costs (\$ per person) in inclusive WTP values

| Cost category | Crash type |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fatality | Serious injury | Moderate/ Minor injury | Unknown injury |
| Vehicle costs |  |  |  |  |
| Repairs* | \$14,617 | \$12,214 | \$12,053 | \$12,104 |
| Unavailability of vehicles* | \$1,855 | \$1,645 | \$869 | \$1,117 |
| Towing* | \$436 | \$387 | \$204 | \$263 |
| Total vehicle costs* | \$16,908 | \$14,247 | \$13,127 | \$13,484 |
| General costs |  |  |  |  |
| Travel delays** | \$82,061 | \$99,317 | \$130 | \$31,739 |
| Insurance administration** | \$52,586 | \$63,646 | \$83 | \$20,339 |
| Police** | \$10,580 | \$3,635 | \$55 | \$1,196 |
| Property** | \$1,704 | \$2,061 | \$3 | \$659 |
| Fire** | \$556 | \$673 | \$2 | \$216 |
| Total general costs** | \$147,487 | \$169,332 | \$272 | \$54,149 |
| Total inclusive costs (vehicle plus general) | \$164,395 | \$183,579 | \$13,399 | \$67,632 |

Source: NGTSM 2015. *Values indexed from June 2013 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2328771A). **Values indexed from June 3013 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).

Table 31 Average number of persons killed and injured in a crash

| Crash type | Urban | Rural | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fatal crash |  |  |  |
| Average no. of persons killed per crash | 1.03 | 1.10 | 1.08 |
| Average no. of persons hospitalised per crash | 0.32 | 0.39 | 0.37 |
| Average no. of persons with moderate injury per crash | 0.65 | 0.40 | 0.48 |
| Average no. of persons with minor/other injury per crash | 0.09 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
| Serious injury crash |  |  |  |
| Average no. of persons hospitalised per crash | 1.10 | 1.14 | 1.11 |
| Average no. of persons with moderate injury per crash | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.19 |
| Average no. of persons with minor/other injury per crash | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| Moderate injury crash |  |  |  |
| Average no. of persons with moderate injury per crash | 1.11 | 1.16 | 1.13 |
| Average no. of persons with minor/other injury per crash | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.13 |
| Minor injury crash |  |  |  |
| Average no. of persons with minor/other injury per crash | 1.14 | 1.18 | 1.15 |

Source: Number of persons is estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW based on casualty and crash data provided by the Centre for Road Safety for urban and rural 2011 to 2015.

### 5.3.1 The Human Capital approach to crash valuation

Although not recommended by TfNSW, the Human Capital approach is commonly used to value the impact of crashes. The Human Capital approach aggregates various identifiable costs, such as: loss of income, medical expenses, long term care, insurance cost, vehicle repair, property damage, travel delays and policing. The value of a statistical life or a fatality is the discounted present value of these costs over a period of up to 40 years.
There are several limitations of the Human Capital approach. Firstly, public policy is designed to reduce the risk of crashes or injuries. However, the Human Capital approach concentrates on what has been lost, rather than prevented. Secondly, it includes lost productivity and income and therefore undervalues fatalities involving non-working individuals. Thirdly, it does not make allowance for pain and suffering. Due to these limitations, the contemporary trend of economic evaluation is to use the crash values derived from the WTP approach. Human Capital accident costs were originally estimated by the Bureau of Transport Economics (BTE 2000). These values were then updated by the NGTSM (Table 32). As noted above, the human capital approach is not the preferred method for calculating crash values.
Table 32 Crash cost per person - Human Capital approach

| Cost components | Fatality | Serious injury | Other injury |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Human costs* |  |  |  |
| Ambulance | \$644 | \$644 | \$350 |
| Hospital in-patient | \$3,481 | \$13,928 | \$71 |
| Other medical | \$2,581 | \$20,909 | \$101 |
| Long-term care | \$0 | \$158,211 | \$0 |
| Labour in the** workplace | \$842,409 | \$39,832 | \$0 |
| Labour in the** household | \$700,776 | \$33,213 | \$0 |
| Quality of life** | \$774,043 | \$83,046 | \$4,413 |
| Insurance claims*** | \$20,654 | \$36,397 | \$2,175 |
| Criminal prosecution*** | \$2,665 | \$771 | \$95 |
| Correctional services*** | \$14,648 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Workplace disruptions*** | \$13,902 | \$14,287 | \$926 |
| Funeral*** | \$2,926 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Coroner*** | \$960 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Vehicle costs |  |  |  |
| Repairs**** | \$14,617 | \$12,214 | \$12,053 |
| Unavailability of vehicles**** | \$1,855 | \$1,645 | \$869 |
| Towing**** | \$436 | \$387 | \$204 |
| General costs |  |  |  |
| Travel delays*** | \$82,061 | \$99,317 | \$130 |
| Insurance administration*** | \$52,586 | \$63,646 | \$83 |
| Police*** | \$10,580 | \$3,635 | \$55 |
| Property*** | \$1,704 | \$2,061 | \$3 |
| Fire*** | \$556 | \$673 | \$2 |
| Total costs | \$2,544,084 | \$584,816 | \$21,531 |

Source: NGTSM 2015
*Values are indexed from June 2013 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2331111C).
**Values are indexed from May 2013 AWE to May 2019 AWE (ABS Series ID A84998729F).
***Values are indexed from June 2013 to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C)
****Values are indexed from June 2013 to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2328771A).
Table 33 presents the cost per crash using a Human Capital approach, by location.
Table 33 Cost per crash - Human Capital approach

| Crash type | Urban | Urban freeway | Rural |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fatal crash | $\$ 2,920,470$ | $\$ 3,000,341$ | $\$ 3,308,260$ |
| Serious / Other injury crash | $\$ 628,460$ | $\$ 660,899$ | $\$ 677,145$ |

Source: NGTSM, Road Parameter Values (2015). Indexed from May 2013 AWE to May 2019 AWE (ABS Series ID A84998729F).

### 5.3.2 Literature review of a value of a statistical life

A literature review indicates that the value of a statistical life (VSL) ranges from around $\$ 2$ million to $\$ 11$ million in March 2019 prices (excluding the two lowest and two highest outliers).
Table 34 Values of statistical life from existing international literature

| Studies | Value of Statistical <br> Life (\$m) | Approximate <br> Value in June <br> 2019 (AUD \$m) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Andersson (2005), Sweden | USD1.3 | $\$ 1.79$ |
| Krupnick et al (2000), Canada | USD1.3 | $\$ 2.10$ |
| RTA (2009) Human Capital Cost | AUD1.69 | $\$ 2.25$ |
| Transport Canada (2007)* | AUD2.21 in 2007 | $\$ 2.91$ |
| Mrozek and Taylor (2001) | USD2.0 | $\$ 3.04$ |
| Guria et al (1999), NZ* | USD2.1 | $\$ 3.51$ |
| Jones-Lee (1994) | USD2.1 | $\$ 3.93$ |
| Tsuge et al (2005), Japan | USD2.9 | $\$ 3.99$ |
| Kneisner and Leith (1991), Australia | USD2.2 | $\$ 4.29$ |
| UK Dept for Transport (2007)* | AUD3.39 in 2007 | $\$ 4.47$ |
| Jones-Lee et at (1995), UK | USD2.7 | $\$ 4.81$ |
| Jenkins et al (2001) | USD3.2 | $\$ 4.87$ |
| NZ Ministry of Transport (2007)* | AUD3.95 in 2007 | $\$ 5.20$ |
| US Federal Highway Administration (2007)* | AUD4.45 in 2007 | $\$ 5.86$ |
| Desaigues and Rabl (1995), France | USD3.4 | $\$ 6.05$ |
| Desvouges et al (1998) | USD3.6 | $\$ 6.10$ |
| Johannesson et al (1997), Sweden | USD3.8 | $\$ 6.49$ |
| Van den Burgh et al (1997), US and UK | USD3.9 | $\$ 6.67$ |
| PWC (2008), Australia | AUD5.95m in 2008 | $\$ 7.44$ |
| Gayer et al (2000), US | USD4.7 | $\$ 7.61$ |
| Meng and Smith (1999), Canada | USD5.2 | $\$ 8.69$ |
| Day (1999), US, Canada, UK | USD5.6 | $\$ 9.36$ |
| Viscusi (1993) | median USD5.5 | $\$ 10.43$ |
| Baranzini and Luzzi (2001), Switzerland | USD7.5 | $\$ 11.42$ |
| Schwab-Christe (1995), Switzerland | USD7.5 | $\$ 13.36$ |
| Miller et al (1997), Australia | median USD15.2 | $\$ 25.98$ |
| ATAP Guidelines (2016), Australia | AUD7.53 | $\$ 8.47$ |
| Median international literature value |  | $\$ 5.86$ |
| Source: Values indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K). *Sourced from PWC (2008). |  |  |

## 6 Environmental impacts

TfNSW recommends the use of the parameter values for environmental externalities in Table 35 and Table 36 for car and public transport vehicles, and in Table 39 and Table 40 for freight vehicles.

TfNSW recommends air pollution and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be calculated using the upper and lower range for congested and free-flow conditions, respectively. For all other externality types, the midpoint estimate should be used.

Table 35 Externality unit costs by transport mode and location - urban


Sources:
*Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data, Austroads, 2012. Values in brackets represent lower and higher ranges. These values are based on Austroads (2003) and Austroads (2012) derived from studies on 5 countries considered comparable to Australia.
**North West Rail Economic Evaluation.
***National Guidelines for Transport System Management in Australia, Part 3, Appraisal of initiatives, Australian Transport Council 2006.
****TfNSW estimate based on Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal NSW (IPART) (2014) Cost of Emissions for NSW Light Rail.
Indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Table 36 Externality unit costs by transport mode and location - rural

| Externality type (range) | Car* | Bus* | Rail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cents per car km | Cents per bus km | Cents per car km |
| Air pollution | 0.04 | 0.00 |  |
|  | (0.02 to 0.04) | (0.00 to 0.42) |  |
| GHG emissions | 2.66 | 15.61 | 0.82 |
|  | (2.34 to 2.97) | N/A |  |
| Water pollution | 0.05 | 0.06 |  |
|  | (0.05 to 0.05) | (0.04 to 0.06) |  |
| Nature and landscape | 0.62 | 1.72 |  |
|  | (0.62 to 2.18) | (1.72 to 7.97) |  |
| Upstream / downstream costs | 4.53 | 23.42 |  |
|  | (3.90 to 5.15) | (18.73 to 28.10) |  |

[^3]
### 6.1 Air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions

Air pollution is predominantly an urban issue. The parameter values given in Table 35 are a function of vehicle kilometres travelled (vkt), population distribution, and population density. As a rule of thumb, the parameter values for air pollution for a passenger car in a rural area is 1 per cent of the corresponding values in an urban area (Table 35).

Air pollution is lower in free flowing conditions than on congested roads. A project that improves an urban road may reduce road congestion and increase the average travel speed, which will reduce air pollution. Vehicle pollutions of carbon monoxide (CO), hydrocarbon (HC), nitrogen oxide (NOx) and particles increase by 22 per cent, 33 per cent, 14 per cent and 13 per cent respectively when driving conditions change from free flowing (urban vehicle speed $25 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ or above) to congested conditions (urban vehicle speed less than $25 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ ).

Since GHG have a global impact, the same value is applied to urban and rural areas in Table 35. Vehicles generate more GHG on congested roads.

### 6.2 Noise pollution

Noise pollution is mostly an urban issue. The externality value is a function of population distribution and the location of the travelling vehicle. Therefore, the rural noise unit cost is set to zero for passenger cars and buses, and not included in Table 36. This does not imply that rural noise impacts are always negligible, as the particular situation of each project needs to be considered. For rural towns, the urban value is assumed. For urban freeways where there are noise barriers or no noise exposure to residential areas, the rural value is assumed.

### 6.3 Water pollution

Water pollution includes organic waste or persistent toxicants run-off from roads generated from vehicle use. These include engine oil leakage and disposal, road surface, particulate matter and other air pollutants from exhaust and tyre degradation. Using the WTP methodology, the water pollution parameter value represents approximately 15 per cent of the air pollution. Concentrations of pollutants in urban waterways are significantly higher compared to rural areas.

### 6.4 Nature and landscape impacts

Nature and landscape impacts are driven by the infrastructure 'footprint'. For example, habitat loss, loss of natural vegetation or reduction in visual amenity as infrastructure is constructed. Key impacts in rural areas are natural impacts; while key impacts in urban areas are mostly amenity/visual, as the urban environment is already dominated by infrastructure. The impacts on nature and the landscape are assumed to be higher for rural areas. Therefore, the impact in urban locations are 10 per cent that for rural locations.

### 6.5 Urban separation

Urban separation is only an externality in urban areas. This negative externality is due to time lost to pedestrians, lack of non-motorised transport provision, and visual intrusion.

### 6.6 Upstream and downstream impacts

Upstream and downstream costs refer to the indirect costs of transport including energy generation, vehicle production and maintenance, and infrastructure construction and maintenance.

### 6.7 Environmental impacts per passenger

Table 37 and Table 38 present environmental externality costs per passenger for cars, buses, rail, light rail and ferries. Table 38 estimates the average load as well as at 100 per cent capacity. These values may be used for initiatives that change volume of passengers on public transport vehicles, or result in mode switch between different vehicle types.
Table 37 Air pollution and greenhouse gas external costs per passenger car, bus and rail

| Emission | Car |  | Bus |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Air pollution | cents/pkm | 1.89 | 0.04 |
| GHG emissions | 2.39 | 0.78 | 0.01 |

Source: TfNSW estimate based on IPART (2014) Cost of Emissions for NSW Ferry Networks and Light Rail and ferry operational data. Indexed from June 2014 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

Table 38 Air pollution and greenhouse gas external costs - ferry and light rail

| Emission | Light rail <br> upstream electricity generation |  |  | Ferry <br> transport operations |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | cents/vkm | cents/pkm <br> (average <br> patronage) | cents/pkm <br> (at <br> capacity) | cents/vkm | cents/km <br> (average <br> patronage) | cents/pkm <br> (at <br> capacity) |
| Air pollution | 41.42 | 0.64 | 0.54 | 955.63 | 10.06 | 2.16 |
| GHG <br> emissions | 32.69 | 0.50 | 0.42 | 93.83 | 0.99 | 0.21 |

Source: TfNSW estimate based on IPART (2014) Cost of Emissions for NSW Ferry Networks and Light Rail and ferry operational data. Indexed from June 2014 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

### 6.8 Freight vehicle environmental externalities

Table 39 and Table 40 present externality costs for freight vehicles by externality type, presented in dollars per vehicle-kilometre travelled, based on network-wide average payloads.
As stated above, TfNSW recommends air pollution and GHG emissions be calculated using the upper and lower range for congested and free-flow conditions, respectively. For all other externality types, the midpoint estimate should be used.

Table 39 Externality unit costs for freight vehicles (cents per kilometre travelled) - urban

| Externality type | Light commercial vehicles | Rigid trucks | Articulated trucks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air pollution | 7.56 | 16.50 | 65.82 |
|  | (5.60 to 12.44) | (8.00 to 20.19) | (31.93 to 80.54) |
| GHG emissions | 2.35 | 3.67 | 14.64 |
|  | (2.19 to 2.47) | (1.84 to 6.42$)$ | (7.34 to 25.62) |
| Noise | 1.29 | 2.75 | 10.97 |
|  | (0.90 to 1.79) | (1.83 to 3.67) | (7.31 to 14.64) |
| Water pollution | 1.13 | 2.47 | 9.87 |
|  | (0.84 to 1.86) | (0.83 to 3.03) | (3.30 to 12.08) |
| Nature and landscape | 0.84 | 0.27 | 1.08 |
|  | (0.84 to 1.63) | (0.27 to 0.56) | (1.08 to 2.22) |
| Urban separation | 1.23 | 1.84 | 27.34 |
|  | (0.73 to 1.74) | (0.92 to 2.76) | (3.67 to 11.00) |
| Upstream and downstream costs | 7.85 | 14.69 | N/A |
|  | (5.60 to 10.09) | (12.85 to 16.52) |  |

Source: Light and heavy vehicles from Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data,
Austroads, 2008. Rail from NGTSM, Part 3, Appraisal of initiatives, Australian Transport Council 2006
Values indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Notes: Average load per vehicle is assumed based on ABS 2018 Survey of Motor Vehicle Use.
Table 40 Externality unit costs for freight vehicles (cents per kilometre travelled) - rural

| Externality type | Light commercial vehicles | Rigid trucks | Articulated trucks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air pollution |  | 0.16 | 0.65 |
|  |  | (0.09 to 0.20) | (0.34 to 0.80) |
| GHG emissions | 2.35 | 3.65 | 14.64 |
|  | (2.19 to 2.47) | (1.84 to 6.42) | (7.34 to 25.62) |
| Noise |  | 0.28 | 1.11 |
|  |  | (0.19 to 0.38) | (0.74 to 1.54) |
| Water pollution | 0.01 | 0.99 | 3.95 |
|  | (0.01 to 0.02) | (0.50 to 1.21) | (1.99 to 4.83) |
| Nature and landscape | 0.01 | 0.76 | 11 |
|  | (0.01 to 0.02) | (2.76 to 5.51) | (11.00 to 21.98) |
| Upstream and downstream costs | 7.85 | 14.69 | 58.6 |
|  | (5.60 to 10.09) | (12.85 to 16.52) | (51.26 to 65.90) |

Source: Light and heavy vehicles from Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data,
Austroads, 2008. Rail from NGTSM, Part 3, Appraisal of initiatives, Australian Transport Council 2006.
Values indexed to June 2019 prices (CPI, Australia, all groups).
Notes: Average load per vehicle is assumed based on ABS 2018 Survey of Motor Vehicle Use; Urban separation is not included in rural externality values.

Table 41 Average freight vehicle payloads

| Vehicle Type | Average load per trip (kg) | Average load per trip (t) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Light vehicles | 359 | 0.359 |
| Rigid trucks | 5879 | 5.879 |
| Articulated trucks | 23451 | 23.451 |

Source: ABS, 9208.0 Table 26 Survey of Motor Vehicle Use, Australia, 2018 - NSW values.
Table 42 and Table 43 present externality costs for freight vehicles by externality type, presented in dollars per 1,000 tones-kilometre travelled. Equation 5 can be used to convert these figures into vehicle-kilometres travelled unit costs, where more detailed payload information is available:

## Equation 5 Freight externality unit conversion

$$
U n i t \operatorname{cost}_{e v}=\frac{C T_{e} \times L_{v}}{10}
$$

Where:

- Unit Cost $_{\text {ev }}=$ the externality unit cost per vehicle type and environmental externality (c/km)
- $\mathbf{C T}_{\mathrm{e}}=$ the cost in \$ per 1000 tonne kilometres, by environmental externality
- $\mathbf{L}_{\mathrm{v}}=$ the average payload per vehicle type,

The assumed weight of freight by vehicle type are in Table 41. If a more accurate average load value for a particular project is known, the above equation can be used to convert the values in Table 42 and Table 43 into cents per kilometres travelled.

Table 42 Externality unit costs for freight vehicles (\$ per 1,000 tonnekilometre travelled) - urban

| Externality type | Light vehicle | Heavy vehicle | Rail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air pollution | 210.54 | 28.07 | 4.55 |
|  | (156.11 to 346.55) | (13.61 to 34.35) |  |
| GHG emissions | 65.58 | 6.24 | 0.41 |
|  | (60.88 to 68.69) | (3.13 to 10.92) |  |
| Noise | 35.90 | 4.68 | 1.93 |
|  | (24.99 to 49.96) | (3.12 to 6.24) |  |
| Water pollution | 31.58 | 4.21 | 0.14 |
|  | (23.41 to 51.92) | (1.41 to 5.15) |  |
| Nature and Landscape | 23.41 | 0.46 | 1.10 |
|  | (23.41 to 45.28) | (0.46 to 0.95) |  |
| Urban separation | 34.35 | 3.13 | 1.10 |
|  | (20.29 to 48.40) | (1.56 to 4.69) |  |
| Upstream and Downstream Costs | 218.56 | 24.99 |  |
|  | (156.11 to 281.01) | (21.86 to 28.10) |  |

Source: Light and heavy vehicles from Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data,
Austroads, 2008. Rail from NGTSM, Part 3, Appraisal of initiatives, Australian Transport Council 2006.
Values indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).
Notes: Average load per vehicle is assumed based on ABS 2018 Survey of Motor Vehicle Use.
Table 43 Externality unit costs for freight vehicles (\$ per 1,000 tonnekilometre travelled) - rural

| Externality type | Light Vehicle | Heavy Vehicle | Rail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Air pollution |  | 0.28 |  |
|  |  | (0.15 to 0.34) |  |
| GHG emissions | 65.58 | 6.24 | 0.41 |
|  | (60.88 to 68.69) | (3.13 to 10.92) |  |
| Noise |  | 0.47 |  |
|  |  | (0.32 to 0.65) |  |
| Water pollution | 0.32 | 1.69 | 0.14 |
|  | (0.24 to 0.56) | (0.85 to 2.06) |  |
| Nature and landscape | 0.24 | 4.69 | 1.10 |
|  | (0.24 to 0.45) | (4.69 to 9.37) |  |
| Upstream and downstream costs | 218.56 | 24.99 |  |
|  | (156.11 to 281.01) | (21.86 to 28.10) |  |

Source: Light and heavy vehicles from Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data, Austroads, 2008. Rail from NGTSM, Part 3, Appraisal of initiatives, Australian Transport Council 2006 Values indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C)
Notes: Average load per vehicle is assumed based on ABS 2018 Survey of Motor Vehicle Use

Table 44 presents parameter values of different types of emissions.
Table 44 Unit values for emissions

| Emission | $\$ /$ tonne |
| :--- | :--- |
| Carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2-e) | 62.79 |
| Carbon monoxide $(\mathrm{CO})$ | 3.95 |
| Oxides of nitrogen $\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ox}}\right)$ | $2,503.55$ |
| Particulate matter (PM10) | $398,451.75$ |
| Total hydrocarbons (THC) | $1,254.41$ |

Source: Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data, Austroads 2012. Values are indexed from June 2010 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).

## 7 Active transport

Active transport refers to physical activity undertaken as a means of transport. The most popular forms of active transport are cycling and walking. The TfNSW recommended parameter values for active transport are in Table 45.

Table 45 Active transport parameters

| Cost / Benefit | Cycling <br> $(\$ /$ bicycle km$)$ | Walking <br> $(\$ / \mathrm{km})$ | Recipient |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Health benefits | 1.22 | 1.83 | Former car and public <br> transport users |
| Congestion cost savings | 0.45 | 0.45 | Former car users |
| Vehicle operating cost savings | 0.21 | 0.27 | Former car users |
| Accident cost | 0.24 | 0.12 | Former car users |
| Air pollution | 0.03 | 0.03 | Former car users |
| GHG emissions | 0.03 | 0.03 | Former car users |
| Noise | 0.01 | 0.01 | Former car users |
| Water pollution | 0.01 | 0.01 | Former car users |
| Nature and landscape | 0.00 | 0.00 | Former car users |
| Urban separation | 0.01 | 0.01 | Former car users |
| Roadway provision cost savings | 0.04 | 0.04 | Former car users |
| Parking cost savings | 0.01 | 0.01 | Former car users |
| Travel time cost |  |  |  |
| Sourer Estan |  |  |  |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. See notes below for details. Values are in June 2019 dollars (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

* TfNSW does not recommend quantifying a travel time cost or saving for active transport projects.


### 7.1 Health benefits

An increase in active transport reduces morbidity and mortality. The existing literature suggests that the value of health benefits from cycling ranges from $\$ 0.07$ to $\$ 1.30$ (Table 46). Health benefits are lower for more active people.
Table 46 Health benefit literature review

| Reference | Cycling (\$ / km) | Walking (\$ / km) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AECOM (2010) | 0.07 |  |
| Marsden Jacob Associates (2009) | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| WHO (HEAT tool) (2012) | 0.96 | 2.31 |
| New Zealand Transport Authority (2010) | 1.22 | 2.43 |
| PWC (2011) | 1.31 | 1.96 |
| Range | 0.072 to 1.309 | 0.439 to 2.435 |

Source: Values have been indexed from June 2011 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

### 7.2 Congestion cost savings

This benefit is applicable only when the cycling or walking trip replaces a car trip. It is assumed that both cycling and walking impose no congestion cost compared to motor vehicles.

### 7.3 Vehicle operating cost savings

This benefit is applicable only when cycling and walking replace car trips. It is a net saving calculated from VOC minus any operating cost for cycling. The operating cost of a bicycle is approximately $\$ 0.04 / \mathrm{km}$. No operating cost is incurred from walking.

### 7.4 Accident cost

Cycling incurs greater accident costs compared to cars, as there are more cycling accidents than vehicle accidents per kilometre travelled. The accident costs per kilometre travelled for car, bus, cycling and walking are estimated in Table 47.
Table 47 Crash costs

| Crash type | Car | Bus | Cycling | Walking |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average annual no. of <br> crashes | 20,683 | 384 | 629 | 1,216 |
| Fatal | 64 | 4 | 5 | 28 |
| Injury | 10,360 | 199 | 621 | 1,186 |
| Property damage | 10,259 | 181 | 2 | 2 |
| Allocated crash cost (\$m) | $\$ 1,353.67$ | $\$ 28.84$ | $\$ 57.13$ | $\$ 135.57$ |
| Million vehicle kilometres <br> travelled (mkvt) | 41,153 | 2,070 | 209 | 883 |
| Average cost (\$/vkt) | $\$ 0.03$ | $\$ 0.01$ | $\$ 0.27$ | $\$ 0.15$ |

Source: Number of crashes based on RMS Road Safety crash statistics 2011-2015. Million vehicle kilometres travelled sourced from 2015/16 Household Travel Survey.

### 7.5 Environmental cost savings

The same values as Table 35 are used if the individual walking or cycling is no longer using a passenger car.

### 7.6 Roadway provision cost savings

Cycling and walking causes less wear-and-tear on roads and requires less space than other vehicles. Footpaths and cycle paths cost less than roads. The roadway provision cost for cars is estimated by the annual roadway provision costs divided by total vehicle kilometres travelled totalling $\$ 0.07 / \mathrm{km}$. The roadway provision cost for cycling (cycle lanes/paths) is approximately $\$ 0.03 / \mathrm{km}$ (NSW Road and Traffic Authority, 2003). This gives a cost saving of $\$ 0.04 / \mathrm{km}$ for cycling.

### 7.7 Parking cost savings

This benefit is applicable only when the cycling and walking trip replaces a car trip with a parking cost. Travelling by car may incur parking costs which includes the costs associated with parking facility infrastructure (land) and maintenance. Parking costs vary depending on the location. In the Sydney CBD, metered parking costs can range from $\$ 3.70$ to $\$ 7.00$ per hour. While cycling requires provision of bicycle racks for parking, the cost is small compared to parking a car. The recommended parking cost savings when cycling and/or walking trips replace car trips is $\$ 0.01 / \mathrm{km}$ (NSW Road and Traffic Authority, 2003).

### 7.8 Travel time costs

Cycling and walking is usually slower than a car or public transport which means that cycling and walking involve a net cost in travel time. However, the travel time is not a key factor for people choosing to walk or cycle. The decision to walk or cycle as a transport mode is often for leisure or to improve health. Therefore, TfNSW recommends no travel time cost or saving for cycling and walking.

## 8 Road damage cost

TfNSW recommends the road damage costs presented in Table 48 be used in CBA to calculate the benefits of diverting or reducing road traffic as a result of a project or initiative.
Table 48 Unit cost of road maintenance by vehicle types

| Vehicle type | Unit costs (cents/vkt) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cars and motorcycles | 4.39 |
| Rigid truck | 5.48 |
| Light rigid (LCV) | 4.39 |
| Medium rigid | 10.08 |
| Heavy rigid | 15.14 |
| Articulated trucks | 18.70 |
| 4 or less axles | 14.91 |
| 5 axles | 16.57 |
| 6 or more axles | 19.32 |
| Combination vehicles | 24.85 |
| Rigid 3 axle plus trailer | 16.45 |
| Rigid 4 axle plus trailer | 25.61 |
| B-double | 25.23 |
| Double road train | 28.39 |
| B-triple | 35.63 |
| Buses | 8.25 |
| 2 axle light bus | 4.39 |
| Rigid bus | 10.22 |
| Articulated bus 3 axle | 11.66 |
| Special purpose vehicles | 13.75 |
| Sub-total: Light Vehicles | 4.39 |
| Sub-total: Heavy Vehicles | 15.08 |
| Total: All Vehicles | 5.09 |
| Source: Estimad |  |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. Values are indexed from December 2011 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Note: $46 \%$ of total cost is for road repair \& maintenance and $54 \%$ for road provision (construction).

### 8.1 Method

The unit cost of road damage was calculated using the process described below. This methodology is based on research by the National Transport Commission (NTC).
Step 1: Collect road expenditure data in NSW and group it into the following categories:

- road serving and operating
- road pavement and shoulder construction
- bridge maintenance and rehabilitation
- road rehabilitation
- road safety and traffic management
- asset extension and improvements
- other items including corporate services, enforcement of heavy vehicle regulations, vehicle registration, driver licensing and debt servicing.
Step 2: Estimate traffic related costs by excluding costs for:
- vehicle registration and driver licensing, which are not directly related to road traffic and its cost has been recovered from registration fees
- debt servicing, which is a funding mechanism and not directly related to road traffic
- local road access and community amenity, which is only partly related to road traffic; with a proportion of costs collected from developers' contributions.

Step 3: Total traffic related costs can be separated into the following groups:

- Vehicle kilometre travelled (vkt): This part of the cost is equally distributed to vkt regardless of vehicle size, mass or axle weight.
- Passenger Car Equivalent (PCU) kilometres: This cost is distributed based on PCU. Therefore, large sized vehicles bear more costs than cars.
- Equivalent Standard Axle (ESA) kilometres: This cost is distributed based on damages caused by vehicle axle weight. Heavier vehicles reduce the serviceability in a much shorter time than light vehicles. It is assumed that damages caused by vehicles are related to the 4th power of their axle weight. The 4th power law describes the relationship between a vehicle's axle weight and road damage.
- Average Gross Mass (AGM) kilometres: This cost is allocated based on gross mass of vehicles.
- Heavy vehicle kilometres travelled: This cost is related to enforcement of heavy vehicle regulations. The cost is distributed based on heavy vehicle vkt.
- Costs that cannot be allocated into any of the above groups are referred to as non-separable items, which are distributed based on vkt for all vehicles. Percentages of cost allocation are sourced from the latest NTC report (National Transport Commission, 2012).
Step 4: Allocate the cost across the following vehicle types:
- cars and motor cycles
- light commercial vehicles
- rigid trucks (2, 3 and 4 axles of different gross mass, with or without a trailer)
- articulated trucks (3, 4, 5 and 6 axles)
- B doubles
- road trains
- buses ( 2 and 3 axle rigid buses, 3 axle articulated buses)
- Special purpose vehicles (light and heavy).

Vehicle kilometres by vehicle types are sourced from ABS Survey of Motor Vehicle Use (SMVU) 2010. PCU and ESA by vehicle types are sourced from NTC. Average Gross Mass (AGM) is sourced from ARRB report (Vuong \& Mathias, 2004).
Step 5: Estimate the unit costs by vehicle types, resulting in the values presented in Table 48.

## 9 Demand elasticity

TfNSW recommends the short-run demand elasticity values in Table 49. For longrun demand elasticity, twice the value of short-run elasticities should be used.
Table 49 Short-run elasticity

| Attributes | Best estimate - demand response |  | Typical range |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Peak | Off peak |  |  |
| Fares | -0.25 | -0.50 | -0.35 | -0.2 to -0.6 |
| Service level (frequency) | 0.25 | 0.50 | 0.35 | +0.2 to +0.5 |
| In vehicle time | -0.30 | -0.50 | -0.40 | -0.1 to -0.7 |

Source: NGTSM, Australian Transport Council, 2006.

### 9.1 Additional information

Elasticity is a measure of a variable's sensitivity to a change in another variable. In transport economics, it usually refers to the change in trips due to changes in the price of a fare or the total travel time. Direct elasticity measures the responsiveness of demand for a particular product to a change in its own price, whereas cross elasticity measures the responsiveness of demand to a change in the price of a substitute or complementary product.
Elasticities are often lower in the short run than in the long run. This is because some changes are not possible to make in a short amount of time. For example, if the train fare during off-peak times reduces, commuters may need time to change their work schedule to take advantage of the reduced price.
Table 50 summarises the direct and cross elasticities of public transport and car use. The ranges of the elasticity values are based on a literature review of transport elasticity particularly focusing on Sydney and Australia. The central values are based on a review undertaken by IPART which used the former rail weekly and bus travel ten (these have now been replaced by Opal) as the fare type.
Table 50 Cross elasticity of demand

| Mode | Rail fare cost ${ }^{5}$ |  | Bus fare cost ${ }^{5}$ |  | Car operating cost (Petrol price) ${ }^{5}$ |  | Public transport fare cost ${ }^{4}$ |  | In vehicle time $^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Range | Value | Range | Value | Range | Value | Range | Value | Value |
| Rail | $\begin{aligned} & -0.043 \\ & \text { to } \\ & -1.103^{(2)} \end{aligned}$ | -0.250 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.004 \text { to } \\ & 0.500^{(5,1)} \end{aligned}$ | 0.004 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.009 \text { to } \\ & 0.190^{(4,5)} \end{aligned}$ | 0.009 |  |  |  |
| Bus | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.009 \text { to } \\ & 0.400 \\ & (5,1) \end{aligned}$ | 0.009 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.040 \text { to } \\ & -0.822 \\ & (4,5) \end{aligned}$ | -0.383 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.005 \text { to } \\ & 1.010(4,5) \end{aligned}$ | 0.005 |  |  |  |
| Car | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.015 \text { to } \\ & 0.090 \\ & (5,1) \end{aligned}$ | 0.015 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.020 \text { to } \\ & 0.007^{(5,1)} \end{aligned}$ | 0.007 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.014 \text { to } \\ & -0.800 \\ & (5,1) \end{aligned}$ | -0.014 |  |  | -0.17 |
| Public <br> Transport |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.07 \text { to } \\ & 0.8^{(3)} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.100 \\ & \text { to } \\ & -0.600 \\ & \text { (4) } \end{aligned}$ | -0.35 |  |

Source: Compiled by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW based on:
(1) Transport Elasticities Database, BITRE, 2009
(2) CityRail Fare Elasticities, Booz \& Co, 2008
(3) Exploring the impacts of fuel price increases on public transport use in Melbourne, Currie \& Phung, 2006
(4) Survey of Public Transport Elasticities, Industry Commission, 1993
(5) Estimation of Public Transport Fare Elasticities in the Sydney Region, IPART, 1996, Table 16, p. 25.

Sydney Trains estimated the demand elasticity values for train travel (Table 51). Compared with other studies, the elasticity for in-vehicle time and generalised journey time is high.

Table 51 Demand elasticity estimated by Sydney Trains

| Crash type | Peak | Off peak | Overall |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fare (price) | -0.35 | -0.42 | -0.38 |
| Rail in-vehicle time | -0.63 | -0.74 | -0.67 |
| Service interval | -0.28 | -0.32 | -0.30 |
| Generalised journey time | -1.00 | -1.16 | -1.07 |

[^4]
## 10 Public transport project expansion factors

Transport demand modelling is usually undertaken in 1 hour, 2 hour or 3.5 hour peak periods. The estimated levels of demand are then converted into annual numbers by applying expansion and annualisation factors.

TfNSW recommends calculating project-specific expansion factors where data is available. The values presented in Table 52 provide expansion factors appropriate for use in public transport projects when estimating specific benefit streams in a CBA in an urban area.

TfNSW requires that urban and rural road projects use project-specific expansion and annualisation factors rather than the factors presented in this section. The TfNSW Evaluation and Assurance team can be contacted for assistance.

Table 52 Expansion factor by benefit category - urban

| Attributes | Input unit | Expansion AM peak |  |  | Annualisation | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 hr to weekday | 2 hr to weekday | 3.5hr to weekday |  |  |
| Trains* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel time savings | hours | 6.84 | 4.61 | 3.40 | 277 | Volume |
| Train crowding | hours |  |  | 2.0 | 277 | Cost |
| Station crowding | hours |  |  | 2.0 | 277 | Cost |
| Station quality | trips | 6.84 | 4.61 | 3.40 | 277 | Volume |
| Vehicle quality | trips | 6.84 | 4.61 | 3.40 | 277 | Volume |
| Travel time reliability | hours |  |  | 2.0 | 277 | Volume |
| Buses** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel time savings | hours | 7.10 | 4.34 | 3.19 | 300 | Volume |
| Bus crowding | hours |  |  | 2.0 | 300 | Cost |
| Stop crowding | hours |  |  | 2.0 | 300 | Cost |
| Stop and station quality | trips | 7.10 | 4.34 | 3.19 | 300 | Volume |
| Vehicle quality | trips | 7.10 | 4.34 | 3.19 | 300 | Volume |
| Travel time reliability | hours |  |  | 2.0 | 300 | Volume |
| Road*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Travel time savings | hours | 12.45 | 6.29 | 4.04 | 336 | Cost |
| Vehicle operating costs / cost savings | vkt | 12.45 | 6.29 | 4.04 | 336 | Cost |
| Crash costs / cost savings | vkt | 12.45 | 6.29 | 4.04 | 336 | Cost |
| Environmental impacts | vkt | 12.45 | 6.29 | 4.04 | 336 | Cost |
| Travel time reliability | hours | 12.45 | 6.29 | 4.04 | 336 | Cost |

Source: Detailed methodology is provided in Orthongthed et al (2013). Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW, based on the following datasets:
*Trains: A compendium of CityRail travel statistics, 7th edition, June 2010
**Buses: Sydney Buses boarding data by time of day and weekday of the year in 2010/11. Data were sourced from State Transit Authority (STA).
***Roads: Traffic volume data in 2011 provided by Roads and Maritime Services. These expansion factors are not suitable use in road projects, which require expansion factors to be calculated on a project-specific basis.
Notes: Crowding and reliability benefits are not generally quantified for off-peak time periods, hence the use of a 1.0 expansion factor for the 3.5 hour to weekday period. 1 hr and 2 hr expansion factors should be calculated on a project-specific basis.

Using Table 52, for a travel time savings benefit measured for the 2hr AM peak in Sydney, a factor of 4.61 should be used to expand this to average weekday volumes. A factor of 277 is applied to annualise this figure for a full year.

### 10.1 Additional information: expansion factors

Table 52 presents the relevant cost expansion factor or volume expansion factor to use. Cost expansion factors are not always the same as volume expansion factors. Cost expansion factors take into account the impacts of congestion, vehicle operating costs, and environmental externalities generated by road use.

The cost expansion factors are lower than the volume expansion factors as the proportion of daily traffic cost is higher than the proportion of traffic volume in the peak periods, for urban areas. In rural regions, the difference between cost and the volume expansion is smaller due to a more even distribution of traffic throughout the day.

### 10.1.1 Volume expansion factors

## Table 53 Volume expansion factors

|  | Roads |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sydney (1) | Rural (2) |
| From peak 1 hour to weekday | 14.31 | 12.10 |
|  | (AM Peak: 07:00 AM - 08:00 AM) | (15:00 PM - 16:00 PM) |
| From peak 2 hours to weekday | 7.21 | 6.13 |
|  | (AM Peak: 07:00 AM - 09:00 AM) | (15:00 PM - 17:00 PM) |
| From peak 3.5 hours to weekday | 4.46 | 3.61 |
|  | (AM Peak: 06:30 AM - 10:00 AM) | (14:30 PM - 18:00 PM) |
| From week day to year | 345 | 347 |
|  | Public transport |  |
|  | Train (Sydney) (3) | Bus (Sydney) (4) |
| From peak 1 hour to weekday | 6.84 | 7.10 |
|  | (AM Peak: 8:00 AM - 9:00 AM) | (AM Peak: 7:30 AM - 8:30 AM) |
| From peak 2 hours to weekday | 4.61 | 4.34 |
|  | (AM Peak: 7:30 AM - 9:30 AM) | (AM Peak: 7:00 AM - 9:00 AM) |
| From peak 3.5 hours to weekday | 3.40 | 3.19 |
|  | (AM Peak: 6:00 AM - 9:30 AM) | (AM Peak: 7:00 AM - 10:30 AM) |
| From week day to year | 277 | 300 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW, based on the following datasets:
(1) Sydney roads: Traffic volume data in 2011 provided by Roads and Maritime Services. Expansion factors are based on traffic data at 7 tolled freeway stations, 22 arterial stations and 31 local road stations. Stations are selected for fairly representing traffic conditions in Sydney Inner, Middle and Outer rings.
(2) Rural roads: Traffic volume data in 2011 provided by Roads and Maritime Services. Expansion factors are based on traffic data at 65 arterial stations and 26 local road stations in Hunter, Northern, South West, Southern and Western regions.
(3) Trains (Sydney): Estimated by Sydney Metro from March 2017 Opal data.
(4) Buses (Sydney): Sydney Buses boarding data by time of day and weekday of the year in 2010/11.

Data were sourced from State Transit Authority (STA).
The volume expansion factors in Table 54 have been converted from those in Table 53 to provide the volume expansion factors in Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT).
Table 54 Volume expansion factors by Average Annual Daily Traffic

|  | Roads |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sydney | Rural |
| From peak 1 hour to average weekday (AADT) | 13.53 | 11.50 |
|  | (AM Peak: 07:00 AM - 08:00 AM) | (15:00 PM - 16:00 PM) |
| From peak 2 hours to average weekday (AADT) | 6.81 | 5.83 |
|  | (AM Peak: 07:00 AM - 09:00 AM) | (15:00 PM - 17:00 PM) |
| From peak 3.5 hours to average weekday (AADT) | 4.22 | 3.43 |
|  | (AM Peak: 06:30 AM - 10:00 AM) | (14:30 PM - 18:00 PM) |
| From average week day to year | 365 | 365 |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW.

### 10.1.2 Cost expansion factors

Cost expansion factors in Table 55 have been estimated using RMS data from 2011/12. The traffic cost is composed of travel time cost, vehicle operating cost,
accident cost and environmental cost. The value of travel time during business hours is greater compared to the peak period due to a higher proportion of business vehicles.

The traffic volume data provided did not differentiate between vehicle types. The cost expansion and volume expansion factors are assumed to be the same for public transport modes (rail, bus and ferry). However, additional crowding costs can be included for peak hours in CBA.
Table 55 Cost expansion factors: road traffic

|  | Roads (ADT) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sydney (1) | Rural (2) |
| From peak 1 hour to weekday | 12.45 | 10.81 |
|  | AM Peak: 08:00 AM - 09:00 AM | 16:00 PM - 17:00 PM |
| From peak 2 hours to weekday | 6.29 | 5.51 |
|  | AM Peak: 07:00 AM - 09:00 AM | 15:00 PM-17:00 PM |
| From peak 3.5 hours to weekday | 4.04 | 3.32 |
|  | AM Peak: 06:30 AM - 10:00 AM | 14:30 PM - 18:00 PM |
| From week day to year | 336 | 349 |
|  | Roads (AADT) |  |
|  | Sydney (1) | Rural (2) |
| From peak 1 hour to average day (AADT) | 12.56 | 10.92 |
|  | AM Peak: 08:00 AM - 09:00 AM | 16:00 PM - 17:00 PM |
| From peak 2 hours to average day (AADT) | 6.34 | 5.56 |
|  | AM Peak: 07:00 AM - 09:00 AM | 15:00 PM - 17:00 PM |
| From peak 3.5 hours to average day (AADT) | 4.07 | 3.34 |
|  | AM Peak: 06:30 AM-10:00 AM | $14: 30 \mathrm{PM}-18: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ |
| From average day to year | 336 | 350 |

Source: Detailed methodology is provided in Orthongthed et al (2013). Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW, based on the following datasets:
(1) Sydney: Traffic volume data in 2011 provided by Roads and Maritime Services for each hour and direction. Breakdown of traffic volume by vehicle type was not available. Expansion factors are based on traffic data at 5 tolled freeway stations, 4 arterial stations and 5 local road stations. Stations are selected for fairly representing traffic conditions in Sydney Inner, Middle and Outer rings.
(2) Rural: Traffic volume data in 2011 provided by Roads and Maritime Services for each hour and direction. Expansion factors are based on traffic data at 26 arterial stations and 10 local road stations in Hunter, Northern, South West, Southern and Western regions.

## 11 Public transport attributes

### 11.1 Public transport crowding

TfNSW recommended multipliers for train crowding are presented in Table 56.
These parameters can be used to evaluate transport projects that change on-board crowding, e.g. projects that increase service frequency, introduce new services, or build new links. These multipliers convert time spent in a crowded situation into equivalent IVT minutes. For example, sitting on a crowded train is valued at 1.01 to 1.05 times an uncrowded on-board train time.

## Table 56 Train crowding multipliers

| Category | TfNSW multiplier | National Guidelines multiplier |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Crowded seat | $1.01-1.05$ | 1.21 |
| Standing | $1.04-1.87$ | 1.65 |
| Crush standing | $2.04-2.52$ | 2.11 |

Source: TfNSW multipliers sourced from Douglas \& Jones (2016). ATAP (2018).
Detailed crowding multipliers by mode are included in Table 57 by percentage of seated capacity. Because of the difference in the amount of standing area per seat between public transport vehicles, crowding multipliers scale at different rates for each vehicle type.

Table 57 Detailed heavy rail, light rail, metro and bus crowding multipliers

| Heavy Rail |  | Light Rail and metro |  | Bus |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% Seated capacity | Multiplier | \% Seated capacity | Multiplier | \% Seated capacity | Multiplier |
| 80\% - 90\% | 1.01 | 80\% - 90\% | 1.01 | 80\% - 90\% | 1.01 |
| 90\% - 100\% | 1.02 | 90\% - 100\% | 1.02 | 90\% - 100\% | 1.05 |
| 100\% - 110\% | 1.05 | 100\% - 110\% | 1.04 | 100\% - 110\% | 1.10 |
| 110\% - 120\% | 1.09 | 110\% - 120\% | 1.06 | 110\% - 120\% | 1.16 |
| 120\% - 130\% | 1.15 | 120\% - 130\% | 1.09 | 120\% - 130\% | 1.24 |
| 130\% - 140\% | 1.21 | 130\% - 140\% | 1.12 | 130\% - 140\% | 1.32 |
| 140\% - 150\% | 1.29 | 140\% - 150\% | 1.15 | 140\% - 150\% | 1.41 |
| 150\% - 160\% | 1.38 | 150\% - 160\% | 1.18 | 150\% - 160\% | 1.52 |
| 160\% - 170\% | 1.48 | 160\% - 170\% | 1.21 | Over 160\%* | 2.04-2.52 |
| 170\% - 180\% | 1.60 | 170\% - 180\% | 1.25 |  |  |
| 180\% - 190\% | 1.72 | 180\% - 190\% | 1.29 |  |  |
| 190\% - 200\% | 1.86 | 190\% - 200\% | 1.33 |  |  |
| Over 200\%* | 2.04-2.52 | 200\% - 210\% | 1.37 |  |  |
|  |  | 210\% - 220\% | 1.46 |  |  |
|  |  | 220\% - 230\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 230\% - 240\% | 1.55 |  |  |
|  |  | 240\% - 250\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 250\% - 260\% | 1.65 |  |  |
|  |  | 260\% - 270\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 270\% - 280\% | 1.76 |  |  |
|  |  | 280\% - 290\% |  |  |  |
|  |  | 290\% - 300\% | 1.87 |  |  |
|  |  | Over 300\%* | 2.04-2.52 |  |  |

Source: Douglas \& Jones (2016) * Crush capacity for each vehicle type
Crowding multipliers have not been estimated for the single-deck trains used by Sydney Metro. For single-deck trains, TfNSW recommends using light rail crowding multipliers.
Transport demand models used in NSW do not constrain public transport demand to the capacity of the service. This results in patronage above crush capacity in some cases. TfNSW recommends that one of the following approaches is used where modelled crowding exceeds the crush capacity threshold:

- Extrapolate the existing crowding function for levels of crowding above the crush capacity threshold
- Apply the maximum crowding factor to all travel occurring over the crush capacity threshold
- Estimate displacement of trips to other travel times or modes using an alternative model, such as the Enhanced Train Crowding Model (ETCM) or another appropriate methodology.


### 11.2 Station crowding

TfNSW recommends the multipliers for station crowding in Table 58.
Four levels of station crowding are used:

- low crowding (crowding level A: max density of 0.31 persons per square metre (psm))
- medium crowding (crowding level B: max density of 0.43 psm to level C : max density of 0.71 psm)
- high crowding (crowding level D: max density of 1.08 psm to level E: max density of 2.13 psm )
- very high crowding (crowding level F: max density of 3.6 psm ).

The multipliers in Table 58 convert waiting and walking in a crowded station into on-board train time. For example, one minute waiting time in a very highly crowded station is equivalent to 3.66 minutes on-board train time. These multipliers can be used to evaluate projects that impact station crowding (e.g. station upgrades, increasing service frequency or introducing new services).

Table 58 Station crowding multipliers

| National <br> Guidelines | Station crowding level |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Low | Medium |  | High | Very High |  |
| Station <br> crowding <br> classification | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| Waiting | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.55 | 3.66 |
| Walking | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 2.77 |

Source: ATAP (2018).

### 11.3 Value of bus stop and station quality attributes

TfNSW recommends the values for bus stop and station quality attributes in Table 59. Public transport projects often involve the construction or improvement of bus stop and rail station attributes such as seating, information, cleanliness and lighting. Valuation of these attributes is often conducted using In Vehicle Time (IVT) minutes which converts a person's willingness-to-pay for the improvement in the attribute to equivalent time spent travelling on-board the bus, train or light rail.
Table 59 presents the IVT minute values from a 2013 stated preference and quality rating survey on bus, light rail and rail services conducted by Douglas Economics, and the converted dollar value. The values represent a service quality improvement from a customer rating of 40 per cent to 80 per cent (using a scale where 0 per cent corresponds to "very poor" and 100 per cent to "very good"). The 2013 survey showed that the average stop/station rating was 65 per cent, 79 per cent, 62 per cent for bus, light rail and rail respectively with an overall rating of 67 per cent for all modes.

To apply these values in a CBA, the rating in the base case (denoted as A in the equation below) and the project case (denoted as B in the equation below) for a particular mode must first be estimated. The economic benefit can then be estimated as:

## Equation 6 Value of stop / station quality

Stop quality benefit $=($ entries + transfers + exits $) \times$ uplift $\times \frac{(B-A)}{40 \%}$
Where:

- Entries = stop / station entries
- Exits = stop / station exits
- Uplift = the attribute dollar value in Table 59
- $\mathbf{A}=$ the quality rating (out of $100 \%$ ) in the base case
- $\mathbf{B}=$ the quality rating (out of $100 \%$ ) in the project case.

The analysis can be done at an individual attribute level or overall rating level dependent on information availability.
Table 59 Value of bus stop / station quality attributes

| Attribute | Sydney 2013 survey |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IVT minutes |  |  | Dollar value of stop/station quality (\$) |  |  |
|  | Bus | Light rail | Rail | Bus | Light rail | Rail |
| Weather protection | 0.95 | 0.53 | 0.35 | 0.28 | 0.16 | 0.10 |
| Seating | 0.69 | 0.60 | 0.46 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.14 |
| Information | 0.86 | 0.72 | 0.37 | 0.25 | 0.21 | 0.11 |
| Lighting | 0.40 | 0.53 | 0.37 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.11 |
| Cleanliness \& graffiti | 0.55 | 1.30 | 0.61 | 0.16 | 0.38 | 0.18 |
| Ticket purchase | 0.23 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.18 |
| Platform Surface |  |  | 0.57 |  |  | 0.17 |
| Platform On/Off |  |  | 0.40 |  |  | 0.12 |
| Toilet Availability \& Cleanliness |  |  | 0.09 |  |  | 0.03 |
| Staff |  |  | 0.24 |  |  | 0.07 |
| Retail Facilities |  |  | 0.11 |  |  | 0.03 |
| Car access facilities |  |  | 0.08 |  |  | 0.02 |
| Bus access facilities |  |  | 0.07 |  |  | 0.02 |
| Attribute sum | 3.7 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 1.09 | 1.26 | 1.28 |
| Overall rating | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 1.00 |

Source: Douglas Economics (2014) Passenger service quality values for bus, LRT and rail in inner Sydney, report to Bureau of Transport Statistics, TfNSW, August 2014.
Note: The values in the table represent the quality improvement from a rating score of $40 \%$ to $80 \%$. The value of each attribute can be used if the individual attributes are known. Otherwise, the 'overall rating' value can be used for a 'package' of improvements or if the individual attribute is unknown.

### 11.4 Value of vehicle quality attributes

TfNSW recommends the values for vehicle quality attributes in Table 60.
Table 60 shows the value of vehicle quality attributes such as improvements to outside appearance, seat availability and heating and air-conditioning in terms of IVT minutes and dollar value. The average vehicle rating was 57 per cent, 71 per cent, 62 per cent for bus, light rail and rail respectively with an overall rating of 63 per cent for all modes in the 2013 survey. The economic benefit can be calculated using the method below:

Equation 7 Value of vehicle quality

$$
\text { Vehicle quality benefit }=\text { boardings } \times \text { uplift } \times \frac{(B-A)}{40 \%}
$$

Where:

- Boardings = vehicle entries
- Uplift = the attribute dollar value in Table 60
- $\mathbf{A}=$ the quality rating (out of $100 \%$ ) in the base case
- $\mathbf{B}=$ the quality rating (out of $100 \%$ ) in the project case.

Table 60 Value of vehicle quality attributes

| Attribute | Sydney 2013 survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | IVT minutes |  | Dollar value of vehicle quality (\$) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bus | Light <br> Rail | Rail | All | Bus | Light <br> Rail | Rail | All |
| Outside appearance | 0.18 | 0.50 | 0.70 | 0.47 | $\$ 0.05$ | $\$ 0.15$ | $\$ 0.21$ | $\$ 0.14$ |
| Ease of on/off | 0.20 | 0.41 | 0.17 | 0.27 | $\$ 0.06$ | $\$ 0.12$ | $\$ 0.05$ | $\$ 0.08$ |
| Seat availability \& comfort | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.52 | 0.37 | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 0.09$ | $\$ 0.15$ | $\$ 0.11$ |
| Space for personal <br> belongings | 0.01 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.04 | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.04$ | $\$ 0.02$ | $\$ 0.01$ |
| Smoothness \& quietness of <br> ride | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.24 | 0.38 | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 0.13$ | $\$ 0.07$ | $\$ 0.11$ |
| Heating \& air-conditioning | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.53 | 0.38 | $\$ 0.09$ | $\$ 0.09$ | $\$ 0.16$ | $\$ 0.11$ |
| Lighting | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.21 | $\$ 0.04$ | $\$ 0.08$ | $\$ 0.07$ | $\$ 0.06$ |
| Inside cleanliness \& graffiti | 0.44 | 0.19 | 0.34 | 0.37 | $\$ 0.13$ | $\$ 0.06$ | $\$ 0.10$ | $\$ 0.11$ |
|  <br> announcements | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.36 | 0.22 | $\$ 0.04$ | $\$ 0.03$ | $\$ 0.11$ | $\$ 0.06$ |
|  <br> internet | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.01 | $\$ 0.01$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.03$ | $\$ 0.003$ |
| Bus driver/on-board train staff | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.50 | $\$ 0.12$ | $\$ 0.14$ | $\$ 0.00$ | $\$ 0.15$ |
| Environment: <br> emissions | 0.28 | 0.42 | 0.29 | 0.37 | $\$ 0.08$ | $\$ 0.12$ | $\$ 0.09$ | $\$ 0.11$ |
| Attribute sum | 2.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | $\$ 0.83$ | $\$ 1.06$ | $\$ 1.05$ | $\$ 1.06$ |
| Overall rating | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.5 | $\$ 0.65$ | $\$ 0.65$ | $\$ 0.83$ | $\$ 0.74$ |

Source: Douglas Economics (2014) Passenger service quality values for bus, LRT and rail in inner
Sydney, report to Bureau of Transport Statistics, TfNSW, August 2014. Prices have been indexed to May 2019 prices (ABS, AWE, SA, Full Time Adult Ordinary Earnings, NSW).
Note: The values represent the quality improvement from a rating score of $40 \%$ to $80 \%$. The value of each attribute can be used if the individual attributes are known. Otherwise, the 'overall rating' value can be used for a 'package' of improvements or if the individual attribute is unknown. A trip time of 25 minutes is assumed.

### 11.5 Value of quality attributes when switching modes

Travellers that switch mode may benefit from access to a service which is perceived as being of higher quality than the one previously used.
Two types of preferences have been estimated: quality and intrinsic. Intrinsic preference is the residual preference after subtracting quality differences. TfNSW recommends the 'intrinsic mode preference' values in Table 62 be used to estimate the additional benefit for travellers switching from bus to light rail and heavy rail. TfNSW does not recommend estimating a vehicle quality benefit for users switching from car to public transport.

Table 61 Modal preference per trip

| Attribute | Estimated modal preference per 25 minute trip |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IVT minutes |  |  | Dollar value of stop/station quality (\$) |  |  |
|  | Bus to light rail | Bus to Rail | Rail to light rail | Bus to light rail | Bus to Rail | Rail to light rail |
| Quality modal preference | 2.10 | 0.10 | 2.00 | 0.60 | 0.03 | 0.58 |
| Intrinsic modal preference | 2.80 | 2.50 | 0.30 | 0.81 | 0.72 | 0.09 |
| Gross modal preference | 4.90 | 2.60 | 2.30 | 1.41 | 0.75 | 0.66 |

Source: Developing a Suite of Demand Parameters for Inner Sydney Public Transport, Douglas \& Jones, November 2016, ATRF. Table 11 (p.17).

Table 62 Modal preference per hour of travel

| Attribute | Estimated modal preference per hour of travel |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IVT minutes |  |  | Dollar value of stop/station quality (\$) |  |  |
|  | Bus to light rail | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bus to } \\ & \text { Rail } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Rail to light rail | Bus to light rail | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bus to } \\ & \text { Rail } \end{aligned}$ | Rail to light rail |
| Quality modal preference | 5.04 | 0.24 | 4.80 | 1.45 | 0.07 | 1.38 |
| Intrinsic modal preference | 6.72 | 6.00 | 0.72 | 1.93 | 1.73 | 0.21 |
| Gross modal preference | 11.76 | 6.24 | 5.52 | 3.39 | 1.80 | 1.59 |

Source: Developing a Suite of Demand Parameters for Inner Sydney Public Transport, Douglas \& Jones, November 2016, ATRF.

### 11.6 Travel time reliability

When travel times are unreliable, travellers will include buffer times to their journey. TfNSW recommends additional buffer time built into a journey (because of travel time variability) be treated equally as costly as the time spent traveling.
Travel time reliability is defined as the consistency and dependability of travel times for a given trip. It can also be thought of as the variability in journey times. Statistical range measures provide information on the range of travel time variability that transport users experience. One of these is the use of the standard deviation statistic.

Travel time reliability can be assessed using the buffer time, which is an additional time allowance a traveller includes due to trip variability. For example, a travel route has an average travel time of 60 minutes and standard deviation of 10 minutes. Assuming a normal distribution, if a trip-maker needs 95 per cent confidence to arrive at the destination on time, the departure time would need to be 20 minutes earlier (two standard deviations). However, the actual travel time is mostly likely to be 60 minutes in that the trip-maker will arrive 20 minutes earlier, which attracts additional waiting time cost.
The valuation of travel time reliability attempts to value the buffer time that the travellers have budgeted before departure. It is worth noting that in this framework, the values of travel time reliability do not include other logistic costs such as worker's cost at warehouses waiting for loading or unloading freight vehicles.

Travel time reliability depends on many factors including road capacity, traffic accidents, road work, weather, traffic controls, special events and traffic fluctuations. This means that the travel time reliability, as measured by standard deviation, is constantly changing.
Table 63 summarises various studies of the value of travel time variability. Empirical evidences indicate that the valuation of travel time reliability varies. The relativity of the value of travel time variability to the value of in-vehicle travel time ranges from 0.10 to 3.23 . TfNSW recommends that the reliability ratio is equal to 1 . That is, the value of travel time reliability should be set at the same value as in-vehicle travel time.

Table 63 Value of travel time reliability

| Study | Mode | Country | Reliability factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hollander (2006) | Bus | UK | 0.10 |
| Bhat and Sardesai (2006) | Multi-modes | US | 0.27 |
| Brownstone and Small (2005) | Car | US | 0.40 |
| Hensher (2001) | Car | NZ | 0.57 |
| Lam and Small (2011) | Car | US | 0.66 |
| Small et all (2005) | Car | US | 0.91 |
| Batley and Ibnez (2009) | Rail | UK | 2.06 |
| Small et al. (1999) | Car | US | 3.23 |
| Reliability ratio recommended by <br> TfNSW | Multi-modes |  | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ |

Source: TfNSW Evaluation \& Assurance (2019).

## 12 Asset life and residual value

### 12.1 Asset life

TfNSW recommends the economic life of assets presented in Table 64. TfNSW recommends that residual value is calculated using the straight line depreciation method.

Often information is available on the useful life of assets in TfNSW financial statements. However, these values will relate to each entity's accounting treatment for depreciation purposes, and may or may not be suitable for use in a CBA.

## Table 64 Economic life of assets

| Asset class |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Network infrastructure | 70 |  |  |
| Rail extensions, busways | $50-150$ |  |  |
| Earthworks | 120 |  |  |
| Bridges - concrete | 40 |  |  |
| Bridges - timber | 100 |  |  |
| tunnels | $100-120$ |  |  |
| Culverts | $50-100$ |  |  |
| Rail track | $15-50$ |  |  |
| Turnouts | 60 |  |  |
| Ballast | 50 |  |  |
| Sleepers - concrete | 20 |  |  |
| Sleepers - timber | $60-80$ |  |  |
| Road pavements - concrete | $30-40$ |  |  |
| Road pavement - asphalt | 20 |  |  |
| Bus priority schemes |  |  |  |
| Nodal infrastructures | 50 |  |  |
| Stations - rail/light rail | 20 |  |  |
| Bus stops | 40 |  |  |
| Ferry wharves | 50 |  |  |
| Interchanges, commuter parking facilities |  |  |  |
| System infrastructure | $40-50$ |  |  |
| Deports, buildings (miscellaneous) | 12 |  |  |
| Plant and equipment (miscellaneous) | 5 |  |  |
| Control centres (IT systems, excl. buildings) | 20 |  |  |
| Rail signals and communications | 15 |  |  |
| Fleet and rolling stock | 35 |  |  |
| Bus |  |  |  |
| Rolling stock |  |  |  |

Source: ATAP (2018), TfNSW.
Some assets have an economic life that is shorter than the appraisal period. Where this is the case, the costs of the replacement of that asset should be included in the CBA in the final year of the asset's economic life.

### 12.2 Residual value

Residual value refers to the components of the project that have significant life remaining at the end of the appraisal period. TfNSW recommends that residual value is calculated using the straight line depreciation method:

## Equation 8 Straight line depreciation

$$
\text { Residual value }=K \times \frac{(\text { Asset life }- \text { Appraisal period })}{\text { Asset life }}
$$

Where:

- $\mathbf{K}=$ the capital cost
- Asset life = useful life / economic life of the asset
- Appraisal period = the appraisal period used for the CBA.

The residual value is treated as accruing in the final year of the appraisal for the purposes of discounting.

The full capital cost should be included when calculating the residual value, including labour, materials, plant, equipment, and other fees or management costs. Only including physical components (such as infrastructure or raw materials) will understate the residual value of the asset.

## 13 People with a disability

Lifts improve train station accessibility for people with a disability. Parameter values for the installation of a lift are:

- $\$ 0.71$ for passengers without a disability
- $\$ 3.29$ for passengers that have mobility challenges. Passengers that have mobility challenges may include elderly people, those with heavy luggage, bicycles and strollers
- $\$ 4.30$ for passengers using a wheelchair.

Table 65 Benefits of rail station lift to passengers

|  | People without a <br> disability (\$ / train <br> trip) | Mobility <br> challenged (mild <br> disabilities) (\$ / <br> train trip) | People using a <br> wheelchair (\$ / <br> train trip) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sydney Station Survey 1997 | $\$ 0.71$ | $\$ 2.76$ |  |
| UK survey 2009 | $\$ 0.07$ | $\$ 0.88$ | $\$ 1.60$ |
| UK survey 2007 | $\$ 0.59$ | $\$ 3.63$ |  |
| Sydney Observation Survey |  | $\$ 3.82$ | $\$ 4.30$ |
| Recommended value (based on SP <br> survey of Sydney Trains) | $\$ 0.71$ | $\$ 3.29$ | $\$ 4.30$ |

Sources:
(1) Sydney surveys from Douglas (2011) Estimating the user benefit of rail station lift, ATRF 2011.
(2) UK survey 2009 from Duckenfield et al (2010) Measuring the benefits of the access for all programme,

European Transport Conference 2010.
(3) UK survey 2007 from Maynard, A, (2007) Monetising the benefits of disabled access in transport appraisal, 2007 Conference Transport Canada.
December 2011 prices indexed to March 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).

## 14 Option value

Option value refers to an individual's willingness-to-pay (WTP) to have the option of another mode of transport, even if they may not use it. For example, a car driver benefits from having the option of a bus service available in case the car unexpectedly breaks down.

There is limited research into the monetary values of options in NSW. Therefore, TfNSW recommends that option values are only included as a benefit as part of sensitivity testing. Table 66 provides indicative monetary values for option values based on a UK study.
The following factors need to be considered when estimating option value:

- The catchment area: this should consider the number of households that are likely to be affected by the project. A catchment area of 2 km is appropriate for minor stations while a catchment of 5 km is suggested for main stations.
- Alternative transport solutions in the area: if a train service is added to an area where public transport does not exist in the Base Case, the full option value is used. If there is already an existing bus service, the option value is lower and is the difference between the train and bus option values.
Table 66 Option value (\$ / household per annum)

| New Service Type | Option value only <br> $(\$ /$ household <br> per annum) | Option value and <br> Non-use value*(\$ / <br> household per <br> annum) | Value of mixed mode <br> package(\$ / <br> household per <br> annum) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Introduce train service where no <br> public transport exists | $\$ 298$ | $\$ 497$ |  |
| Introduce bus service where no <br> public transport exists | $\$ 163$ | $\$ 272$ | $\$ 769$ |
| Introduce both bus and train service <br> where no public transport exists | $\$ 298$ | $\$ 497$ |  |
| Introduce train service where bus <br> exists | $\$ 135$ | $\$ 226$ |  |

Source: UK DfT 2012, Transport Analysis Guidelines. Values converted to AUD from GBP (average 2010 exchange rate) then indexed from December 2010 to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Notes: *Non-use value refers to the value placed on the existence of a service regardless of any possibility of future use of the individual.

## 15 Cost estimation

A robust CBA needs comprehensive and accurate cost estimates that are able to be easily and clearly traced, replicated and updated. These expenses are generally estimated by a quantity surveyor, construction economist, or cost manager.
The standard for cost estimation can be found in the Cost Estimation Guidance by the Australian Government of Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities and Regional Development (DITCRD). For large projects, especially those seeking federal funding, DITCRD's cost estimation guidance should be followed and requires highly accurate estimates, including probabilistic cost estimation and itemised costing from first principles.

### 15.1 Difference between costings in a financial appraisal and a cost-benefit analysis

The cost estimates used in a CBA differ from the cost estimates used in a financial appraisal. CBA uses real costs, discounted to present values using the social discount rate. Financial appraisals tend to report costs in nominal dollars and may use a different discount rate to the CBA.

Resource costs are used in a CBA and do not include taxes and subsidies. Taxes and subsidies are transfer payments due to government policy decision and do not impact the underlying level of benefits and costs of an initiative to the NSW community. Rather, they impact how these benefits and costs are shared by the NSW community.
Cost escalation is also treated differently in a CBA. Prices in a CBA are generally in real terms, that is, no escalation takes place. Escalation should not be included unless the prices of specific inputs or outputs are expected to move at a rate significantly different from the general inflation rate. That is, if prices of project components move at a different rate.

### 15.1.1 Level of accuracy

The NSW Government recommends the use of probabilistic modelling approaches to be informed by actual experience of project managers, service delivery officers, legal or other experts who are able to identify and place a value on salient risks.
In practice, the accuracy of project estimates should increase during the decision making process in keeping with available information about the project options. At the planning stage, estimates are likely to be less accurate than final out-turn costs. While early estimates may not be as accurate as final cost, planning estimates are generally accurate in relative terms, so they provide a reasonable basis for the ranking and initial screening of options.

The cost of gaining greater accuracy should also be considered. For early stage investigations and unfunded transport projects the amounts spent on accurate cost estimations should be enough to support an informed choice and not necessarily be definitive.
For projects not seeking federal funding, where possible TfNSW recommends that expected value should be used for the CBA as a preference over the P50 value but cost estimates at P50 value can be used in the CBA. The project risk profile, life cycle phase, delivery strategy and the expertise available to the project team also need to be considered in deciding on the accuracy of cost estimates.

Cost estimates in a CBA should be clear in stating the level of coverage, completeness and accuracy involved, with particular care exercised in the public release of cost estimates that are preliminary or likely to be revised.

### 15.2 Indicative operation and maintenance costs

Operation and maintenance costs are expenses associated with the maintenance and administration of the project or initiative on a day-to-day basis, after it is built. The figures from Table 67 to Table 76 should only be used strategically. For example, they can be used to calculate the cost of network wide changes, where indicative costs are needed. For the majority of projects, Section 15 does not provide adequate consideration of project-specific factors to be used in cost estimation.

### 15.2.1 Heavy rail

Operating and maintenance cost parameter values for suburban and intercity trains are presented in Table 67. Although average costs are presented, it is noted that rolling stock maintenance, presentation and cleaning costs are higher for suburban trains compared to intercity trains; while power, traction and crew costs are lower for suburban trains.

Marginal costs are often more relevant in an economic evaluation because comparisons are between the base case and the project case. Marginal cost can be estimated by removing fixed costs. For example, rolling stock presentation and cleaning are often fixed costs because they incur independently of the number of kilometres travelled. High level benchmark station maintenance and operating costs are included in Table 68.
Table 67 Train operating and maintenance costs

| Cost description | \$ per car km | Marginal cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Average cost | $\$ 0.26$ |
| Power/traction | $\$ 0.26$ | $\$ 0.35$ |
| Rollingstock routine maintenance | $\$ 0.35$ |  |
| Rollingstock presentation / cleaning* | $\$ 0.17$ |  |
| Rollingstock major periodic maintenance* | $\$ 0.98$ | $\$ 0.98$ |
| Infrastructure routine maintenance | $\$ 0.98$ |  |
| Infrastructure major periodic maintenance* | $\$ 1.55$ | $\$ 1.38$ |
| Crew | $\$ 1.38$ | $\$ 2.97$ |
| Total recurrent costs | $\$ 5.68$ |  |

Source: Railcorp Operating and Maintenance cost analysis, June 2015.
*These items are not marginal costs.
Crew costs are indexed from June 2015 to June 2015 wages (ABS Series ID A2599999R). All other costs are indexed from June 2015 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.
Table 68 Station operating and maintenance costs

| Cost description | \$m/ year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Surface station | Underground station |
| Station operating and | \$0.64 | \$1.07 |
| maintenance (range) | (\$0.63-\$0.80) | (\$1.07-\$1.61) |

Source: Railcorp Operating and Maintenance cost analysis, June 2015. Values indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

### 15.2.2 Rail freight

Table 69 presents indicative values. The values are suitable for CBA as they exclude tax.

Freight rail operating costs can vary widely depending on a range of factors. Some of the factors that may affect below rail operating costs include tonnage carried, axle loads, line speed, age and type of infrastructure and rolling stock characteristics. The factors that may affect above rail costs include type of rolling stock, condition of asset, level of usage, gradient, curvature, speed limits, axle load, payload and number of wagons.
Given the wide variability in freight rail operations the costs are provided in a range (i.e. low, medium and high). The below rail fixed maintenance costs are provided as annualised average costs for the coal network and the interstate freight network.

Users should exercise judgment when choosing the most appropriate value noting the following on the items provided in Table 69:

- Items 1a and 1b: These are the fixed costs of track maintenance for the coal and inter-state network. They cover the costs of track maintenance over three distinct phases:
- immediately after construction - inspection and routine maintenance
- after 5 years - inspection and routine maintenance, regular rail regrinding and resurfacing
- after 10 years - Major Periodic Maintenance.
- Item 3: Rail track variable maintenance costs vary with the volume of the load carried. These costs include grinding, ballast cleaning etc.
- Item 4: Major Periodic Maintenance (MPM) covers re-sleepering and laying ballast. They are typically incurred every 10 years. However, heavy usage may result in more frequent MPM.
- Item 5: This is the cost of new rolling stock including locomotives and wagons purchased. The economic life of rolling stock is assumed to be 35 years.
- Item 6: Refit costs are the cost of refitting locomotives and wagons depending on usage. Assume these occur every 10 years for locomotives and 15 years for wagons. It should be noted that locomotive and wagon refit costs can vary significantly between 15 per cent and 50 per cent of the cost of a new unit.
- Items 7 and 8: If no refurbishment or half-life fit out costs are available, use costs in Items 7 and 8. Alternatively, Items 7 b and 8 b are per km values which may be used if detailed maintenance costs are not available. To avoid double counting, if items 7 and 8 are used, item 6 should be excluded.
- Item 9: To estimate fuel costs multiply the fuel consumption rate in Item 9 with the resource price of fuel (market wholesale price for diesel fuel less 10 per cent GST and excise taxes). This will provide the fuel cost per locomotive km . Fuel cost will vary significantly with load, terrain and distance travelled.
- Item 10: This provides the hourly cost of a two person crew which can be used to estimate crew costs for each trip or over one year making assumptions about working hours and working conditions.

Table 69 Freight operating and maintenance costs - above and below rail


Source: Infrastructure Advisory Services (2013). Values have been indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS
Series ID A2325806K). Values for Crewing cost have been indexed from December 2012 to June 2019 wages (ABS Series ID A2599999R).
Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

### 15.2.3 Light rail

Table 70 presents the operating and maintenance cost parameters for light rail, with cost breakdown by track, station and train.

Table 70 Operating and maintenance costs - light rail

| Cost item | Cost | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Light rail vehicle | 3.5 to 5.1 | \$m / per light rail vehicle |
| Track maintenance cost |  |  |
| Fixed: track and right of way | 12,379 | \$ / track km |
| Fixed: electric overhead | 11,605 | \$ / track km |
| Variable: track and right of way | 0.62 | \$ / train km |
| Variable: signals \& communications | 12.44 | \$ / train km |
| Variable: electric overhead | 0.15 | \$ / train km |
| Station |  |  |
| Station staff | 24.76 | \$ / train hour |
| Station maintenance | 15,474 | \$ / station per year |
| Train |  |  |
| Driver | 46.43 | \$ / train hour |
| Maintenance | 1.39 | \$ / train hour |
| Customer services and ticketing | 23.83 | \$ / train hour |
| Cleaning | 13,927 | \$ / train-year |
| Materials and overheads | 60,489 | \$ / train-year |

Source: North West Transport Link Economic Appraisal by Douglas Economics (Jan 2006). Values have
been indexed from December 2005 to June 2019 (ABS Series ID A84994877K).
Notes: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

### 15.2.4 Transitway and Metrobus

Table 71 presents the operating and maintenance parameters for Metrobus and Transitway buses.

## Table 71 Operating costs - buses

| Cost item | Unit cost | Unit type |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total non-labour costs | $\$ 1.69$ | $\$ /$ bus km |
| Labour cost | $\$ 54.40$ | $\$ /$ bus hour |

Source: TfNSW analysis. Values have been indexed from March 2015 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Notes: (1) Cost per revenue and dedicated school bus kilometre is an average of Sydney Transit Authority (STA) figures for a standard bus. Cost cover all running costs of a service variation excluding labour for a weekday between hours of 0559 and 2359. Dead running costs has been loaded to revenue and school bus kilometres by a factor of 1.259 . (2) Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

### 15.2.5 Bus depots

Table 72 presents a list of operating and capital costs in a bus depot proposal.

Table 72 Operating and capital costs - bus depots

| Cost item | Unit cost | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Depot operating costs |  |  |
| Employee related | 34,710 | \$ / bus lot |
| Other operating costs | 1,815 | \$ / bus lot |
| Maintenance costs | 1,689 | \$ / bus lot |
| Administration | 2,447 | \$ / bus lot |
| Rent |  |  |
| Imputed rent | 5,366-21.463 | \$ / bus lot |
| Bus |  |  |
| Road repair and maintenance | 0.04 | \$ / bus km |
| Crash cost | 0.01 | \$/ bus km |
| Road congestion | 0.83 | \$/ bus km |
| Air pollution | 0.38 | \$/ bus km |
| GHG emissions | 0.16 | \$/ bus km |
| Noise | 0.03 | \$/ bus km |
| Water pollution | 0.06 | \$ / bus km |
| Nature and landscape | 0.00 | \$/ bus km |
| Urban separation | 0.03 | \$/ bus km |
| Upstream and downstream | 0.23 | \$/ bus km |
| Bus cost by type |  |  |
| Category 1 | 65,604 | \$ / bus |
| Category 2 | 120,274 | \$ / bus |
| Category 3 | 371,755 | \$ / bus |
| Category 4 | 404,557 | \$ / bus |
| Articulated bus | 754,443 to 820,047 | \$ / bus |
| Double deck bus | 754,443 | \$ / bus |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW.
Notes: (1) Imputed rent depends largely on land value and location. (2) Refer to Table 24 for Road congestion and Table 35 for environmental costs (e.g. air pollution, GHG emissions). (3) Road repair and maintenance costs account for $46 \%$ of total repair, maintenance and provision cost - refer to Table 68. (4) Bus categories $1,2,3$ and 4 correspond to 13 to 18 passengers, 19 to 24 passengers, 25 to 41 passengers and $42+$ passengers respectively.

* Values have been indexed from June 2016 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
** Values have been indexed from June 2014 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.


### 15.2.6 Ferry services

Table 73 presents the costs of ferry services, vessels and wharves. The ferry fleet includes different vessel types that have different capacities and operating costs.
Table 73 Operating and capital costs - ferry services

| Cost item |  | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vessel costs | $\$ 5,401,000$ | Unit type |
| River Cat ferry | $\$ 27,004,000$ | per vessel |
| Manly class | $\$ 6,481,000$ | per vessel |
| Wharf costs | $\$ 1,620,000$ | per wharf |
| Ferry wharf (commuter upgrade) | $\$ 7,561,000$ | per wharf |
| Ferry wharf (recreational) upgrade | $\$ 432,000$ | per ramp |
| New ferry wharf |  |  |
| Boat ramp upgrade | $\$ 906$ | per service hour |
| Operating costs | $\$ 1,189$ | per service hour |
| Harbour rate (Parramatta and Inner harbour) |  |  |
| Freshwater rate |  |  |

Source: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW based on costings supplied to NSW Treasury in 2015. Values have been indexed from March 2015 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K). Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

### 15.2.7 Local infrastructure costs

Table 74 represents the median cost of delivering the infrastructure item and should be used as a guide.
Table 74 Infrastructure benchmark costs

| Infrastructure type | Detail description | Benchmark base cost (\$ / unit) | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| New sub-arterial road | New 3 lane flexible pavement road | 9,908 | m |
|  | New 4 lane flexible pavement road | 11,506 | m |
| Sub-arterial road widening | Flexible pavement | 7,020 | m |
|  | Rigid pavement | 7,219 | m |
| New rural road | New 2 lane, flexible pavement road | 2,610 | m |
| Rural road widening | Widening flexible pavement by 1 lane | 3,972 | m |
| Guide posts/safety barriers/pedestrian fencing | Metal guide posts | 62-115 | each |
|  | Guardrail safety barriers | 230-379 | m |
|  | Steel pedestrian fencing | 821-1436 | m |
| Traffic calming on 2 lane road | Flat top road hump | 34,719 | each |
|  | Concrete road hump | 9,268 | each |
| New concrete footpath adjacent to traffic lane | 1.2 m wide footpath | 254 | m |
|  | 2.2 m wide footpath | 613 | m |
|  | 2.5 m wide footpath | 752 | m |
| Removal of old footpath and replace with new | 1.2 m wide footpath | 287 | m |
|  | 2.2 m wide footpath | 640 | m |
|  | 2.5 m wide footpath | 776 | m |
| Unsignalised intersection | "T" intersection | 19,906 | each |
|  | 4 way intersection | 33,405 | each |
| Signalised intersection | "T" intersection | 246,054 | each |
|  | 4 way intersection | 293,044 | each |
| Roundabout | 4 leg roundabout with 2 approach lanesgreenfield | 38,576 | each |
|  | 4 leg roundabout with 2 approach lanesbrownfield (existing traffic) | 112,493 | each |
|  | 4 leg roundabout and pavement with 2 approach lanes-greenfield | 371,433 | each |
| Pedestrian crossing | Spanning 2 lanes including pedestrian refuge | 6,172 | each |
| Bus stop | Including enclosure, seating and signage | 19,690 | each |
| Street Lighting | Including post with 4.5 m outreach- 10.5 m high | 11,311 | each |
|  | Including post with 4.5 m outreach- 12 m high | 17,275 | each |
| On road cycleway | 2.2 m wide lane without kerb separation | 263 | m |
|  | 2.2 m wide lane with kerb separation | 334 | m |
| Pedestrian underpass | Under rail line | 171,860 | m |
| Road pavement resurfacing | Milling and filling of road pavement | 109 | m2 |
| Cycleway facilities | Stainless steel bicycle racks | 1,260 | each |
| Pedestrian/cycle overpass with antithrow screens and covered walkway | Pedestrian Bridge | 34,082 | m |
|  | Cycle overbridge | 35,942 | m |
| Single lane, on road cycleway, surface treatment and signage | Without kerb separation | 263 | m |
|  | With kerb separation | 334 | m |
| Carpark | At grade carpark | 7,082 | space |
|  | Multi-storey | 38,266 | space |

Source: IPART Report on Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs, Final Report, April 2014. Values indexed from June 2013 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K). Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

Table 75 Infrastructure reference costs

| Infrastructure type | Detail description | Benchmark base cost (\$ / unit) | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road bridge over railway, waterway or grade separation | Single span bridge 9.4 m wide $\times 19 \mathrm{~m}$ (lower bound) | 1,084,296 | each |
|  | Single span bridge 25 m wide $\times 34 \mathrm{~m}$ (upper bound) with ramps | 7,274,439 | each |
| Intersection state / local road | Intersection with perpendicular junction, widening for turning, profiling \& removal of 1.2 m width asphalt carriageway for local road tie-in, traffic mitigation measures, 100 mm asphalt paving, rework at pavement interface, signage. | 67,466 | each |
|  | Above plus acceleration-deceleration lane off and on, stormwater pipe | 354,797 | each |
| Additional cost for road maintenance attributed to mining activity | Lower bound (10\% acceleration) | 12,479 | km |
|  | Upper Bound (30\% acceleration) | 48,134 | km |

Source: IPART Report on Local Infrastructure Benchmark Costs, Final Report, April 2014. Values indexed from June 2013 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
Note: Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.

### 15.2.8 Average fare by mode

Table 76 provides the average fares for train, bus, ferry and light rail; estimated from Opal data.

## Table 76 Fare by public transport mode (\$/trip)

| Card type | Train | Bus | Ferry | Light rail |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adult | $\$ 3.98$ | $\$ 2.12$ | $\$ 3.98$ | $\$ 1.52$ |
| Child / Youth | $\$ 1.93$ | $\$ 1.08$ | $\$ 1.93$ | $\$ 0.90$ |
| Concession | $\$ 2.07$ | $\$ 1.05$ | $\$ 2.07$ | $\$ 0.74$ |
| Senior | $\$ 0.75$ | $\$ 0.73$ | $\$ 0.75$ | $\$ 0.42$ |
| Weighted Average | $\$ 2.49$ | $\$ 1.71$ | $\$ 3.31$ | $\$ 1.27$ |

Source: Data provided by TfNSW Customer Services. Based on Opal trip data only from September quarter 2016 to June quarter 2017. Increased for 2017 and 2018 Opal price increases.
Notes: GST on ticket price is excluded. Values are indicative, they should only be used strategically.
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# Appendix A Value of travel time - additional information 

TfNSW recommends the values of travel time (VTT) times in Section 2. The following is additional information on VTT.

## A. 1 Value of travel time approach

The TfNSW recommended VTT is in line with the ATAP values and based on the Austroads method. The Austroads method of calculating the VTT follows the willingness-to-pay (WTP) approach and is linked to a person's productivity and earnings. Austroads recommended the following valuation principles:

- Private travel time is valued at 40 per cent of the seasonally adjusted full time Average Weekly Earnings (AWE) for Australia, assuming a 38 -hour working week. This rate is applicable for travel modes of private car, motorcycle, bicycle, walking and public transport for commuting and recreational trip purposes.
- Business travel time is valued at 128 per cent of the seasonally adjusted full time AWE for Australia, applicable for all business trips. This is because businesses pay tax as well as wages. It is assumed that time spent travelling for business purposes is unproductive and therefore foregone working time (Austroads, 2012).
Below are some reasons for the lower VTT for private travel compared to business travel:
- The traveller's WTP is based on after-tax income.
- A worker's after-tax income is shared by household members. The WTP is then related to household disposable income and the number of persons in the household.
- For most people, the marginal disutility of travel is lower than that of work. In Sydney, the average work trip duration is 35 minutes (one way), and the daily travel time per capita is 79 minutes (Bureau of Transport Statistics, TfNSW, 2013). Most people seem to enjoy a certain amount of personal travel, about 30 minutes per day, and dislike travelling more than 90 minutes per day (Mokhtarian \& Salomon, 2001). The benefit of small reductions in travel time, say from 34 minutes to 30 minutes, would be marginal or negligible for many people.
In general, however, the VTT reflects the willingness of travellers to trade time for money. Willingness to pay depends on additional factors including the value and urgency attached to the journey purpose and comfort of the trip. Therefore, VTT values are arguably better determined from revealed preference and stated preference data.


## A. 2 Value of travel time - used in transport demand modelling

TfNSW undertook the Value of Travel Time Study in 2015-2016 (Table 77). This study used stated preference surveys to estimate the VTT for several modes of travel.

The values in Table 77 are behavioural values and could be used in transport demand models (not economic evaluations). Transport demand models use different values of time for different segments of the NSW community in order to
estimate their travel behaviour. For example, transport demand models differentiate travellers by behavioural characteristics, such as income (with higher income earners assumed to have a higher value of time), trip purpose, and time of day.
Table 77 Value of travel time by mode - TfNSW 2015-16 survey

| Mode | Mode share \% | Personal income (\$000 p.a.) | Value of travel time (\$/hr) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Non income standardised | Income standardised |
| Car | 85.40 | 68 | 16.87 | 16.58 |
| Train | 6.70 | 48 | 14.70 | 16.50 |
| Bus | 7.40 | 41 | 8.42 | 10.94 |
| Ferry | 0.40 | 75 | 16.35 | 15.16 |
| Light Rail | 0.10 | 69 | 22.52 | 22.04 |
| Public transport | 14.60 | 46 | 11.60 | 13.67 |
| All | 100.00 | 64 | 16.10 | 16.16 |

Source: 2015/16 TfNSW Value of Travel Time Study. Values indexed to May 2019 AWE (ABS Series ID A84994877K).

When valuing the benefit of travel time savings in a CBA, the purpose is to inform decisions on resource allocation. This differs from the transport modeller's objective of predicting behaviour. For this reason, the VTT savings is assumed to be consistent across modes and segments of the community. If a higher VTT was used for road travel compared to public transport, resource allocation would preference road projects, all else being equal. Similarly, if a higher VTT was used for higher income earners, transport initiatives in high socioeconomic areas would be preferred over lower socioeconomic areas, all else being equal.
The key finding of the 2015-2016 study is that the estimated VTT weighted by mode share is very close to $\$ 17.72$ per person hour (the TfNSW recommended VTT for private travel). The TfNSW recommended VTT is an equity (or resource) value for use in CBA of road and public transport initiatives.

## A. 3 Value of travel time - Sydney Trains method

In 2010, Sydney Trains (formerly RailCorp) engaged Douglas Economics to update the value of rail travel time used in economic evaluations. This study was updated in 2013. The values were estimated by stated preference market research that asked passengers to choose between two hypothetical rail journeys varying in travel time, fare and departure time. The overall value of on-board train time was estimated at $\$ 16.72$ ( $\$ 15.38$ in November 2018 values) per hour with a peak value of $\$ 14.95$ ( $\$ 15.36$ ) and an off-peak value of $\$ 14.03$ (\$15.41), as shown in Table 78. Table 79 compares the VTT from the Sydney Trains survey and that recommended by ATAP.

Table 78 Value of on-board train time (\$/hr)

| Time period | Short | Medium | Long | All | Overall |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $<25 \mathrm{~min}$ | $26-29 \mathrm{~min}$ | $>60 \mathrm{~min}$ |  |  |
| Peak | 15.26 | 16.72 | 13.06 | 14.95 |  |
| Off peak | 14.81 | 13.55 | 13.89 | 14.03 |  |

Source: Service Quality Values for Sydney Rail, Report to Railcorp by Douglas Economics, October 2016. Values indexed from November 2016 AWE to May 2019 AWE (ABS Series ID A84994877K).

Table 79 Value of on-board train time - comparisons

| Source | Value of time (\$/hr) | Difference from ATAP value (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sydney Trains concession fare | 8.88 | -49.91 |
| Sydney Trains non-concession fare | 18.31 | 3.36 |
| Sydney Trains overall | 15.77 | -10.98 |
| ATAP - private trips | 17.72 |  |

Source: Service Quality Values of Rail Transport in Sydney, Report to Railcorp by Douglas Economics, August 2015 values indexed to May 2019 AWE ((ABS Series ID A84994877K).

The difference between the Sydney Trains and ATAP VTT (which is recommended by TfNSW) can be explained by the following factors:

- The ATAP value is anchored at 40 per cent of AWE, while the Sydney Trains value is based on stated preference surveys of train users. The value of stated preference surveys can be affected by many factors such as sampling, income, trip purpose and general consumer sentiments at the time of the survey.
- Various surveys on the VTT have indicated that the VTT for public transport is lower than car travel. Abrantes and Wardman (2010), having undertaken meta-analysis of UK values of travel time of 1,749 valuations in 226 studies from 1980 to 2008, reported that the VTT of bus users was 35 per cent below that of car users, and the VTT of rail users was 15 per cent below car travel. Bus users tend to have lower VTT in stated preference surveys. However, bus travel is less comfortable than car travel, suggesting bus users are willing-to-pay a higher cost to cut bus travel time.
- The lower VTT for train users can be largely attributed to the lower value of private leisure. Based on the 2014/15 Household Travel Survey undertaken by Bureau of Transport Statistics, business trips represent 6 per cent of total train trips on weekdays, or 5 per cent in the 3 hour morning peak (6:30AM 9:00AM) on weekdays.


## Appendix B Vehicle classification

A number of vehicle classification systems are used in this document and by other state and federal guidance documents. This section provides an overview of the different vehicle types and a concordance between classifications. More detail can be found on the Austroads website.

Table 80 Vehicle Classifications

| Demand Category* |  | Vehicle class | Vehicle name / category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Light <br> Vehicle (LV) | Car | 1 | Small Car <br> Medium Car <br> Large Car |
|  | Light Commercial Vehicle (LCV) |  | Courier Van-Utility / Light Commercial Vehicle** 4WD Petrol |
|  | N/A*** | 2 | Trailer Caravan |
| Heavy Vehicle (HV) | Rigid | 3 | Light Rigid |
|  |  | 4 | Medium Rigid |
|  |  | 5 | Heavy Rigid |
|  | Articulated | 6 | Three Axle Articulated |
|  |  | 7 | Four Axle Articulated |
|  |  | 8 | Five Axle Articulated |
|  |  | 9 | Six Axle Articulated |
|  |  | 10 | B Double Heavy Truck + Trailer |
|  |  | 11 | Double Road Train <br> Medium Articulated + Trailer |
|  |  | 12 | Triple Road Train Heavy Truck + three trailers |

Source: TfNSW Evaluation \& Assurance, based on Austroads (2018) Guide to Pavement Technology Part 4K: Selection and Design of Sprayed Seals, Appendix B Austroads.

* These categories are used by demand models such as PTPM and STM
** Light Commercial Vehicle as per Austroads AP-R264-05 (2005a); Courier Van-Utility as per ARRB
RC2062 (2002) for Austroads.
*** Trailers and caravans are generally not separately modelled in strategic demand models.

Figure 2 Austroads typical configurations


Source: Austroads (2018) Guide to Pavement Technology Part 4K: Selection and Design of Sprayed Seals, Appendix B Austroads.

## Appendix C Parameters for use with strategic demand models

Table 81 provides parameter values for use with PTPM's economic output module.
Table 81 Parameters for use with PTPM - C1

| Row number | PTPM Output | Unit | Period | Economic parameter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Transport Travel Time Savings |  |  |  |  |
| Row 290 | Commute | hours ( $\Delta$ ) | 3.5h AM | \$17.72 |
| Row 291 | Business | hours ( $\Delta$ ) | 3.5h AM | \$57.48 |
| Row 292 | Education | hours ( $\Delta$ ) | 3.5h AM | \$17.72 |
| Row 293 | Other | hours ( $\Delta$ ) | 3.5h AM | \$17.72 |
| Road User Travel Time Savings (1) |  |  |  |  |
| Row 497 | VHT - Car continuous | hours ( $\Delta$ ) | 2h AM | \$35.76 |
| Row 498 | VHT - Car new (incl. ROH) | hours ( $\Delta$ ) | 2h AM | \$35.76 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs - Resource Costs (2) |  |  |  |  |
| Row 477 | < 10 kph | km | 2h AM | \$1.1458 |
| Row 478 | $10-20 \mathrm{kph}$ | km | 2h AM | \$0.4962 |
| Row 479 | 20-30 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3662 |
| Row 480 | 30-40 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3106 |
| Row 481 | 40-50 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.2796 |
| Row 482 | 50-60 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.2599 |
| Row 483 | 60-70 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.2463 |
| Row 484 | 70-80 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.2363 |
| Row 485 | 80-90 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.2287 |
| Row 486 | 90-100 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.2226 |
| Vehicle Operating Costs - Perceived Costs (3) |  |  |  |  |
| Row 477 | < 10 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 478 | 10-20 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 479 | 20-30 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 480 | 30-40 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 481 | 40-50 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 482 | 50-60 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 483 | 60-70 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 484 | 70-80 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 485 | 80-90 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Row 486 | 90-100 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.3595 |
| Urban road congestion (4) |  |  |  |  |
| Row 487 | Total | km | 2h AM | \$0.4366 |
| Road Safety Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| Row 487 | Total | km | 2h AM | \$0.0716 |
| Environmental Externalities |  |  |  |  |
| Row 477 | < 10 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1340 |
| Row 478 | 10-20 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1340 |
| Row 479 | 20-30 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1340 |
| Row 480 | 30-40 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1340 |
| Row 481 | 40-50 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1340 |
| Row 482 | 50-60 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1261 |
| Row 483 | 60-70 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1261 |
| Row 484 | 70-80 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1261 |
| Row 485 | 80-90 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1261 |
| Row 486 | 90-100 kph | km | 2h AM | \$0.1261 |
| Active Transport Health Externalities |  |  |  |  |
| Row 149 | Walk time (access, egress and interchange) | hours | 3.5h AM | \$0.3652 |
| Road Damage Costs |  |  |  |  |
| Row 487 | Total | km | 2h AM | \$0.0439 |

Source: Evaluation \& Assurance (2019)
(1) Private / Business purpose split calculated from 2012/13 NSW Household Travel Survey.
(2) TfNSW Depreciation-adjusted VOC model results for 'Medium Car' used for resource costs.
(3) Flat perceived costs from PTPM used - for further information on calculating VOC benefits, refer to Transport for NSW Technical Note on Vehicle Operating Costs (2019).
(4) Not to be calculated in combination with road user travel time savings and vehicle operating costs.

## Appendix D Rural vehicle operating cost tables

This appendix contains the VOC tables for rural vehicle operating costs calculated at 75 per cent payload, estimated using the equations contained in section 3.2.2.
These VOCs have been calculated based on the ATAP VOC model.
Table 82 to Table 97 presents the VOC for rural (uninterrupted travel or free flow) travel for each vehicle type by speed; for each road surface condition (very good, good, fair, poor), gradient ( 0 per cent, 4 per cent, 6 per cent, 8 per cent) and road curvature (straight, curvy, very curvy). Table 98 presents the fuel consumption for vehicles on a typical road with good road surface conditions and 4 per cent gradient at varying levels of curvature (straight, curvy, very curvy).
Further details can be found in Australian Transport Assessment and Planning PV2 Road Parameter Values (2016).
There is also the Rural Vehicle Operating Cost and Fuel Consumption Excel Tool where CBA practitioners can insert their own inputs into the ATAP VOC model.

Table 82 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D1

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 28.0 | 24.7 | 23.3 | 22.7 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.8 | 23.2 | 23.8 | 24.5 |
| Medium Car | 38.9 | 33.9 | 31.6 | 30.4 | 29.8 | 29.7 | 29.8 | 30.1 | 30.5 | 31.2 |
| Large Car | 52.2 | 45.3 | 42.0 | 40.2 | 39.3 | 38.8 | 38.7 | 38.9 | 39.2 | 39.7 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 40.1 | 35.8 | 33.8 | 32.9 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 32.9 | 33.4 | 34.1 | 34.9 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 43.3 | 39.1 | 37.2 | 36.3 | 36.0 | 36.1 | 36.5 | 37.0 | 37.8 | 38.7 |
| Light Rigid | 50.9 | 47.0 | 45.6 | 45.3 | 45.6 | 46.5 | 47.7 | 49.3 | 51.1 | 53.3 |
| Medium Rigid | 66.5 | 59.4 | 56.4 | 55.1 | 54.9 | 55.3 | 56.2 | 57.5 | 59.2 | 61.2 |
| Heavy Rigid | 82.1 | 71.4 | 67.0 | 65.6 | 65.8 | 67.1 | 69.4 | 72.4 | 76.1 | 80.4 |
| Heavy Bus | 128.4 | 112.9 | 105.7 | 101.9 | 100.1 | 99.3 | 99.4 | 100.2 | 101.4 | 103.1 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 108.5 | 96.0 | 91.2 | 89.9 | 90.6 | 92.8 | 96.2 | 100.5 | 105.7 | 111.8 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 119.5 | 106.0 | 100.6 | 98.9 | 99.3 | 101.1 | 104.2 | 108.2 | 113.0 | 118.7 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 128.8 | 114.5 | 108.8 | 106.8 | 107.0 | 108.8 | 111.8 | 115.7 | 120.5 | 126.2 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 136.3 | 123.5 | 118.5 | 117.1 | 117.7 | 119.8 | 123.1 | 127.4 | 132.6 | 138.5 |
| B-Double | 151.2 | 135.7 | 129.4 | 127.1 | 127.1 | 128.7 | 131.6 | 135.5 | 140.3 | 145.9 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 150.4 | 135.6 | 129.7 | 127.6 | 127.8 | 129.6 | 132.6 | 136.6 | 141.5 | 147.2 |
| A-Double | 182.0 | 163.8 | 156.1 | 152.9 | 152.4 | 153.5 | 156.0 | 159.6 | 164.1 | 169.4 |
| B Triple | 212.6 | 190.1 | 180.2 | 175.6 | 174.0 | 174.4 | 176.1 | 179.0 | 182.9 | 187.6 |
| A B Combination | 205.4 | 186.2 | 178.0 | 174.6 | 173.9 | 174.9 | 177.4 | 180.9 | 185.5 | 190.9 |
| A-Triple | 232.4 | 211.0 | 201.7 | 197.7 | 196.5 | 197.3 | 199.5 | 202.9 | 207.3 | 212.6 |
| Double B-Double | 233.6 | 213.0 | 204.1 | 200.3 | 199.4 | 200.3 | 202.7 | 206.3 | 210.8 | 216.3 |


| Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road <br> conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) | $0 \%$ to $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ to $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ to $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ to $8 \%$ |  |
| Curvature (Terrain <br> type) | Straight (0-99'/km) |  |  | Curvy (100-299'/km) | Very curvy <br> $\left(300^{\prime}+/ k m\right)$ |
| Roughness (IRI) | $1-2$ (Very <br> good) | $3-4$ (Good) | $5-6$ (Fair) | $7-8$ (Poor) |  |
| Roughness (NRM) | $0-49$ | $50-99$ | $100-149$ | $150-199$ |  |

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees / km)

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 27.9 | 24.7 | 23.3 | 22.7 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.8 | 23.2 | 23.8 | 24.5 |
| Medium Car | 38.8 | 33.9 | 31.6 | 30.4 | 29.9 | 29.7 | 29.8 | 30.0 | 30.5 | 31.1 |
| Large Car | 52.1 | 45.3 | 42.1 | 40.3 | 39.3 | 38.9 | 38.7 | 38.8 | 39.1 | 39.6 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 40.1 | 35.8 | 33.8 | 32.9 | 32.6 | 32.7 | 33.0 | 33.5 | 34.3 | 35.2 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 43.3 | 39.1 | 37.2 | 36.4 | 36.1 | 36.2 | 36.6 | 37.2 | 38.0 | 38.9 |
| Light Rigid | 50.8 | 47.0 | 45.6 | 45.3 | 45.7 | 46.5 | 47.7 | 49.3 | 51.1 | 53.2 |
| Medium Rigid | 66.6 | 59.4 | 56.5 | 55.3 | 55.2 | 55.8 | 56.9 | 58.5 | 60.4 | 62.8 |
| Heavy Rigid | 82.3 | 71.4 | 67.1 | 65.8 | 66.3 | 68.0 | 70.6 | 74.2 | 78.4 | 83.3 |
| Heavy Bus | 128.6 | 112.8 | 105.7 | 102.1 | 100.5 | 100.1 | 100.6 | 101.8 | 103.6 | 105.9 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 108.5 | 96.1 | 91.5 | 90.4 | 91.5 | 94.0 | 97.8 | 102.5 | 108.3 | 114.9 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 119.3 | 106.0 | 100.7 | 99.2 | 99.7 | 101.8 | 105.0 | 109.2 | 114.4 | 120.3 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 128.5 | 114.5 | 108.9 | 107.1 | 107.5 | 109.4 | 112.6 | 116.8 | 121.8 | 127.8 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 136.4 | 123.5 | 118.7 | 117.6 | 118.6 | 121.2 | 125.1 | 130.0 | 135.9 | 142.8 |
| B-Double | 151.1 | 135.7 | 129.5 | 127.5 | 128.0 | 130.1 | 133.5 | 138.1 | 143.6 | 150.1 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 150.3 | 135.6 | 129.9 | 128.1 | 128.8 | 131.1 | 134.7 | 139.5 | 145.2 | 151.8 |
| A-Double | 182.1 | 163.8 | 156.3 | 153.6 | 153.6 | 155.4 | 158.8 | 163.3 | 169.0 | 175.6 |
| B Triple | 212.5 | 190.1 | 180.4 | 176.3 | 175.2 | 176.2 | 178.8 | 182.6 | 187.5 | 193.4 |
| A B Combination | 205.8 | 186.4 | 178.4 | 175.6 | 175.6 | 177.7 | 181.3 | 186.2 | 192.3 | 199.4 |
| A-Triple | 232.8 | 211.3 | 202.4 | 199.0 | 198.7 | 200.5 | 204.0 | 208.9 | 215.0 | 222.1 |
| Double B-Double | 234.1 | 213.3 | 204.8 | 201.7 | 201.6 | 203.8 | 207.5 | 212.7 | 219.0 | 226.5 |

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km)


Table 83 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D2

| IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient $=\mathbf{4 \%}$; Curvature $=$ Straight $(\mathbf{2 0}$ degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Speed $(\mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h r})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| Small Car | 28.2 | 25.0 | 23.6 | 22.9 | 22.7 | 22.8 | 23.0 | 23.4 | 24.0 | 24.7 |
| Medium Car | 39.3 | 34.3 | 32.0 | 30.8 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 30.1 | 30.3 | 30.8 | 31.3 |
| Large Car | 52.7 | 45.8 | 42.5 | 40.7 | 39.8 | 39.3 | 39.1 | 39.2 | 39.5 | 40.0 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 41.8 | 37.4 | 35.3 | 34.3 | 33.8 | 33.6 | 33.7 | 34.0 | 34.5 | 35.1 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 44.2 | 40.0 | 38.1 | 37.2 | 36.8 | 36.8 | 37.1 | 37.5 | 38.2 | 38.9 |
| Light Rigid | 54.6 | 50.2 | 48.4 | 47.8 | 47.9 | 48.5 | 49.4 | 50.6 | 52.1 | 53.9 |
| Medium Rigid | 74.4 | 66.9 | 63.5 | 61.8 | 61.0 | 60.9 | 61.1 | 61.7 | 62.6 | 63.7 |
| Heavy Rigid | 107.3 | 96.1 | 90.9 | 88.1 | 86.6 | 86.0 | 85.9 | 86.2 | 86.9 | 87.9 |
| Heavy Bus | 147.7 | 133.2 | 125.7 | 121.0 | 117.5 | 114.7 | 112.3 | 110.2 | 108.1 | 106.2 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 144.9 | 130.1 | 123.7 | 120.8 | 119.9 | 120.4 | 121.8 | 124.0 | 126.9 | 130.3 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 161.7 | 146.6 | 139.8 | 136.5 | 135.3 | 135.3 | 136.2 | 137.9 | 140.1 | 143.0 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 173.9 | 158.4 | 151.3 | 147.7 | 146.1 | 145.7 | 146.3 | 147.5 | 149.3 | 151.5 |
| Rigid +5 Axle Dog | 201.0 | 186.5 | 180.0 | 176.8 | 175.5 | 175.4 | 176.1 | 177.5 | 179.5 | 182.0 |
| B-Double | 219.1 | 202.5 | 194.7 | 190.4 | 188.1 | 187.0 | 186.7 | 187.0 | 187.8 | 189.0 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 220.5 | 204.3 | 196.8 | 193.0 | 191.2 | 190.6 | 191.0 | 192.0 | 193.6 | 195.6 |
| A-Double | 272.0 | 252.7 | 243.0 | 237.2 | 233.3 | 230.6 | 228.5 | 226.9 | 225.6 | 224.5 |
| B Triple | 306.8 | 283.6 | 271.6 | 264.0 | 258.5 | 254.2 | 250.4 | 247.1 | 243.9 | 240.9 |
| A B Combination | 319.2 | 298.0 | 287.1 | 280.3 | 275.4 | 271.5 | 268.3 | 265.4 | 262.8 | 260.3 |
| A-Triple | 366.8 | 342.6 | 330.0 | 322.0 | 316.1 | 311.4 | 307.4 | 303.7 | 300.2 | 296.9 |
| Double B-Double | 373.0 | 349.1 | 336.9 | 329.2 | 323.7 | 319.4 | 315.9 | 312.7 | 309.8 | 307.1 |

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 4\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees / km)

## Vehicle class

## Small Car

Medium Car
Large Car
Courier Van-Utility
Courier Van-Utility
Light Rigid
Medium Rigid
Heavy Rigid
Heavy Bus
Artic 4 Axle
Artic 5 Axle
Artic 6 Axle
Artic 6 Axle
Rigid +5 Axle Dog
B-Double
Twin steer+5 Axle Dog
A-Double
B Triple
A B Combination
A-Triple

Double B-Double | Speed (km/hr) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 30 |

| Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| 28.2 | 25.0 | 23.6 | 23.0 | 22.7 | 22.8 | 23.0 | 23.4 | 24.0 | 24.6 |
| 39.2 | 34.3 | 32.0 | 30.8 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 30.1 | 30.3 | 30.7 | 31.3 | | 39.2 | 34.3 | 32.0 | 30.8 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 30.1 | 30.3 | 30.7 | 31.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | 52.6 | 45.8 | 42.6 | 40.8 | 39.8 | 39.3 | 39.1 | 39.2 | 39.4 | 39.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 52.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 41.8 | 37.3 | 35.3 | 34.3 | 33.8 | 33.6 | 33.7 | 34.0 | 34.4 | 35.0 | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44.2 | 40.0 | 38.1 | 37.2 | 36.9 | 36.9 | 37.2 | 37.7 | 38.3 | 39.1 | 44.1 |
| 54.4 | 50.2 | 48.5 | 47.8 | 47.9 | 48.3 | 49.1 | 50.2 | 51.5 | 53.1 | 54.3 |


$\square$ | 161.5 | 147.2 | 140.7 | 137.3 | 135.8 | 135.3 | 135.7 | 136.7 | 138.1 | 140.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 173.7 | 159.1 | 152.2 | 148.6 | 146.8 | 146.0 | 146.0 | 146.6 | 147.7 | 149.1 |
| 201.1 | 187.1 | 180.8 | 177.8 | 176.6 | 176.5 | 177.3 | 18.7 | 18.7 | 183.2 | |  | 201.1 | 187.1 | 180.8 | 177.8 | 176.6 | 176.5 | 177.3 | 178.7 | 180.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 219.3 | 203.0 | 195.4 | 191.5 | 189.5 | 188.7 | 188.7 | 189.5 | 190.7 | 192.4 | | 2190.3 | 203.0 | 195.4 | 191.5 | 189.5 | 188.7 | 188.7 | 189.5 | 190.7 | 192.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 220.6 | 204.9 | 197.7 | 194.1 | 192.5 | 192.1 | 192.6 | 193.8 | 195.6 | 197.9 |

 \begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline 307.0 \& 284.2 \& 272.6 \& 265.3 \& 260.2 \& 256.1 \& 252.8 \& 249.9 \& 247.2 <br>
\hline 319.3 \& 298.8 \& 288.2 \& 281.7 \& 277.0 \& 273.4 \& 270.3 \& 267.7 \& 265.3 <br>
263.0 <br>
\hline

 

\hline 366.9 \& 343.5 \& 331.3 \& 323.4 \& 317.7 \& 313.0 \& 308.9 \& 305.2 \& 301.6 \& 298.1 <br>
\hline 373.1 \& 350.0 \& 338.2 \& 330.8 \& 325.5 \& 321.4 \& 317.9 \& 314.8 \& 312.0 \& 309.4
\end{tabular}

| 16.4 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.0 | 161 |

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 4\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km)

 | Speed (km/hr) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 30 |
| 20 | 25.0 |

| Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road <br> conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) | $0 \%$ to $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ to $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ to $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ to $8 \%$ |  |
| Curvature (Terrain <br> type) | Straight (0-99'/km) |  | Curvy (100-299'/km) | Very curvy <br> $\left(300^{\prime}+/ k m\right)$ |  |
| Roughness (IRI) | $1-2$ (Very <br> good) | $3-4$ (Good) | $5-6$ (Fair) | $7-8$ (Poor) |  |
| Roughness (NRM) | $0-49$ | $50-99$ | $100-149$ | $150-199$ |  |


\section*{| 39.0 |
| :--- |
| 52.4 |
| 41.7 |
| 44.1 |
| 54.3 |}


| 54.3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 74. |
| 107.0 |


| 147 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28.1 | 25.0 | 23.7 | 23.0 | 22.8 | 22.9 | 23.1 | 23.5 | 24.0 | 24.6 |
| 39.0 | 34.3 | 32.1 | 30.9 | 30.3 | 30.1 | 30.1 | 30.3 | 30.7 | 31.1 |
| 52.4 | 45.8 | 42.7 | 40.9 | 39.9 | 39.4 | 39.2 | 39.1 | 39.3 | 39.6 |
| 41.7 | 37.3 | 35.4 | 34.4 | 34.0 | 33.9 | 34.1 | 34.5 | 35.0 | 35.7 |
| 44.1 | 39.9 | 38.1 | 37.4 | 37.2 | 37.3 | 37.8 | 38.5 | 39.4 | 40.5 |
| 54.3 | 50.3 | 48.6 | 48.0 | 48.0 | 48.4 | 49.2 | 50.2 | 51.4 | 52.8 |
| 74.1 | 67.3 | 64.2 | 62.6 | 62.0 | 61.9 | 62.1 | 62.7 | 63.5 | 64.6 |
| 107.0 | 96.6 | 91.7 | 89.1 | 87.7 | 87.1 | 87.1 | 87.4 | 88.1 | 89.0 |
| 147.7 | 133.3 | 126.1 | 121.6 | 118.6 | 116.4 | 114.6 | 113.2 | 111.9 | 110.8 |
| 144.3 | 131.3 | 125.4 | 122.6 | 121.4 | 121.2 | 121.8 | 123.1 | 124.8 | 127.0 |
| 161.1 | 147.9 | 141.8 | 138.5 | 136.8 | 136.1 | 136.0 | 136.5 | 137.4 | 138.6 |
| 173.4 | 159.8 | 153.3 | 149.9 | 148.0 | 147.1 | 146.9 | 147.1 | 147.8 | 148.8 |
| 201.1 | 187.6 | 181.9 | 179.4 | 178.8 | 179.5 | 181.0 | 183.4 | 186.4 | 190.0 |
| 219.3 | 203.6 | 196.5 | 193.1 | 191.8 | 191.8 | 192.7 | 194.4 | 196.7 | 199.6 |
| 220.6 | 205.5 | 198.8 | 195.8 | 194.8 | 195.0 | 196.3 | 198.3 | 201.0 | 204.3 |
| 272.2 | 253.8 | 245.1 | 240.5 | 238.1 | 237.1 | 237.0 | 237.5 | 238.7 | 240.4 |
| 306.9 | 284.8 | 273.8 | 267.2 | 262.9 | 259.8 | 257.5 | 255.8 | 254.5 | 253.4 |
| 319.2 | 299.5 | 289.5 | 283.5 | 279.5 | 276.5 | 274.2 | 272.4 | 270.9 | 269.5 |
| 366.8 | 344.4 | 332.8 | 325.4 | 319.9 | 315.5 | 311.7 | 308.2 | 304.9 | 301.7 |
| 372.9 | 350.9 | 339.7 | 332.8 | 327.9 | 324.1 | 321.1 | 318.4 | 316.0 | 313.8 |

Table 84 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D3

| IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient $=\mathbf{6 \%}$; Curvature $=$ Straight $(\mathbf{2 0}$ degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Speed $(\mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h r})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| Small Car | 28.7 | 25.5 | 24.1 | 23.4 | 23.1 | 23.2 | 23.4 | 23.7 | 24.2 | 24.8 |
| Medium Car | 40.0 | 35.0 | 32.6 | 31.4 | 30.8 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.7 | 31.0 | 31.5 |
| Large Car | 53.3 | 46.5 | 43.2 | 41.4 | 40.4 | 39.9 | 39.7 | 39.7 | 39.9 | 40.3 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 43.7 | 39.6 | 37.6 | 36.4 | 35.7 | 35.3 | 35.0 | 34.9 | 34.8 | 34.8 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 46.2 | 41.8 | 39.8 | 38.8 | 38.2 | 38.1 | 38.1 | 38.4 | 38.8 | 39.3 |
| Light Rigid | 58.5 | 54.2 | 52.3 | 51.4 | 51.2 | 51.3 | 51.7 | 52.4 | 53.3 | 54.3 |
| Medium Rigid | 82.1 | 74.5 | 71.0 | 69.2 | 68.4 | 68.1 | 68.2 | 68.7 | 69.4 | 70.4 |
| Heavy Rigid | 128.6 | 117.2 | 111.7 | 108.4 | 106.4 | 105.1 | 104.3 | 103.8 | 103.6 | 103.5 |
| Heavy Bus | 163.7 | 149.8 | 142.1 | 136.8 | 132.5 | 128.6 | 124.9 | 121.3 | 117.5 | 113.6 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 174.6 | 159.7 | 152.4 | 148.3 | 145.8 | 144.2 | 143.3 | 142.9 | 142.8 | 143.0 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 196.4 | 181.0 | 173.7 | 169.8 | 167.5 | 166.3 | 165.9 | 165.9 | 166.4 | 167.3 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 212.1 | 196.3 | 188.7 | 184.5 | 182.0 | 180.7 | 180.0 | 179.9 | 180.2 | 180.9 |
| Rigid +5 Axle Dog | 253.0 | 237.5 | 230.2 | 226.3 | 224.2 | 223.3 | 223.1 | 223.5 | 224.4 | 225.7 |
| B-Double | 274.7 | 256.8 | 248.2 | 243.2 | 240.1 | 238.2 | 237.1 | 236.4 | 236.2 | 236.3 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 277.7 | 260.4 | 252.2 | 247.8 | 245.3 | 244.0 | 243.6 | 243.7 | 244.4 | 245.5 |
| A-Double | 343.4 | 321.6 | 310.6 | 303.8 | 299.2 | 295.8 | 293.1 | 290.9 | 289.0 | 287.4 |
| B Triple | 381.4 | 355.1 | 341.4 | 332.5 | 325.9 | 320.6 | 315.8 | 311.5 | 307.2 | 303.1 |
| A B Combination | 406.6 | 381.6 | 370.3 | 364.7 | 362.3 | 361.8 | 362.8 | 365.0 | 368.1 | 372.0 |
| A-Triple | 468.9 | 440.8 | 429.3 | 425.3 | 425.5 | 428.7 | 434.1 | 441.5 | 450.5 | 461.1 |
| Double B-Double | 478.8 | 451.4 | 440.9 | 437.9 | 439.5 | 444.3 | 451.6 | 461.0 | 472.4 | 485.5 |


| Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road <br> conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) $0 \%$ to $2 \%$ $2 \%$ to $4 \%$ $4 \%$ to $6 \%$ $6 \%$ to $8 \%$  <br> Curvature (Terrain <br> type) Straight (0-99'/km)   Curvy (100-299'/km) Very curvy <br> $\left(300^{\prime}+/ k m\right)$ <br> Roughness (IRI) $1-2$ (Very <br> good) $3-4$ (Good) $5-6$ (Fair) $7-8$ (Poor)  <br> Roughness (NRM) $0-49$ $50-99$ $100-149$ $150-199$  |  |  |  |  |  |

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees / km)

## Vehicle class

## Small Car

Medium Car
Large Car
Courier Van-Utility
Courier Van-Utility
Light Rigid
Medium Rigid
Heavy Rigid
Heavy Bus
Artic 4 Axle
Artic 5 Axle
Artic 6 Axle
Rigid + 5 Axle Dog
B-Double
Twin steer+5 Axle Dog
A-Double
B Triple
A B Combination
A-Triple
A-Triple

| Speed (km/hr) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 30 |


| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28.7 | 25.5 | 24.1 | 23.4 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.3 | 23.7 | 24.2 | 24.8 | | 28.7 | 25.5 | 24.1 | 23.4 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.3 | 23.7 | 24.2 | 24.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39.9 | 35.0 | 32.7 | 31.4 | 30.8 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30. | 31.0 | 314 | | 39.9 | 35.0 | 32.7 | 31.4 | 30.8 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.7 | 31.0 | 31.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 53.2 | 46.5 | 432 | 41.5 | 40.4 | 39.9 | 39. | 39.6 | 39.8 | 40.1 | | 43.6 | 39.6 | 37.6 | 36.5 | 35.7 | 35.3 | 35.0 | 34.8 | 34.7 | 34.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 46.1 | 41.8 | 39.8 | 38.8 | 38.3 | 38.1 | 38.2 | 38.4 | 38.8 | 39.3 |
| 58.4 | 54.2 | 52.4 | 51.5 | 51.2 | 51.2 | 51.5 | 52.0 | 52.7 | 53.6 | | 58.4 | 54.2 | 52.4 | 51.5 | 51.2 | 51.2 | 51.5 | 52.0 | 52.7 | 53.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 82.0 | 74.6 | 71.2 | 69.4 | 68.5 | 68.1 | 68.2 | 68.5 | 69.0 | 69.8 | | 82.0 | 74.6 | 71.2 | 69.4 | 68.5 | 68.1 | 68.2 | 68.5 | 69.0 | 69.8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 128.7 | 117.3 | 111.8 | 108.7 | 106.8 | 105.6 | 104.9 | 104.6 | 104.5 | 104.6 |
| 163.7 | 149.7 | 142.1 | 13.7 | 132.4 | 128.5 | 12.8 | 121.1 | 117.4 | 113.4 | | 163.7 | 149.7 | 142.1 | 136.7 | 132.4 | 128.5 | 124.8 | 121.1 | 117.4 | 113.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 174.9 | 160.6 | 153.7 | 149.9 | 147.7 | 146.4 | 145.8 | 145.7 | 145.9 | 146.5 | | 196.8 | 181.8 | 174.9 | 171.3 | 169.6 | 168.9 | 169.1 | 169.8 | 171.1 | 172.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 212.6 | 197.1 | 189.8 | 186.1 | 184.2 | 183.4 | 183.5 | 184. | 185.5 | 187.1 | | 212.6 | 197.1 | 189.8 | 186.1 | 184.2 | 183.4 | 183.5 | 184.2 | 185.5 | 187.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 253.3 | 238.4 | 231.6 | 228.2 | 226.6 | 226.2 | 226.6 | 227.7 | 229.3 | 231.3 | |  | 253.3 | 238.4 | 231.6 | 228.2 | 226.6 | 226.2 | 226.6 | 227.7 | 229.3 | 231.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 278.1 | 257.8 | 249.6 | 245.1 | 242.5 | 241.0 | 240.4 | 240.3 | 240.7 | 241.5 |  | |  | 278.1 | 261.5 | 253.8 | 249.8 | 247.8 | 247.1 | 247.3 | 248.2 | 249.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 243.7 | 322.8 | 312.4 | 306.1 | 3019 | 298.9 | 296.7 | 29.9 | 293.5 | | 343.7 | 322.8 | 312.4 | 306.1 | 301.9 | 298.9 | 296.7 | 294.9 | 293.5 | 292.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 381.6 | 356.4 | 3432 | 334.7 | 328.4 | 323. | 318.7 | 31.5 | 310.5 | 306. | | 381.6 | 356.4 | 343.2 | 334.7 | 328.4 | 323.2 | 318.7 | 314.5 | 310.5 | 306.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 407.2 | 383.3 | 372.8 | 368.0 | 366.5 | 367.1 | 369.3 | 372.7 | 377.2 | 382.6 | $469.7 ~ 4442.9 ~ 432.7 ~ 429.9 ~ 431.6 ~ 436.4 ~ 443.7 ~ 453.1 ~ 464.4 ~ 477.5$

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) \begin{tabular}{|l|l|}

\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{| Speed (km/hr) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 30 |
| 28.6 |  |} <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

| 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23.5 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 23.4 |
| 31.5 | 30.9 | 30.6 | 30.6 |
| 41.6 | 40.6 | 40.0 | 39.7 |
| 36.6 | 35.9 | 35.4 | 35.2 |
| 38.9 | 38.5 | 38.4 | 38.6 |
| 51.7 | 51.3 | 51.3 | 51.5 |
| 69.9 | 69.0 | 68.6 | 68.5 |
| 109.6 | 108.1 | 107.4 | 107.3 |
| 137.2 | 133.1 | 129.5 | 126.2 |
| 151.7 | 150.0 | 149.2 | 149.2 |
| 173.1 | 172.0 | 172.1 | 173.0 |
| 187.9 | 186.7 | 186.8 | 187.9 |
| 230.4 | 229.7 | 230.2 | 231.8 |
| 247.3 | 245.5 | 244.9 | 245.3 |
| 252.1 | 251.0 | 251.4 | 252.8 |
| 308.4 | 304.7 | 302.3 | 300.5 |
| 336.9 | 330.8 | 325.8 | 321.4 |
| 371.6 | 371.3 | 373.1 | 376.7 |
| 435.0 | 438.5 | 445.3 | 454.9 |
| 448.6 | 454.0 | 463.2 | 475.4 |



| 90 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 23.7 | 24.2 |
| 30.7 | 31.0 |
| 39.7 | 39.8 |
| 35.0 | 34.9 |
| 39.0 | 39.5 |
| 51.8 | 52.3 |
| 68.8 | 69.2 |
| 107.6 | 108.3 |
| 122.9 | 119.5 |
| 149.8 | 150.7 |
| 174.7 | 177.0 |
| 189.7 | 192.1 |
| 234.1 | 237.1 |
| 246.4 | 248.1 |
| 255.0 | 257.9 |
| 299.3 | 298.5 |
| 317.2 | 313.2 |
| 381.7 | 388.0 |
| 466.9 | 481.1 |


| 100 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24.2 | 24 |
| 31.0 | 31 |
| 39.8 | 40 |
| 34.9 | 34 |
| 39.5 | 40 |
| 52.3 | 52 |
| 69.2 | 69 |
| 108.3 | 10 |
| 119.5 | 1 |
| 150.7 | 15 |
| 177.0 | 17 |
| 192.1 | 19 |
| 237.1 | 24 |
| 248.1 | 25 |
| 257.9 | 26 |
| 298.5 | 29 |
| 313.2 | 30 |
| 388.0 | 39 |
| 481.1 | 497 |

Table 85 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D4

| IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient $=\mathbf{8 \%}$; Curvature $=$ Straight $(\mathbf{2 0}$ degrees $/ \mathbf{k m})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Speed $(\mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h r})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| Small Car | 29.8 | 26.6 | 25.1 | 24.4 | 24.0 | 23.9 | 24.0 | 24.2 | 24.6 | 25.0 |
| Medium Car | 41.3 | 36.4 | 34.0 | 32.7 | 32.0 | 31.6 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 31.5 | 31.7 |
| Large Car | 54.9 | 48.0 | 44.7 | 42.8 | 41.7 | 41.0 | 40.7 | 40.5 | 40.5 | 40.7 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 45.8 | 42.0 | 40.0 | 38.8 | 38.0 | 37.3 | 36.8 | 36.3 | 35.9 | 35.5 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 48.4 | 44.3 | 42.3 | 41.2 | 40.5 | 40.1 | 39.8 | 39.7 | 39.6 | 39.7 |
| Light Rigid | 63.2 | 58.9 | 56.9 | 55.8 | 55.3 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 55.2 | 55.5 | 55.9 |
| Medium Rigid | 90.3 | 82.9 | 79.4 | 77.5 | 76.4 | 75.9 | 75.7 | 75.7 | 76.0 | 76.4 |
| Heavy Rigid | 153.1 | 140.9 | 134.8 | 131.2 | 128.7 | 127.0 | 125.7 | 124.7 | 123.8 | 123.1 |
| Heavy Bus | 181.6 | 167.7 | 159.6 | 153.4 | 148.0 | 142.7 | 137.4 | 131.9 | 126.0 | 119.7 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 208.7 | 191.8 | 183.6 | 178.7 | 175.7 | 173.7 | 172.4 | 171.6 | 171.1 | 170.8 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 235.2 | 218.5 | 210.4 | 205.8 | 203.1 | 201.5 | 200.6 | 200.2 | 200.3 | 200.7 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 255.1 | 237.8 | 229.4 | 224.7 | 221.7 | 219.9 | 218.8 | 218.3 | 218.1 | 218.2 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 311.4 | 293.8 | 285.8 | 281.8 | 280.1 | 279.9 | 280.6 | 282.2 | 284.4 | 287.2 |
| B-Double | 336.7 | 316.5 | 306.9 | 301.8 | 299.1 | 297.8 | 297.5 | 298.0 | 299.0 | 300.6 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 342.3 | 322.7 | 313.7 | 309.1 | 306.9 | 306.2 | 306.5 | 307.7 | 309.6 | 312.1 |
| A-Double | 422.9 | 397.9 | 387.3 | 382.9 | 382.0 | 383.5 | 386.8 | 391.6 | 397.6 | 404.8 |
| B Triple | 463.8 | 434.0 | 421.1 | 415.3 | 413.6 | 414.5 | 417.5 | 422.0 | 427.9 | 435.0 |
| A B Combination | 504.0 | 478.3 | 471.2 | 473.2 | 480.9 | 493.0 | 508.8 | 527.9 | 550.2 | 575.4 |
| A-Triple | 584.3 | 558.0 | 554.9 | 563.7 | 580.7 | 604.3 | 633.6 | 668.3 | 708.0 | 752.6 |
| Double B-Double | 599.0 | 574.0 | 572.4 | 583.0 | 602.1 | 628.1 | 660.3 | 698.2 | 741.5 | 790.1 |


| Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road <br> conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) | $0 \%$ to $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ to $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ to $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ to $8 \%$ |  |
| Curvature (Terrain <br> type) | Straight (0-99'/km) |  |  | Curvy (100-299'/km) | Very curvy <br> $\left(300^{\prime}+/ k m\right)$ |
| Roughness (IRI) | $1-2$ (Very <br> good) | $3-4$ (Good) | $5-6$ (Fair) | $7-8$ (Poor) |  |
| Roughness (NRM) | $0-49$ | $50-99$ | $100-149$ | $150-199$ |  |

## IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 8\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

## Vehicle class $\quad$ Speed (km/hr)

Small Car Medium Car Large Car Courier Van-Utility 4WD Mid-Size Petrol Light Rigid Medium Rigid Heavy Rigid Heavy Rigid
Heavy Bus Heavy Bus Artic 4 Axle
Artic 5 Axle Artic 5 Axle Artic 6 Axle
Rigid +5 Axle Dog B-Double
Twin steer+5 Axle Dog A-Double B Triple A B Combination
A-Triple
Double B-Double

| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29.7 | 26.6 | 25.1 | 24.4 | 24.0 | 23.9 | 24.0 | 24.2 | 24.5 | 2.8 |

.

IRI = 1, NRM = 25; Gradient = 8\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) Speed (km/hr)

110
24.6
24.6
31.1
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathbf{2 0} & \mathbf{3 0} & \mathbf{4 0} & \mathbf{5 0} & \mathbf{6 0} \\ 29.6 & 26.6 & 25.2 & 24.5 & 24.1 \\ 41.1 & 36.4 & 34.1 & 32.8 & 32.1 \\ 54.6 & 48.1 & 44.8 & 43.0 & 41.8\end{array}$
45.1
54.6
45.8
45.8
$45.8 \quad 42.0$

Table 86 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D5

| IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient $=\mathbf{0} \%$; Curvature $=$ Straight $(\mathbf{2 0}$ degrees $/ \mathbf{k m})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Speed $(\mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h r})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| Small Car | 29.5 | 26.2 | 24.8 | 24.2 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.3 | 24.7 | 25.3 | 26.0 |
| Medium Car | 40.8 | 35.8 | 33.5 | 32.3 | 31.7 | 31.5 | 31.6 | 31.9 | 32.4 | 33.1 |
| Large Car | 54.4 | 47.5 | 44.2 | 42.5 | 41.5 | 41.1 | 40.9 | 41.1 | 41.4 | 41.9 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 43.5 | 39.1 | 37.2 | 36.3 | 35.9 | 36.0 | 36.3 | 36.8 | 37.5 | 38.3 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 46.6 | 42.3 | 40.5 | 39.6 | 39.3 | 39.4 | 39.7 | 40.3 | 41.0 | 41.9 |
| Light Rigid | 55.6 | 51.8 | 50.4 | 50.0 | 50.4 | 51.3 | 52.5 | 54.0 | 55.9 | 58.1 |
| Medium Rigid | 71.4 | 64.3 | 61.3 | 60.1 | 59.8 | 60.2 | 61.1 | 62.4 | 64.1 | 66.1 |
| Heavy Rigid | 93.5 | 82.8 | 78.5 | 77.0 | 77.2 | 78.5 | 80.8 | 83.8 | 87.5 | 91.8 |
| Heavy Bus | 143.4 | 127.9 | 120.7 | 117.0 | 115.1 | 114.4 | 114.5 | 115.2 | 116.5 | 118.1 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 124.8 | 112.3 | 107.5 | 106.2 | 107.0 | 109.2 | 112.5 | 116.8 | 122.1 | 128.1 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 137.0 | 123.5 | 118.1 | 116.4 | 116.7 | 118.6 | 121.6 | 125.7 | 130.5 | 136.2 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 148.0 | 133.7 | 128.0 | 126.0 | 126.2 | 128.0 | 131.0 | 134.9 | 139.7 | 145.4 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 155.5 | 142.6 | 137.6 | 136.2 | 136.9 | 139.0 | 142.3 | 146.5 | 151.7 | 157.7 |
| B-Double | 174.9 | 159.5 | 153.1 | 150.8 | 150.9 | 152.5 | 155.4 | 159.3 | 164.1 | 169.7 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 172.6 | 157.9 | 151.9 | 149.9 | 150.1 | 151.9 | 154.8 | 158.8 | 163.7 | 169.5 |
| A-Double | 212.4 | 194.1 | 186.4 | 183.3 | 182.7 | 183.8 | 186.3 | 189.9 | 194.4 | 199.7 |
| B Triple | 248.7 | 226.2 | 216.3 | 211.8 | 210.1 | 210.5 | 212.2 | 215.1 | 219.0 | 223.7 |
| A B Combination | 240.2 | 221.0 | 212.8 | 209.4 | 208.7 | 209.8 | 212.2 | 215.8 | 220.3 | 225.7 |
| A-Triple | 272.0 | 250.6 | 241.3 | 237.3 | 236.1 | 236.9 | 239.1 | 242.5 | 246.9 | 252.2 |
| Double B-Double | 273.5 | 252.9 | 244.0 | 240.2 | 239.3 | 240.2 | 242.6 | 246.2 | 250.8 | 256.2 |

IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

## Vehicle class

## Small Car

Medium Car
Large Car
Courier Van-Utility
Courier Van-Utility
Light Rigid
Medium Rigid
Heavy Rigid
Heavy Bus
Artic 4 Axle
Artic 5 Axle
Artic 6 Axle
Rigid + 5 Axle Dog
B-Double
Twin steer+5 Axle Dog
A-Double
B Triple
A B Combination
A-Triple

A-Triple | Speed (km/hr) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 30 |

| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 29.4 | 26.3 | 24.9 | 24 | 24.0 | 24.1 | 24.3 | 24 | 25 | 20.7 |

IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient $=\mathbf{0 \%}$; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) Speed (km/hr)

| Speed $(\mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h r})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| 29.3 | 26.3 | 24.9 | 24.3 | 24.1 | 24.2 | 24.4 | 24.8 | 25.3 | 26.0 |
| 40.6 | 35.8 | 33.7 | 32.5 | 32.0 | 31.7 | 31.8 | 32.0 | 32.4 | 33.0 |
| 54.2 | 47.6 | 44.5 | 42.8 | 41.8 | 41.3 | 41.1 | 41.2 | 41.4 | 41.8 |
| 43.5 | 39.2 | 37.3 | 36.5 | 36.4 | 36.6 | 37.1 | 37.8 | 38.8 | 39.9 |
| 46.5 | 42.4 | 40.6 | 39.9 | 39.7 | 40.0 | 40.6 | 41.5 | 42.5 | 43.8 |
| 55.6 | 51.8 | 50.5 | 50.3 | 50.8 | 51.8 | 53.2 | 55.0 | 57.1 | 59.4 |
| 71.8 | 64.4 | 61.7 | 61.2 | 62.0 | 63.7 | 66.1 | 69.2 | 72.9 | 77.2 |
| 94.1 | 82.8 | 79.1 | 78.9 | 80.9 | 84.4 | 89.3 | 95.4 | 102.5 | 110.6 |
| 143.8 | 127.9 | 121.3 | 118.6 | 118.3 | 119.6 | 122.0 | 125.5 | 129.7 | 134.8 |
| 125.3 | 112.8 | 109.2 | 110.0 | 113.4 | 118.9 | 126.2 | 135.0 | 145.3 | 156.9 |
| 137.0 | 123.8 | 119.4 | 119.1 | 121.4 | 125.5 | 131.2 | 138.2 | 146.5 | 155.9 |
| 148.0 | 134.1 | 129.3 | 128.9 | 131.1 | 135.3 | 141.0 | 148.2 | 156.6 | 166.2 |
| 156.0 | 142.9 | 139.3 | 140.3 | 144.2 | 150.3 | 158.3 | 167.9 | 179.2 | 191.9 |
| 175.3 | 159.8 | 154.9 | 155.1 | 158.4 | 164.1 | 171.7 | 181.1 | 192.1 | 204.6 |
| 173.1 | 158.2 | 153.8 | 154.3 | 158.0 | 164.1 | 172.2 | 182.0 | 193.5 | 206.6 |
| 213.1 | 194.4 | 188.5 | 188.7 | 192.6 | 199.3 | 208.3 | 219.4 | 232.5 | 247.3 |
| 249.2 | 226.6 | 218.6 | 217.3 | 220.2 | 226.1 | 234.5 | 244.9 | 257.3 | 271.5 |
| 241.4 | 221.3 | 215.4 | 216.3 | 221.4 | 229.8 | 240.9 | 254.4 | 270.1 | 288.0 |
| 273.4 | 251.1 | 244.6 | 245.5 | 251.2 | 260.5 | 272.8 | 287.8 | 305.3 | 325.1 |
| 275.1 | 253.4 | 247.3 | 248.7 | 254.9 | 264.8 | 277.7 | 293.3 | 311.6 | 332.2 |

Table 87 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D6

## IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 4\%; Curvature = Straight (20 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 29.7 | 26.5 | 25.1 | 24.4 | 24.2 | 24.3 | 24.5 | 24.9 | 25.5 | 26.2 |
| Medium Car | 41.2 | 36.2 | 33.9 | 32.7 | 32.1 | 31.9 | 32.0 | 32.2 | 32.7 | 33.2 |
| Large Car | 54.9 | 48.0 | 44.7 | 43.0 | 42.0 | 41.5 | 41.3 | 41.4 | 41.7 | 42.2 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 45.2 | 40.7 | 38.6 | 37.6 | 37.1 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 37.4 | 37.8 | 38.4 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 47.4 | 43.2 | 41.3 | 40.4 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.3 | 40.8 | 41.4 | 42.2 |
| Light Rigid | 59.2 | 54.8 | 53.1 | 52.5 | 52.6 | 53.1 | 54.0 | 55.3 | 56.8 | 58.5 |
| Medium Rigid | 79.2 | 71.7 | 68.3 | 66.6 | 65.8 | 65.7 | 65.9 | 66.5 | 67.4 | 68.5 |
| Heavy Rigid | 118.4 | 107.3 | 102.0 | 99.3 | 97.8 | 97.1 | 97.0 | 97.4 | 98.1 | 99.1 |
| Heavy Bus | 162.8 | 148.3 | 140.8 | 136.1 | 132.6 | 129.8 | 127.5 | 125.3 | 123.3 | 121.3 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 161.4 | 146.7 | 140.3 | 137.4 | 136.5 | 136.9 | 138.3 | 140.5 | 143.4 | 146.9 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 179.7 | 164.5 | 157.7 | 154.5 | 153.2 | 153.2 | 154.1 | 155.8 | 158.1 | 160.9 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 193.6 | 178.0 | 170.9 | 167.4 | 165.8 | 165.4 | 166.0 | 167.2 | 169.0 | 171.2 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 220.5 | 206.0 | 199.5 | 196.3 | 195.0 | 194.9 | 195.6 | 197.0 | 199.0 | 201.5 |
| B-Double | 243.3 | 226.7 | 218.9 | 214.6 | 212.3 | 211.2 | 210.9 | 211.2 | 212.0 | 213.3 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 243.3 | 227.1 | 219.6 | 215.8 | 214.0 | 213.5 | 213.8 | 214.8 | 216.4 | 218.4 |
| A-Double | 302.7 | 283.3 | 273.7 | 267.9 | 264.0 | 261.3 | 259.2 | 257.6 | 256.3 | 255.2 |
| B Triple | 343.3 | 320.1 | 308.1 | 300.5 | 295.0 | 290.7 | 286.9 | 283.6 | 280.4 | 277.3 |
| A B Combination | 354.0 | 332.8 | 322.0 | 315.1 | 310.2 | 306.4 | 303.1 | 300.3 | 297.6 | 295.1 |
| A-Triple | 406.4 | 382.1 | 369.5 | 361.5 | 355.7 | 351.0 | 346.9 | 343.3 | 339.8 | 336.4 |
| Double B-Double | 412.8 | 388.9 | 376.7 | 369.0 | 363.5 | 359.2 | 355.7 | 352.5 | 349.6 | 346. |

Double B-Double

## IRI $=3$, NRM $=78$; Gradient $=4 \%$; Curvature $=$ Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

| Vehicle class | Speed $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 29.7 | 26.5 | 25.1 | 24.5 | 24.3 | 24.3 | 24.5 | 24.9 | 25.5 | 26.1 |
| Medium Car | 41.1 | 36.2 | 33.9 | 32.7 | 32.1 | 31.9 | 32.0 | 32.2 | 32.6 | 33.2 |
| Large Car | 54.9 | 48.1 | 44.8 | 43.1 | 42.1 | 41.6 | 41.4 | 41.4 | 41.7 | 42.1 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 45.1 | 40.7 | 38.7 | 37.6 | 37.2 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 37.4 | 37.8 | 38.4 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 47.4 | 43.2 | 41.3 | 40.5 | 40.1 | 40.1 | 40.4 | 40.9 | 41.6 | 42.4 |
| Light Rigid | 59.1 | 54.9 | 53.2 | 52.5 | 52.6 | 53.0 | 53.8 | 54.9 | 56.2 | 57.8 |
| Medium Rigid | 79.1 | 71.9 | 68.5 | 66.8 | 66.0 | 65.8 | 66.0 | 66.4 | 67.2 | 68.1 |
| Heavy Rigid | 118.4 | 107.3 | 102.2 | 99.4 | 97.9 | 97.2 | 97.1 | 97.4 | 98.1 | 99.0 |
| Heavy Bus | 162.8 | 148.3 | 140.8 | 136.1 | 132.7 | 130.0 | 127.7 | 125.6 | 123.7 | 121.8 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 161.0 | 147.1 | 140.9 | 137.8 | 136.6 | 136.5 | 137.2 | 138.5 | 140.4 | 142.8 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 179.3 | 165.0 | 158.4 | 155.1 | 153.5 | 153.1 | 153.5 | 154.4 | 155.9 | 157.8 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 193.2 | 178.6 | 171.7 | 168.1 | 166.3 | 165.5 | 165.5 | 166.1 | 167.2 | 168.6 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 220.3 | 206.4 | 200.1 | 197.1 | 195.8 | 195.8 | 196.5 | 198.0 | 200.0 | 202.5 |
| B-Double | 243.3 | 227.0 | 219.4 | 215.4 | 213.4 | 212.6 | 212.7 | 213.4 | 214.7 | 216.4 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 243.2 | 227.4 | 220.2 | 216.6 | 215.0 | 214.6 | 215.1 | 216.3 | 218.1 | 220.4 |
| A-Double | 302.6 | 283.6 | 274.3 | 268.9 | 265.5 | 263.3 | 261.8 | 260.8 | 260.3 | 260.0 |
| B Triple | 343.2 | 320.4 | 308.8 | 301.5 | 296.3 | 292.3 | 289.0 | 286.1 | 283.4 | 280.9 |
| A B Combination | 353.8 | 333.3 | 322.8 | 316.2 | 311.5 | 307.9 | 304.9 | 302.2 | 299.8 | 297.5 |
| A-Triple | 406.2 | 382.7 | 370.5 | 362.7 | 356.9 | 352.3 | 348.2 | 344.4 | 340.8 | 337.3 |
| Double B-Double | 412.6 | 389.5 | 377.7 | 370.3 | 365.0 | 360.8 | 357.4 | 354.3 | 351.5 | 348.8 |

Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road

## conditions

| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) | $0 \%$ to 2\% |  | $2 \%$ to 4\% |  | $4 \%$ to $6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Curvature (Terrain <br> type) | Straight (0-99'/km) |  | Curvy (100-299'/km) | Very curvy <br> $\left(300^{\prime}+/ \mathrm{km}\right)$ |  |
| Roughness (IRI) | $1-2$ (Very <br> good) | $3-4$ (Good) | $5-6$ (Fair) | $7-8$ (Poor) |  |
| Roughness (NRM) | $0-49$ | $50-99$ | $100-149$ | $150-199$ |  |

IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 4\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) Speed (km/hr)

| Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |  |  |
| 29.6 | 26.6 | 25.2 | 24.6 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 24.6 | 25.0 | 25.5 | 26.2 |
| 41.0 | 36.2 | 34.0 | 32.9 | 32.3 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 32.3 | 32.6 | 33.1 |
| 54.7 | 48.1 | 45.0 | 43.3 | 42.3 | 41.7 | 41.5 | 41.5 | 41.6 | 41.9 |
| 45.1 | 40.8 | 38.8 | 37.8 | 37.4 | 37.3 | 37.5 | 37.9 | 38.5 | 39.2 |
| 47.4 | 43.2 | 41.4 | 40.7 | 40.5 | 40.6 | 41.1 | 41.8 | 42.7 | 43.8 |
| 59.0 | 55.0 | 53.3 | 52.7 | 52.7 | 53.2 | 53.9 | 54.9 | 56.1 | 57.6 |
| 78.9 | 72.1 | 69.0 | 67.5 | 66.8 | 66.7 | 67.0 | 67.5 | 68.4 | 69.4 |
| 118.1 | 107.7 | 102.8 | 100.2 | 98.9 | 98.3 | 98.2 | 98.5 | 99.2 | 100.2 |
| 162.8 | 148.4 | 141.2 | 136.7 | 133.7 | 131.5 | 129.7 | 128.3 | 127.0 | 125.9 |
| 160.7 | 147.7 | 141.8 | 138.9 | 137.7 | 137.6 | 138.2 | 139.4 | 141.2 | 143.4 |
| 178.8 | 165.6 | 159.5 | 156.2 | 154.5 | 153.8 | 153.7 | 154.2 | 155.1 | 156.3 |
| 192.8 | 179.2 | 172.8 | 169.3 | 167.4 | 166.5 | 166.3 | 166.6 | 167.2 | 168.2 |
| 220.2 | 206.8 | 201.0 | 198.5 | 197.9 | 198.6 | 200.2 | 202.5 | 205.5 | 209.1 |
| 243.1 | 227.4 | 220.3 | 217.0 | 215.6 | 215.6 | 216.5 | 218.2 | 220.6 | 223.4 |
| 243.0 | 227.9 | 221.2 | 218.2 | 217.2 | 217.4 | 218.7 | 220.7 | 223.4 | 226.7 |
| 302.5 | 284.0 | 275.4 | 270.8 | 268.4 | 267.4 | 267.2 | 267.8 | 269.0 | 270.6 |
| 343.0 | 320.9 | 309.9 | 303.3 | 299.0 | 295.9 | 293.7 | 291.9 | 290.6 | 289.5 |
| 353.6 | 333.9 | 324.0 | 318.0 | 313.9 | 311.0 | 308.7 | 306.9 | 305.3 | 304.0 |
| 405.9 | 383.6 | 372.0 | 364.5 | 359.1 | 354.7 | 350.9 | 347.4 | 344.1 | 340.9 |
| 412.3 | 390.3 | 379.1 | 372.2 | 367.3 | 363.5 | 360.5 | 357.8 | 355.4 | 353.2 |

Table 88 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D7

## IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Straight (20 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 30.2 | 27.0 | 25.6 | 24.9 | 24.6 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 25.2 | 25.7 | 26.3 |
| Medium Car | 41.8 | 36.9 | 34.5 | 33.3 | 32.7 | 32.4 | 32.4 | 32.6 | 32.9 | 33.4 |
| Large Car | 55.5 | 48.7 | 45.5 | 43.7 | 42.7 | 42.1 | 41.9 | 41.9 | 42.1 | 42.5 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 47.1 | 43.0 | 41.0 | 39.8 | 39.1 | 38.7 | 38.4 | 38.2 | 38.2 | 38.2 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 49.4 | 45.0 | 43.0 | 42.0 | 41.5 | 41.3 | 41.3 | 41.6 | 42.0 | 42.5 |
| Light Rigid | 63.2 | 58.9 | 57.0 | 56.1 | 55.9 | 56.0 | 56.5 | 57.1 | 58.0 | 59.0 |
| Medium Rigid | 86.9 | 79.3 | 75.8 | 74.1 | 73.2 | 72.9 | 73.1 | 73.5 | 74.3 | 75.2 |
| Heavy Rigid | 139.8 | 128.4 | 122.9 | 119.7 | 117.7 | 116.4 | 115.5 | 115.0 | 114.8 | 114.7 |
| Heavy Bus | 179.0 | 165.0 | 157.4 | 152.1 | 147.7 | 143.9 | 140.2 | 136.5 | 132.8 | 128.8 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 192.1 | 177.1 | 169.8 | 165.7 | 163.2 | 161.6 | 160.7 | 160.3 | 160.2 | 160.4 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 215.2 | 199.9 | 192.6 | 188.6 | 186.3 | 185.2 | 184.7 | 184.8 | 185.3 | 186.1 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 232.8 | 216.9 | 209.3 | 205.1 | 202.7 | 201.3 | 200.7 | 200.6 | 200.9 | 201.5 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 273.5 | 258.0 | 250.7 | 246.8 | 244.8 | 243.8 | 243.7 | 244.1 | 245.0 | 246.2 |
| B-Double | 299.9 | 282.1 | 273.4 | 268.5 | 265.4 | 263.5 | 262.3 | 261.7 | 261.4 | 261.5 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 301.8 | 284.5 | 276.3 | 271.8 | 269.3 | 268.0 | 267.6 | 267.8 | 268.4 | 269.5 |
| A-Double | 375.4 | 353.6 | 342.6 | 335.9 | 331.3 | 327.9 | 325.2 | 323.0 | 321.1 | 319.4 |
| B Triple | 419.2 | 393.0 | 379.2 | 370.4 | 363.8 | 358.4 | 353.7 | 349.3 | 345.1 | 341.0 |
| A B Combination | 443.2 | 418.2 | 406.8 | 401.2 | 398.8 | 398.4 | 399.4 | 401.5 | 404.6 | 408.6 |
| A-Triple | 510.5 | 482.4 | 471.0 | 466.9 | 467.1 | 470.3 | 475.7 | 483.1 | 492.1 | 502.7 |
| Double B-Double | 520.8 | 493.4 | 482.9 | 479.9 | 481.5 | 486.3 | 493.5 | 503.0 | 514.3 | 527.5 |

IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees / km)

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| Small Car | 30.2 | 27.0 | 25.6 | 24.9 | 24.7 | 24.7 | 24.9 | 25.2 | 25.7 | 26.3 |
| Medium Car | 41.8 | 36.9 | 34.6 | 33.4 | 32.7 | 32.4 | 32.4 | 32.6 | 32.9 | 33.3 |
| Large Car | 55.5 | 48.7 | 45.5 | 43.7 | 42.7 | 42.2 | 41.9 | 41.9 | 42.1 | 42.4 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 47.0 | 43.0 | 41.0 | 39.9 | 39.1 | 38.7 | 38.4 | 38.2 | 38.1 | 38.1 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 49.3 | 45.0 | 43.0 | 42.0 | 41.5 | 41.3 | 41.4 | 41.6 | 42.0 | 42.6 |
| Light Rigid | 63.1 | 59.0 | 57.1 | 56.2 | 55.9 | 55.9 | 56.2 | 56.7 | 57.4 | 58.3 |
| Medium Rigid | 86.8 | 79.4 | 76.0 | 74.2 | 73.3 | 73.0 | 73.0 | 73.3 | 73.9 | 74.6 |
| Heavy Rigid | 139.8 | 128.5 | 123.0 | 119.9 | 118.0 | 116.8 | 116.1 | 115.8 | 115.7 | 115.8 |
| Heavy Bus | 178.9 | 165.0 | 157.3 | 152.0 | 147.7 | 143.8 | 140.1 | 136.4 | 132.6 | 128.7 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 191.9 | 177.6 | 170.8 | 166.9 | 164.7 | 163.5 | 162.9 | 162.7 | 163.0 | 163.6 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 215.2 | 200.3 | 193.3 | 189.8 | 188.0 | 187.3 | 187.5 | 188.2 | 189.5 | 191.2 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 232.8 | 217.2 | 210.0 | 206.3 | 204.4 | 203.6 | 203.7 | 204.4 | 205.7 | 207.3 |
| Rigid +5 Axle Dog | 273.5 | 258.6 | 251.8 | 248.3 | 246.7 | 246.3 | 246.7 | 247.8 | 249.4 | 251.4 |
| B-Double | 299.8 | 282.6 | 274.4 | 269.9 | 267.3 | 265.9 | 265.2 | 265.2 | 265.6 | 266.4 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 301.7 | 285.0 | 277.3 | 273.4 | 271.4 | 270.7 | 270.9 | 271.8 | 273.2 | 275.2 |
| A-Double | 375.3 | 354.4 | 344.0 | 337.7 | 333.5 | 330.5 | 328.3 | 326.5 | 325.1 | 323.9 |
| B Triple | 419.1 | 393.9 | 380.7 | 372.2 | 365.8 | 360.7 | 356.2 | 352.0 | 347.9 | 343.9 |
| A B Combination | 443.2 | 419.3 | 408.9 | 404.1 | 402.6 | 403.2 | 405.4 | 408.8 | 413.3 | 418.7 |
| A-Triple | 510.8 | 484.0 | 473.8 | 471.1 | 472.7 | 477.5 | 484.8 | 494.2 | 505.5 | 518.6 |
| Double B-Double | 521.1 | 495.1 | 485.9 | 484.5 | 487.8 | 494.4 | 503.9 | 515.8 | 529.9 | 546.0 |

IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) Speed (km/hr)

| Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |  |
| 30.1 | 27.1 | 25.7 | 25.0 | 24.8 | 24.8 | 24.9 | 25.3 | 25.7 | 26.3 |
| 41.7 | 36.9 | 34.7 | 33.5 | 32.9 | 32.6 | 32.5 | 32.6 | 32.9 | 33.3 |
| 55.3 | 48.8 | 45.7 | 43.9 | 42.9 | 42.3 | 42.1 | 42.0 | 42.2 | 42.4 |
| 47.0 | 43.0 | 41.1 | 40.0 | 39.3 | 38.9 | 38.6 | 38.4 | 38.3 | 38.3 |
| 49.3 | 45.0 | 43.1 | 42.2 | 41.8 | 41.7 | 41.9 | 42.3 | 42.8 | 43.5 |
| 63.0 | 59.1 | 57.3 | 56.4 | 56.1 | 56.0 | 56.2 | 56.5 | 57.0 | 57.7 |
| 86.6 | 79.7 | 76.4 | 74.7 | 73.8 | 73.4 | 73.4 | 73.6 | 74.0 | 74.6 |
| 139.9 | 128.7 | 123.5 | 120.7 | 119.2 | 118.5 | 118.4 | 118.7 | 119.4 | 120.3 |
| 178.9 | 165.1 | 157.5 | 152.4 | 148.3 | 144.8 | 141.4 | 138.1 | 134.8 | 131.3 |
| 191.8 | 178.2 | 171.9 | 168.6 | 166.9 | 166.2 | 166.2 | 166.7 | 167.7 | 169.0 |
| 215.1 | 200.8 | 194.4 | 191.4 | 190.3 | 190.4 | 191.3 | 193.0 | 195.3 | 198.1 |
| 232.7 | 217.7 | 211.1 | 207.9 | 206.8 | 206.9 | 207.9 | 209.7 | 212.1 | 215.1 |
| 273.4 | 259.2 | 253.0 | 250.4 | 249.6 | 250.2 | 251.8 | 254.1 | 257.1 | 260.7 |
| 299.7 | 283.3 | 275.8 | 272.0 | 270.2 | 269.7 | 270.0 | 271.1 | 272.8 | 275.0 |
| 301.6 | 285.7 | 278.7 | 275.5 | 274.5 | 274.8 | 276.2 | 278.4 | 281.4 | 284.9 |
| 375.1 | 355.4 | 345.6 | 339.9 | 336.2 | 333.7 | 332.0 | 330.8 | 330.0 | 329.5 |
| 418.9 | 394.9 | 382.4 | 374.2 | 368.1 | 363.1 | 358.7 | 354.6 | 350.6 | 346.6 |
| 443.3 | 420.7 | 411.3 | 407.6 | 407.2 | 409.1 | 412.7 | 417.7 | 423.9 | 431.3 |
| 511.1 | 485.9 | 477.1 | 476.0 | 479.4 | 486.3 | 495.9 | 507.9 | 522.1 | 538.4 |
| 521.4 | 497.1 | 489.5 | 489.9 | 495.3 | 504.5 | 516.7 | 531.7 | 549.3 | 569.3 |

Table 89 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D8

## IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient = 8\%; Curvature = Straight (20 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

| IRI = 3, NRM = 78; Gradient $=\mathbf{8 \%}$; Curvature $=$ Straight $(\mathbf{2 0}$ degrees / $\mathbf{k m})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Vehicle class | Speed $(\mathbf{k m} / \mathbf{h r})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{9 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ |
| Small Car | 31.3 | 28.1 | 26.6 | 25.9 | 25.5 | 25.4 | 25.5 | 25.7 | 26.0 | 26.5 |
| Medium Car | 43.2 | 38.3 | 35.9 | 34.6 | 33.9 | 33.4 | 33.3 | 33.2 | 33.3 | 33.6 |
| Large Car | 57.1 | 50.3 | 46.9 | 45.1 | 43.9 | 43.3 | 42.9 | 42.7 | 42.8 | 42.9 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 49.2 | 45.4 | 43.4 | 42.2 | 41.4 | 40.7 | 40.2 | 39.7 | 39.3 | 38.9 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 51.7 | 47.6 | 45.6 | 44.4 | 43.7 | 43.3 | 43.0 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 42.9 |
| Light Rigid | 68.0 | 63.6 | 61.6 | 60.6 | 60.0 | 59.8 | 59.8 | 60.0 | 60.3 | 60.7 |
| Medium Rigid | 95.1 | 87.8 | 84.2 | 82.3 | 81.2 | 80.7 | 80.5 | 80.5 | 80.8 | 81.2 |
| Heavy Rigid | 164.3 | 152.1 | 146.0 | 142.4 | 139.9 | 138.2 | 136.9 | 135.8 | 135.0 | 134.3 |
| Heavy Bus | 197.0 | 183.2 | 175.1 | 168.9 | 163.5 | 158.2 | 152.9 | 147.3 | 141.5 | 135.2 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 227.1 | 210.3 | 202.0 | 197.2 | 194.2 | 192.2 | 190.8 | 190.0 | 189.5 | 189.3 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 255.1 | 238.3 | 230.2 | 225.7 | 222.9 | 221.3 | 220.4 | 220.1 | 220.1 | 220.5 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 276.8 | 259.5 | 251.1 | 246.3 | 243.4 | 241.6 | 240.5 | 239.9 | 239.7 | 239.9 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 333.4 | 315.7 | 307.7 | 303.8 | 302.1 | 301.8 | 302.5 | 304.1 | 306.3 | 309.1 |
| B-Double | 363.4 | 343.2 | 333.6 | 328.5 | 325.8 | 324.5 | 324.2 | 324.7 | 325.8 | 327.3 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 367.9 | 348.3 | 339.3 | 334.7 | 332.5 | 331.8 | 332.2 | 333.4 | 335.2 | 337.7 |
| A-Double | 457.0 | 432.0 | 421.3 | 416.9 | 416.1 | 417.6 | 420.9 | 425.6 | 431.7 | 438.9 |
| B Triple | 503.8 | 474.0 | 461.1 | 455.3 | 453.6 | 454.5 | 457.5 | 462.0 | 467.9 | 475.1 |
| A B Combination | 542.9 | 517.2 | 510.2 | 512.1 | 519.8 | 531.9 | 547.7 | 566.8 | 589.1 | 614.3 |
| A-Triple | 628.7 | 602.5 | 599.4 | 608.2 | 625.2 | 648.7 | 678.0 | 712.7 | 752.4 | 797.1 |
| Double B-Double | 643.9 | 618.9 | 617.2 | 627.8 | 646.9 | 673.0 | 705.2 | 743.1 | 786.4 | 835.0 |

Double B-Double


## IRI $=3$, NRM $=78$; Gradient $=8 \%$; Curvature $=$ Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

|  | Vehicle class |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| Small Car |  |
| Medium Car |  |
| Large Car |  |
| Courier Van-Utility |  |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol |  |
| Light Rigid |  |
| Medium Rigid |  |
| Heavy Rigid |  |
| Heavy Bus |  |
| Artic 4 Axle |  |
| Artic 5 Axle |  |
| Artic 6 Axle |  |
| Rigid +5 Axle Dog |  |
| B-Double |  |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog |  |
| A-Double |  |
| B Triple |  |
| A B Combination |  |
| A-Triple |  |
| Double B-Double |  |

Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road
conditions

IRI $=3$, NRM $=78$; Gradient $=8 \%$; Curvature $=$ Very Curvy/Very Winding(300 -320 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ )

| Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| 31.2 | 28.1 | 26.7 | 26.0 | 25.6 | 25.5 | 25.5 | 25.6 | 25.8 | 26.1 |
| 43.0 | 38.3 | 36.1 | 34.8 | 34.0 | 33.5 | 33.2 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 |
| 56.9 | 50.4 | 47.1 | 45.3 | 44.1 | 43.4 | 42.9 | 42.6 | 42.4 | 42.3 |
| 49.2 | 45.4 | 43.5 | 42.3 | 41.5 | 40.9 | 40.4 | 40.0 | 39.6 | 39.3 |
| 51.6 | 47.6 | 45.7 | 44.6 | 44.0 | 43.6 | 43.4 | 43.3 | 43.3 | 43.4 |
| 67.8 | 63.9 | 61.9 | 60.9 | 60.2 | 59.8 | 59.5 | 59.4 | 59.3 | 59.3 |
| 94.9 | 88.0 | 84.7 | 82.8 | 81.6 | 80.9 | 80.5 | 80.3 | 80.2 | 80.3 |
| 164.2 | 152.5 | 146.9 | 143.8 | 142.0 | 140.9 | 140.4 | 140.2 | 140.4 | 140.8 |
| 196.9 | 183.2 | 175.2 | 169.2 | 163.9 | 158.8 | 153.6 | 148.2 | 142.5 | 136.4 |
| 227.0 | 212.5 | 205.4 | 201.2 | 198.6 | 196.9 | 195.7 | 194.9 | 194.5 | 194.3 |
| 254.8 | 240.0 | 233.1 | 229.5 | 227.7 | 227.1 | 227.3 | 228.0 | 229.3 | 231.0 |
| 276.5 | 261.0 | 253.9 | 250.2 | 248.5 | 247.9 | 248.2 | 249.2 | 250.7 | 252.6 |
| 333.5 | 317.9 | 311.5 | 309.1 | 309.1 | 310.6 | 313.3 | 317.1 | 321.7 | 327.2 |
| 363.4 | 345.4 | 337.5 | 333.8 | 332.5 | 332.8 | 334.2 | 336.5 | 339.6 | 343.4 |
| 367.9 | 350.6 | 343.2 | 340.2 | 339.6 | 340.7 | 342.9 | 346.2 | 350.4 | 355.4 |
| 457.4 | 435.4 | 427.2 | 425.3 | 427.1 | 431.6 | 438.2 | 446.7 | 456.8 | 468.5 |
| 504.3 | 477.9 | 467.7 | 464.7 | 465.9 | 470.2 | 476.9 | 485.5 | 496.0 | 508.2 |
| 544.2 | 522.7 | 519.8 | 526.6 | 539.9 | 558.5 | 581.7 | 609.2 | 640.7 | 676.1 |
| 631.1 | 610.3 | 613.0 | 628.7 | 653.7 | 686.6 | 726.6 | 773.3 | 826.4 | 885.8 |
| 646.4 | 627.0 | 631.5 | 649.3 | 677.0 | 713.0 | 756.5 | 807.2 | 864.8 | 929.1 |

Table 90 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D9

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 31.1 | 27.9 | 26.5 | 25.8 | 25.6 | 25.7 | 26.0 | 26.4 | 27.0 | 27.7 |
| Medium Car | 42.9 | 37.9 | 35.6 | 34.4 | 33.8 | 33.7 | 33.8 | 34.1 | 34.5 | 35.2 |
| Large Car | 57.0 | 50.1 | 46.8 | 45.0 | 44.1 | 43.6 | 43.5 | 43.6 | 44.0 | 44.5 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 47.6 | 43.2 | 41.3 | 40.4 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.3 | 40.8 | 41.5 | 42.4 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 50.5 | 46.2 | 44.3 | 43.5 | 43.2 | 43.3 | 43.6 | 44.2 | 44.9 | 45.8 |
| Light Rigid | 61.1 | 57.3 | 55.8 | 55.5 | 55.9 | 56.7 | 58.0 | 59.5 | 61.4 | 63.5 |
| Medium Rigid | 77.1 | 70.1 | 67.0 | 65.8 | 65.5 | 65.9 | 66.8 | 68.1 | 69.8 | 71.8 |
| Heavy Rigid | 105.0 | 94.3 | 90.0 | 88.5 | 88.7 | 90.1 | 92.3 | 95.3 | 99.0 | 103.3 |
| Heavy Bus | 159.4 | 143.9 | 136.7 | 132.9 | 131.0 | 130.3 | 130.4 | 131.1 | 132.4 | 134.1 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 141.4 | 128.9 | 124.1 | 122.8 | 123.5 | 125.7 | 129.0 | 133.4 | 138.6 | 144.6 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 154.8 | 141.3 | 135.9 | 134.2 | 134.6 | 136.4 | 139.5 | 143.5 | 148.4 | 154.0 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 167.5 | 153.2 | 147.5 | 145.5 | 145.8 | 147.5 | 150.5 | 154.4 | 159.3 | 164.9 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 174.7 | 161.8 | 156.9 | 155.4 | 156.1 | 158.2 | 161.5 | 165.8 | 170.9 | 176.9 |
| B-Double | 198.9 | 183.4 | 177.1 | 174.8 | 174.8 | 176.4 | 179.3 | 183.2 | 188.0 | 193.6 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 195.1 | 180.4 | 174.4 | 172.4 | 172.6 | 174.3 | 177.3 | 181.3 | 186.2 | 191.9 |
| A-Double | 242.8 | 224.6 | 216.8 | 213.7 | 213.1 | 214.3 | 216.7 | 220.3 | 224.8 | 230.2 |
| B Triple | 285.2 | 262.8 | 252.9 | 248.3 | 246.7 | 247.1 | 248.8 | 251.7 | 255.6 | 260.3 |
| A B Combination | 275.0 | 255.8 | 247.6 | 244.1 | 243.4 | 244.5 | 246.9 | 250.5 | 255.0 | 260.4 |
| A-Triple | 311.5 | 290.2 | 280.9 | 276.8 | 275.7 | 276.5 | 278.7 | 282.1 | 286.5 | 291.7 |
| Double B-Double | 313.3 | 292.6 | 283.7 | 279.9 | 279.0 | 279.9 | 282.3 | 285.9 | 290.5 | 295.9 |

Double B-Double

| 313.3 | 292.6 | 283.7 | 2799 | 279.0 | 279.9 | 282.3 | 2859 | 290.5 | 295.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IRI $=5$, NRM $=131$; Gradient $=0 \%$; Curvature $=$ Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IRI= 5, NRM = 131; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 31.1 | 27.9 | 26.5 | 25.9 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 26.0 | 26.4 | 27.0 | 27.7 | 31.0 | 28.0 | 26.6 | 26.0 | 25.8 | 25.8 | 26.1 | 26.5 | 27.0 | 27.7 |
| Medium Car | 42.8 | 37.9 | 35.6 | 34.5 | 33.9 | 33.7 | 33.8 | 34.1 | 34.5 | 35.1 | 42.7 | 38.0 | 35.8 | 34.7 | 34.1 | 33.9 | 33.9 | 34.2 | 34.6 | 35.1 |
| Large Car | 56.9 | 50.1 | 46.9 | 45.1 | 44.2 | 43.7 | 43.6 | 43.7 | 44.0 | 44.4 | 56.8 | 50.2 | 47.1 | 45.4 | 44.4 | 43.9 | 43.7 | 43.8 | 44.0 | 44.4 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 47.6 | 43.2 | 41.3 | 40.4 | 40.1 | 40.2 | 40.5 | 41.0 | 41.8 | 42.7 | 47.6 | 43.3 | 41.4 | 40.6 | 40.5 | 40.7 | 41.2 | 41.9 | 42.9 | 44.0 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 50.5 | 46.2 | 44.4 | 43.5 | 43.3 | 43.4 | 43.7 | 44.3 | 45.1 | 46.1 | 50.5 | 46.3 | 44.5 | 43.8 | 43.7 | 43.9 | 44.5 | 45.4 | 46.4 | 47.7 |
| Light Rigid | 61.1 | 57.3 | 55.9 | 55.6 | 55.9 | 56.8 | 58.0 | 59.5 | 61.4 | 63.5 | 61.1 | 57.3 | 56.0 | 55.8 | 56.3 | 57.3 | 58.7 | 60.5 | 62.6 | 64.9 |
| Medium Rigid | 77.2 | 70.1 | 67.1 | 65.9 | 65.8 | 66.4 | 67.5 | 69.1 | 71.0 | 73.4 | 77.5 | 70.1 | 67.4 | 66.9 | 67.7 | 69.4 | 71.8 | 74.9 | 78.6 | 82.8 |
| Heavy Rigid | 105.2 | 94.3 | 90.0 | 88.7 | 89.2 | 90.9 | 93.5 | 97.0 | 101.3 | 106.2 | 105.6 | 94.4 | 90.7 | 90.5 | 92.4 | 96.0 | 100.9 | 106.9 | 114.1 | 122.2 |
| Heavy Bus | 159.5 | 143.8 | 136.7 | 133.1 | 131.4 | 131.1 | 131.6 | 132.8 | 134.6 | 136.8 | 159.8 | 143.9 | 137.3 | 134.7 | 134.4 | 135.6 | 138.1 | 141.5 | 145.8 | 150.8 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 141.4 | 129.0 | 124.4 | 123.3 | 124.3 | 126.9 | 130.6 | 135.4 | 141.2 | 147.8 | 141.9 | 129.4 | 125.8 | 126.6 | 130.0 | 135.5 | 142.8 | 151.6 | 161.9 | 173.5 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 154.8 | 141.5 | 136.3 | 134.7 | 135.2 | 137.3 | 140.5 | 144.8 | 149.9 | 155.8 | 155.0 | 141.8 | 137.4 | 137.1 | 139.4 | 143.5 | 149.2 | 156.2 | 164.5 | 173.9 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 167.5 | 153.4 | 147.8 | 146.0 | 146.5 | 148.4 | 151.6 | 155.7 | 160.8 | 166.7 | 167.7 | 153.8 | 149.1 | 148.6 | 150.9 | 155.0 | 160.8 | 167.9 | 176.3 | 185.9 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 174.8 | 161.9 | 157.1 | 156.0 | 157.0 | 159.7 | 163.5 | 168.5 | 174.4 | 181.2 | 175.3 | 162.3 | 158.7 | 159.6 | 163.5 | 169.6 | 177.6 | 187.3 | 198.6 | 211.3 |
| B-Double | 199.0 | 183.5 | 177.4 | 175.4 | 175.8 | 177.9 | 181.4 | 185.9 | 191.5 | 197.9 | 199.5 | 183.9 | 179.0 | 179.2 | 182.5 | 188.2 | 195.9 | 205.2 | 216.2 | 228.7 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 195.2 | 180.5 | 174.7 | 173.0 | 173.7 | 176.0 | 179.6 | 184.3 | 190.1 | 196.7 | 195.8 | 180.9 | 176.4 | 177.0 | 180.7 | 186.8 | 194.8 | 204.7 | 216.2 | 229.2 |
| A-Double | 242.9 | 224.6 | 217.1 | 214.4 | 214.4 | 216.3 | 219.6 | 224.2 | 229.8 | 236.4 | 243.7 | 225.0 | 219.1 | 219.3 | 223.2 | 229.9 | 238.9 | 250.1 | 263.1 | 277.9 |
| B Triple | 285.4 | 263.0 | 253.3 | 249.1 | 248.1 | 249.1 | 251.6 | 255.5 | 260.4 | 266.3 | 286.1 | 263.4 | 255.4 | 254.2 | 257.1 | 263.0 | 271.3 | 281.7 | 294.1 | 308.3 |
| A B Combination | 275.2 | 255.8 | 247.9 | 245.0 | 245.1 | 247.1 | 250.7 | 255.6 | 261.7 | 268.8 | 276.2 | 256.1 | 250.2 | 251.1 | 256.2 | 264.6 | 275.7 | 289.2 | 304.9 | 322.8 |
| A-Triple | 311.7 | 290.3 | 281.3 | 277.9 | 277.6 | 279.5 | 283.0 | 287.8 | 293.9 | 301.0 | 313.0 | 290.7 | 284.2 | 285.1 | 290.8 | 300.1 | 312.4 | 327.4 | 344.9 | 364.7 |
| Double B-Double | 313.5 | 292.7 | 284.2 | 281.0 | 281.0 | 283.1 | 286.9 | 292.1 | 298.4 | 305.9 | 314.8 | 293.1 | 287.0 | 288.4 | 294.6 | 304.5 | 317.4 | 333.1 | 351.3 | 371.9 |

Table 91 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D10

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 31.4 | 28.2 | 26.7 | 26.1 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 26.2 | 26.6 | 27.1 | 27.8 |
| Medium Car | 43.3 | 38.3 | 36.0 | 34.8 | 34.2 | 34.0 | 34.1 | 34.3 | 34.8 | 35.3 |
| Large Car | 57.5 | 50.6 | 47.3 | 45.5 | 44.5 | 44.0 | 43.9 | 44.0 | 44.3 | 44.7 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 49.2 | 44.7 | 42.7 | 41.6 | 41.2 | 41.0 | 41.1 | 41.4 | 41.9 | 42.4 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 51.3 | 47.1 | 45.2 | 44.3 | 43.9 | 43.9 | 44.2 | 44.6 | 45.3 | 46.1 |
| Light Rigid | 64.6 | 60.2 | 58.5 | 57.9 | 58.0 | 58.5 | 59.5 | 60.7 | 62.2 | 64.0 |
| Medium Rigid | 84.9 | 77.4 | 73.9 | 72.2 | 71.5 | 71.3 | 71.5 | 72.1 | 73.0 | 74.1 |
| Heavy Rigid | 129.8 | 118.7 | 113.4 | 110.6 | 109.2 | 108.5 | 108.4 | 108.8 | 109.5 | 110.5 |
| Heavy Bus | 178.7 | 164.3 | 156.8 | 152.0 | 148.6 | 145.8 | 143.4 | 141.3 | 139.2 | 137.2 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 178.2 | 163.4 | 157.0 | 154.1 | 153.2 | 153.7 | 155.1 | 157.3 | 160.2 | 163.6 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 197.9 | 182.7 | 175.9 | 172.7 | 171.4 | 171.4 | 172.3 | 174.0 | 176.3 | 179.1 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 213.5 | 197.9 | 190.8 | 187.3 | 185.7 | 185.3 | 185.9 | 187.1 | 188.8 | 191.1 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 240.0 | 225.5 | 219.0 | 215.8 | 214.5 | 214.3 | 215.1 | 216.5 | 218.4 | 220.9 |
| B-Double | 267.6 | 250.9 | 243.1 | 238.9 | 236.6 | 235.5 | 235.2 | 235.5 | 236.3 | 237.5 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 266.2 | 249.9 | 242.5 | 238.7 | 236.9 | 236.3 | 236.6 | 237.6 | 239.2 | 241.3 |
| A-Double | 333.3 | 314.0 | 304.3 | 298.5 | 294.6 | 291.9 | 289.8 | 288.2 | 286.9 | 285.8 |
| B Triple | 380.1 | 356.9 | 344.9 | 337.3 | 331.8 | 327.4 | 323.7 | 320.3 | 317.2 | 314.1 |
| A B Combination | 388.6 | 367.4 | 356.5 | 349.7 | 344.8 | 340.9 | 337.7 | 334.9 | 332.2 | 329.7 |
| A-Triple | 445.7 | 421.4 | 408.9 | 400.8 | 395.0 | 390.3 | 386.3 | 382.6 | 379.1 | 375.7 |
| Double B-Double | 452.2 | 428.3 | 416.1 | 408.4 | 402.9 | 398.6 | 395.1 | 391.9 | 389.0 | 386.3 |

Double B-Double

| 452.2 | 428.3 | 416.1 | 408.4 | 402.9 | 398.6 | 395.1 | 391.9 | 389.0 | 386.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IRI $=5$, NRM = 131; Gradient $=4 \%$; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IRI=5, NRM = 131; Gradient = 4\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding (300-320 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 31.4 | 28.2 | 26.8 | 26.1 | 25.9 | 26.0 | 26.2 | 26.6 | 27.1 | 27.8 | 31.3 | 28.2 | 26.9 | 26.3 | 26.0 | 26.1 | 26.3 | 26.7 | 27.2 | 27.8 |
| Medium Car | 43.2 | 38.3 | 36.0 | 34.9 | 34.3 | 34.0 | 34.1 | 34.3 | 34.7 | 35.3 | 43.1 | 38.4 | 36.2 | 35.0 | 34.4 | 34.2 | 34.2 | 34.4 | 34.8 | 35.2 |
| Large Car | 57.4 | 50.6 | 47.4 | 45.6 | 44.6 | 44.1 | 43.9 | 44.0 | 44.2 | 44.6 | 57.3 | 50.7 | 47.6 | 45.9 | 44.9 | 44.3 | 44.1 | 44.1 | 44.2 | 44.5 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 49.2 | 44.8 | 42.7 | 41.7 | 41.2 | 41.0 | 41.1 | 41.4 | 41.9 | 42.4 | 49.2 | 44.8 | 42.9 | 41.9 | 41.5 | 41.4 | 41.6 | 42.0 | 42.5 | 43.2 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 51.3 | 47.1 | 45.2 | 44.3 | 44.0 | 44.0 | 44.3 | 44.8 | 45.5 | 46.3 | 51.3 | 47.1 | 45.3 | 44.6 | 44.4 | 44.5 | 45.0 | 45.7 | 46.6 | 47.7 |
| Light Rigid | 64.5 | 60.3 | 58.6 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 58.4 | 59.2 | 60.3 | 61.6 | 63.2 | 64.4 | 60.4 | 58.8 | 58.2 | 58.2 | 58.6 | 59.3 | 60.3 | 61.6 | 63.0 |
| Medium Rigid | 84.7 | 77.5 | 74.1 | 72.4 | 71.6 | 71.4 | 71.6 | 72.0 | 72.8 | 73.7 | 84.5 | 77.7 | 74.6 | 73.1 | 72.4 | 72.3 | 72.5 | 73.1 | 74.0 | 75.0 |
| Heavy Rigid | 129.8 | 118.7 | 113.5 | 110.8 | 109.3 | 108.6 | 108.5 | 108.8 | 109.4 | 110.4 | 129.5 | 119.0 | 114.1 | 111.5 | 110.2 | 109.6 | 109.5 | 109.9 | 110.5 | 111.5 |
| Heavy Bus | 178.8 | 164.3 | 156.8 | 152.1 | 148.6 | 145.9 | 143.6 | 141.6 | 139.6 | 137.7 | 178.7 | 164.4 | 157.1 | 152.7 | 149.7 | 147.4 | 145.7 | 144.2 | 143.0 | 141.9 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 177.6 | 163.7 | 157.5 | 154.5 | 153.2 | 153.1 | 153.8 | 155.2 | 157.1 | 159.5 | 177.2 | 164.2 | 158.3 | 155.4 | 154.2 | 154.1 | 154.7 | 155.9 | 157.7 | 159.9 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 197.3 | 183.0 | 176.4 | 173.1 | 171.6 | 171.1 | 171.5 | 172.4 | 173.9 | 175.8 | 196.7 | 183.5 | 177.4 | 174.1 | 172.4 | 171.7 | 171.7 | 172.1 | 173.0 | 174.2 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 212.9 | 198.3 | 191.4 | 187.8 | 186.0 | 185.2 | 185.2 | 185.8 | 186.9 | 188.3 | 212.4 | 198.8 | 192.4 | 188.9 | 187.0 | 186.1 | 185.9 | 186.2 | 186.8 | 187.8 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 239.6 | 225.6 | 219.3 | 216.3 | 215.1 | 215.0 | 215.8 | 217.2 | 219.2 | 221.7 | 239.3 | 225.9 | 220.1 | 217.7 | 217.1 | 217.7 | 219.3 | 221.6 | 224.7 | 228.3 |
| B-Double | 267.3 | 251.0 | 243.4 | 239.4 | 237.4 | 236.6 | 236.7 | 237.4 | 238.7 | 240.4 | 267.0 | 251.3 | 244.2 | 240.8 | 239.5 | 239.5 | 240.4 | 242.1 | 244.4 | 247.3 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 265.8 | 250.0 | 242.8 | 239.3 | 237.6 | 237.2 | 237.8 | 239.0 | 240.8 | 243.1 | 265.4 | 250.4 | 243.7 | 240.7 | 239.7 | 239.9 | 241.2 | 243.2 | 245.9 | 249.2 |
| A-Double | 333.0 | 314.0 | 304.7 | 299.3 | 295.9 | 293.6 | 292.2 | 291.2 | 290.7 | 290.4 | 332.7 | 314.3 | 305.7 | 301.1 | 298.7 | 297.6 | 297.5 | 298.1 | 299.3 | 300.9 |
| B Triple | 379.7 | 357.0 | 345.3 | 338.1 | 332.9 | 328.9 | 325.6 | 322.6 | 320.0 | 317.4 | 379.4 | 357.3 | 346.3 | 339.8 | 335.4 | 332.4 | 330.1 | 328.4 | 327.0 | 326.0 |
| A B Combination | 388.2 | 367.7 | 357.1 | 350.6 | 345.9 | 342.3 | 339.2 | 336.6 | 334.2 | 331.9 | 387.9 | 368.2 | 358.3 | 352.3 | 348.2 | 345.3 | 343.0 | 341.1 | 339.6 | 338.3 |
| A-Triple | 445.3 | 421.8 | 409.6 | 401.8 | 396.0 | 391.3 | 387.3 | 383.5 | 379.9 | 376.4 | 444.9 | 422.6 | 411.0 | 403.5 | 398.1 | 393.7 | 389.9 | 386.4 | 383.1 | 379.8 |
| Double B-Double | 451.7 | 428.7 | 416.9 | 409.4 | 404.1 | 400.0 | 396.6 | 393.5 | 390.7 | 388.0 | 451.4 | 429.4 | 418.2 | 411.2 | 406.3 | 402.6 | 399.5 | 396.9 | 394.5 | 392.3 |

Table 92 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D11

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 31.9 | 28.7 | 27.2 | 26.5 | 26.3 | 26.3 | 26.5 | 26.9 | 27.4 | 28.0 |
| Medium Car | 44.0 | 39.0 | 36.6 | 35.4 | 34.8 | 34.5 | 34.5 | 34.7 | 35.0 | 35.5 |
| Large Car | 58.1 | 51.3 | 48.0 | 46.2 | 45.2 | 44.7 | 44.5 | 44.5 | 44.7 | 45.1 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 51.1 | 47.0 | 45.0 | 43.9 | 43.2 | 42.7 | 42.5 | 42.3 | 42.2 | 42.3 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 53.2 | 48.8 | 46.8 | 45.8 | 45.3 | 45.1 | 45.2 | 45.4 | 45.8 | 46.4 |
| Light Rigid | 68.7 | 64.3 | 62.4 | 61.6 | 61.4 | 61.5 | 61.9 | 62.6 | 63.5 | 64.5 |
| Medium Rigid | 92.6 | 85.0 | 81.5 | 79.7 | 78.9 | 78.6 | 78.7 | 79.2 | 79.9 | 80.9 |
| Heavy Rigid | 151.3 | 139.9 | 134.3 | 131.1 | 129.1 | 127.8 | 127.0 | 126.5 | 126.3 | 126.2 |
| Heavy Bus | 195.1 | 181.1 | 173.5 | 168.1 | 163.8 | 160.0 | 156.3 | 152.6 | 148.8 | 144.9 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 209.5 | 194.5 | 187.2 | 183.1 | 180.6 | 179.0 | 178.1 | 177.7 | 177.6 | 177.8 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 234.1 | 218.7 | 211.4 | 207.4 | 205.2 | 204.0 | 203.5 | 203.6 | 204.1 | 205.0 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 253.3 | 237.5 | 229.9 | 225.7 | 223.2 | 221.9 | 221.2 | 221.1 | 221.5 | 222.1 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 293.7 | 278.2 | 270.9 | 267.1 | 265.0 | 264.1 | 263.9 | 264.3 | 265.2 | 266.5 |
| B-Double | 325.0 | 307.1 | 298.5 | 293.5 | 290.5 | 288.5 | 287.4 | 286.7 | 286.5 | 286.6 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 325.6 | 308.3 | 300.1 | 295.6 | 293.1 | 291.8 | 291.4 | 291.6 | 292.2 | 293.3 |
| A-Double | 407.1 | 385.3 | 374.3 | 367.6 | 362.9 | 359.5 | 356.9 | 354.7 | 352.8 | 351.1 |
| B Triple | 457.1 | 430.9 | 417.1 | 408.3 | 401.7 | 396.3 | 391.6 | 387.2 | 383.0 | 378.8 |
| A B Combination | 479.1 | 454.1 | 442.8 | 437.2 | 434.7 | 434.3 | 435.3 | 437.5 | 440.6 | 444.5 |
| A-Triple | 551.5 | 523.4 | 511.9 | 507.9 | 508.1 | 511.3 | 516.7 | 524.1 | 533.1 | 543.7 |
| Double B-Double | 562.0 | 534.6 | 524.0 | 521.1 | 522.7 | 527.4 | 534.7 | 544.1 | 555.5 | 568.6 |

Double B-Double

| 562.0 | 534.6 | 524.0 | 521.1 | 522.7 | 527.4 | 534.7 | 544.1 | 555.5 | 568.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IRI = 5, NRM = 131; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IRI $=5$, NRM $=131$; Gradient $=6 \%$; Curvature $=$ Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 31.8 | 28.7 | 27.3 | 26.6 | 26.3 | 26.3 | 26.5 | 26.9 | 27.3 | 27.9 | 31.8 | 28.7 | 27.3 | 26.7 | 26.4 | 26.4 | 26.6 | 26.9 | 27.4 | 28.0 |
| Medium Car | 43.9 | 39.0 | 36.7 | 35.5 | 34.8 | 34.6 | 34.5 | 34.7 | 35.0 | 35.4 | 43.8 | 39.1 | 36.8 | 35.6 | 35.0 | 34.7 | 34.7 | 34.8 | 35.1 | 35.5 |
| Large Car | 58.1 | 51.3 | 48.1 | 46.3 | 45.3 | 44.7 | 44.5 | 44.5 | 44.7 | 45.0 | 57.9 | 51.4 | 48.2 | 46.5 | 45.5 | 44.9 | 44.7 | 44.6 | 44.8 | 45.0 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 51.1 | 47.1 | 45.1 | 43.9 | 43.2 | 42.7 | 42.4 | 42.3 | 42.2 | 42.1 | 51.1 | 47.1 | 45.2 | 44.1 | 43.4 | 42.9 | 42.7 | 42.5 | 42.4 | 42.4 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 53.2 | 48.9 | 46.9 | 45.9 | 45.4 | 45.2 | 45.3 | 45.5 | 45.9 | 46.4 | 53.2 | 48.9 | 47.0 | 46.0 | 45.6 | 45.6 | 45.8 | 46.1 | 46.7 | 47.4 |
| Light Rigid | 68.6 | 64.4 | 62.6 | 61.7 | 61.4 | 61.4 | 61.7 | 62.2 | 62.9 | 63.7 | 68.5 | 64.5 | 62.8 | 61.9 | 61.5 | 61.5 | 61.6 | 62.0 | 62.5 | 63.1 |
| Medium Rigid | 92.4 | 85.1 | 81.7 | 79.9 | 79.0 | 78.6 | 78.6 | 78.9 | 79.5 | 80.3 | 92.2 | 85.3 | 82.0 | 80.3 | 79.4 | 79.0 | 79.0 | 79.2 | 79.6 | 80.2 |
| Heavy Rigid | 151.3 | 139.9 | 134.4 | 131.3 | 129.4 | 128.2 | 127.5 | 127.2 | 127.1 | 127.2 | 151.2 | 140.0 | 134.8 | 132.0 | 130.5 | 129.8 | 129.7 | 130.0 | 130.7 | 131.6 |
| Heavy Bus | 195.0 | 181.1 | 173.4 | 168.1 | 163.7 | 159.9 | 156.2 | 152.5 | 148.7 | 144.8 | 195.0 | 181.1 | 173.6 | 168.5 | 164.4 | 160.9 | 157.5 | 154.2 | 150.8 | 147.4 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 209.0 | 194.7 | 187.8 | 184.0 | 181.8 | 180.6 | 180.0 | 179.8 | 180.1 | 180.7 | 208.7 | 195.2 | 188.9 | 185.6 | 183.9 | 183.1 | 183.1 | 183.7 | 184.6 | 186.0 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 233.7 | 218.8 | 211.9 | 208.3 | 206.5 | 205.9 | 206.0 | 206.8 | 208.0 | 209.7 | 233.5 | 219.1 | 212.8 | 209.8 | 208.6 | 208.7 | 209.7 | 211.4 | 213.7 | 216.5 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 253.1 | 237.5 | 230.3 | 226.5 | 224.6 | 223.9 | 224.0 | 224.7 | 225.9 | 227.6 | 252.8 | 237.8 | 231.2 | 228.0 | 226.9 | 227.0 | 228.0 | 229.8 | 232.2 | 235.2 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 293.4 | 278.5 | 271.7 | 268.2 | 266.7 | 266.2 | 266.6 | 267.7 | 269.3 | 271.4 | 293.1 | 278.9 | 272.8 | 270.1 | 269.4 | 270.0 | 271.5 | 273.8 | 276.8 | 280.5 |
| B-Double | 324.5 | 307.4 | 299.2 | 294.6 | 292.0 | 290.6 | 290.0 | 289.9 | 290.3 | 291.1 | 324.2 | 307.9 | 300.3 | 296.5 | 294.8 | 294.2 | 294.6 | 295.7 | 297.4 | 299.6 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 325.2 | 308.5 | 300.8 | 296.8 | 294.9 | 294.2 | 294.4 | 295.3 | 296.7 | 298.6 | 324.9 | 309.0 | 302.0 | 298.8 | 297.8 | 298.1 | 299.5 | 301.7 | 304.7 | 308.2 |
| A-Double | 406.7 | 385.8 | 375.4 | 369.1 | 364.9 | 361.9 | 359.6 | 357.9 | 356.4 | 355.3 | 406.4 | 386.6 | 376.8 | 371.1 | 367.4 | 365.0 | 363.2 | 362.0 | 361.2 | 360.7 |
| B Triple | 456.6 | 431.4 | 418.2 | 409.7 | 403.4 | 398.2 | 393.7 | 389.5 | 385.5 | 381.5 | 456.3 | 432.3 | 419.8 | 411.6 | 405.6 | 400.6 | 396.1 | 392.0 | 388.0 | 384.0 |
| A B Combination | 478.9 | 455.0 | 444.5 | 439.8 | 438.2 | 438.8 | 441.0 | 444.4 | 448.9 | 454.3 | 478.8 | 456.2 | 446.7 | 443.1 | 442.7 | 444.6 | 448.2 | 453.2 | 459.4 | 466.8 |
| A-Triple | 551.4 | 524.7 | 514.4 | 511.7 | 513.4 | 518.2 | 525.4 | 534.8 | 546.2 | 559.2 | 551.5 | 526.4 | 517.6 | 516.4 | 519.9 | 526.7 | 536.4 | 548.4 | 562.6 | 578.8 |
| Double B-Double | 561.9 | 535.9 | 526.8 | 525.3 | 528.6 | 535.3 | 544.7 | 556.6 | 570.7 | 586.8 | 562.1 | 537.7 | 530.2 | 530.6 | 536.0 | 545.1 | 557.4 | 572.4 | 589.9 | 609.9 |

Table 93 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D12

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 32.9 | 29.7 | 28.2 | 27.5 | 27.1 | 27.0 | 27.1 | 27.3 | 27.7 | 28.1 |
| Medium Car | 45.3 | 40.3 | 38.0 | 36.7 | 35.9 | 35.5 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.4 | 35.7 |
| Large Car | 59.7 | 52.8 | 49.5 | 47.6 | 46.5 | 45.8 | 45.4 | 45.3 | 45.3 | 45.4 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 53.3 | 49.5 | 47.5 | 46.3 | 45.5 | 44.8 | 44.3 | 43.8 | 43.4 | 43.0 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 55.5 | 51.4 | 49.4 | 48.3 | 47.6 | 47.2 | 46.9 | 46.8 | 46.7 | 46.8 |
| Light Rigid | 73.5 | 69.2 | 67.1 | 66.1 | 65.5 | 65.3 | 65.3 | 65.5 | 65.8 | 66.2 |
| Medium Rigid | 100.8 | 93.4 | 89.9 | 88.0 | 86.9 | 86.3 | 86.1 | 86.2 | 86.4 | 86.9 |
| Heavy Rigid | 175.7 | 163.6 | 157.5 | 153.9 | 151.4 | 149.7 | 148.4 | 147.3 | 146.5 | 145.8 |
| Heavy Bus | 213.3 | 199.5 | 191.4 | 185.2 | 179.8 | 174.5 | 169.2 | 163.6 | 157.8 | 151.5 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 245.3 | 228.4 | 220.2 | 215.4 | 212.3 | 210.3 | 209.0 | 208.2 | 207.7 | 207.4 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 274.7 | 257.9 | 249.8 | 245.3 | 242.5 | 240.9 | 240.0 | 239.7 | 239.7 | 240.1 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 298.2 | 280.9 | 272.5 | 267.7 | 264.8 | 262.9 | 261.8 | 261.3 | 261.1 | 261.3 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 354.6 | 337.0 | 329.0 | 325.1 | 323.4 | 323.1 | 323.8 | 325.4 | 327.6 | 330.4 |
| B-Double | 389.6 | 369.4 | 359.9 | 354.8 | 352.0 | 350.7 | 350.4 | 350.9 | 352.0 | 353.6 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 393.0 | 373.4 | 364.4 | 359.8 | 357.6 | 356.9 | 357.2 | 358.4 | 360.3 | 362.8 |
| A-Double | 490.3 | 465.3 | 454.6 | 450.2 | 449.4 | 450.9 | 454.2 | 458.9 | 465.0 | 472.2 |
| B Triple | 543.4 | 513.6 | 500.6 | 494.9 | 493.2 | 494.1 | 497.0 | 501.6 | 507.5 | 514.6 |
| A B Combination | 580.8 | 555.1 | 548.0 | 550.0 | 557.7 | 569.8 | 585.6 | 604.7 | 627.0 | 652.2 |
| A-Triple | 671.9 | 645.7 | 642.6 | 651.4 | 668.4 | 691.9 | 721.3 | 755.9 | 795.7 | 840.3 |
| Double B-Double | 687.4 | 662.4 | 660.8 | 671.4 | 690.5 | 716.5 | 748.7 | 786.6 | 830.0 | 878.6 |

Double B-Double


| IRI = 5, NRM = 131; Gradient = 8\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IRI $=5$, NRM $=131$; Gradient $=8 \%$; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 32.9 | 29.7 | 28.3 | 27.5 | 27.2 | 27.0 | 27.1 | 27.3 | 27.6 | 28.0 | 32.8 | 29.8 | 28.4 | 27.6 | 27.3 | 27.1 | 27.1 | 27.2 | 27.4 | 27.7 |
| Medium Car | 45.2 | 40.4 | 38.0 | 36.7 | 36.0 | 35.5 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.5 | 45.1 | 40.5 | 38.2 | 36.9 | 36.1 | 35.6 | 35.3 | 35.2 | 35.1 | 35.2 |
| Large Car | 59.6 | 52.8 | 49.5 | 47.7 | 46.5 | 45.8 | 45.4 | 45.2 | 45.2 | 45.3 | 59.5 | 52.9 | 49.7 | 47.9 | 46.7 | 45.9 | 45.4 | 45.1 | 45.0 | 44.9 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 53.3 | 49.5 | 47.6 | 46.3 | 45.5 | 44.8 | 44.3 | 43.8 | 43.4 | 42.9 | 53.3 | 49.5 | 47.6 | 46.4 | 45.6 | 45.0 | 44.5 | 44.1 | 43.7 | 43.3 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 55.5 | 51.5 | 49.5 | 48.3 | 47.6 | 47.2 | 46.9 | 46.8 | 46.7 | 46.8 | 55.5 | 51.5 | 49.6 | 48.5 | 47.8 | 47.5 | 47.3 | 47.2 | 47.2 | 47.3 |
| Light Rigid | 73.4 | 69.2 | 67.2 | 66.2 | 65.6 | 65.2 | 65.1 | 65.1 | 65.3 | 65.5 | 73.3 | 69.3 | 67.4 | 66.3 | 65.7 | 65.2 | 65.0 | 64.8 | 64.8 | 64.8 |
| Medium Rigid | 100.7 | 93.5 | 90.0 | 88.1 | 87.0 | 86.3 | 86.0 | 85.9 | 86.0 | 86.3 | 100.5 | 93.6 | 90.3 | 88.4 | 87.2 | 86.5 | 86.1 | 85.9 | 85.8 | 85.9 |
| Heavy Rigid | 175.7 | 163.6 | 157.7 | 154.1 | 151.8 | 150.2 | 149.0 | 148.2 | 147.5 | 147.0 | 175.5 | 163.9 | 158.2 | 155.1 | 153.3 | 152.2 | 151.7 | 151.5 | 151.7 | 152.1 |
| Heavy Bus | 213.3 | 199.5 | 191.3 | 185.2 | 179.7 | 174.5 | 169.1 | 163.5 | 157.6 | 151.3 | 213.2 | 199.5 | 191.5 | 185.5 | 180.2 | 175.0 | 169.9 | 164.5 | 158.7 | 152.7 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 244.8 | 229.1 | 221.4 | 216.8 | 213.9 | 211.9 | 210.6 | 209.6 | 209.0 | 208.6 | 244.6 | 230.1 | 223.0 | 218.8 | 216.2 | 214.5 | 213.3 | 212.6 | 212.1 | 211.9 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 274.2 | 258.3 | 250.8 | 246.6 | 244.3 | 243.0 | 242.5 | 242.5 | 243.0 | 243.8 | 273.9 | 259.0 | 252.1 | 248.6 | 246.8 | 246.2 | 246.3 | 247.1 | 248.4 | 250.1 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 297.7 | 281.2 | 273.4 | 269.0 | 266.6 | 265.2 | 264.7 | 264.7 | 265.1 | 265.9 | 297.3 | 281.8 | 274.7 | 271.0 | 269.3 | 268.7 | 269.0 | 270.0 | 271.5 | 273.4 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 354.3 | 337.7 | 330.4 | 327.1 | 326.1 | 326.6 | 328.2 | 330.6 | 333.8 | 337.7 | 354.2 | 338.6 | 332.2 | 329.8 | 329.8 | 331.3 | 334.0 | 337.8 | 342.4 | 347.9 |
| B-Double | 389.2 | 370.1 | 361.3 | 356.8 | 354.7 | 354.1 | 354.5 | 355.8 | 357.7 | 360.2 | 389.0 | 371.0 | 363.1 | 359.4 | 358.2 | 358.4 | 359.8 | 362.2 | 365.3 | 369.1 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 392.6 | 374.1 | 365.8 | 361.9 | 360.3 | 360.3 | 361.5 | 363.5 | 366.3 | 369.8 | 392.4 | 375.1 | 367.7 | 364.7 | 364.1 | 365.1 | 367.4 | 370.7 | 374.9 | 379.9 |
| A-Double | 490.0 | 466.5 | 457.0 | 453.7 | 454.1 | 457.0 | 461.8 | 468.3 | 476.2 | 485.5 | 490.1 | 468.1 | 459.9 | 457.9 | 459.8 | 464.2 | 470.9 | 479.4 | 489.5 | 501.2 |
| B Triple | 543.2 | 515.0 | 503.4 | 498.9 | 498.6 | 501.1 | 505.8 | 512.3 | 520.4 | 529.9 | 543.3 | 516.9 | 506.6 | 503.6 | 504.9 | 509.2 | 515.8 | 524.5 | 535.0 | 547.1 |
| A B Combination | 580.9 | 557.2 | 552.1 | 556.1 | 566.3 | 581.2 | 600.3 | 623.0 | 649.3 | 678.9 | 581.4 | 559.9 | 557.0 | 563.8 | 577.1 | 595.7 | 618.9 | 646.4 | 677.9 | 713.3 |
| A-Triple | 672.7 | 649.0 | 648.5 | 660.3 | 680.7 | 708.3 | 742.2 | 782.0 | 827.4 | 878.3 | 673.6 | 652.8 | 655.5 | 671.2 | 696.2 | 729.1 | 769.1 | 815.8 | 868.9 | 928.3 |
| Double B-Double | 688.1 | 665.7 | 666.8 | 680.6 | 703.4 | 733.7 | 770.7 | 814.0 | 863.4 | 918.7 | 689.2 | 669.8 | 674.3 | 692.2 | 719.8 | 755.8 | 799.3 | 850.0 | 907.6 | 971.9 |

Table 94 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D13

| IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Straight (20 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 32.9 | 29.7 | 28.3 | 27.6 | 27.4 | 27.5 | 27.8 | 28.2 | 28.8 | 29.5 |
| Medium Car | 45.2 | 40.2 | 37.9 | 36.7 | 36.2 | 36.0 | 36.1 | 36.4 | 36.9 | 37.5 |
| Large Car | 59.9 | 53.0 | 49.7 | 47.9 | 47.0 | 46.5 | 46.4 | 46.5 | 46.9 | 47.4 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 52.3 | 48.0 | 46.0 | 45.1 | 44.8 | 44.8 | 45.1 | 45.6 | 46.3 | 47.1 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 55.0 | 50.7 | 48.9 | 48.0 | 47.7 | 47.8 | 48.1 | 48.7 | 49.4 | 50.3 |
| Light Rigid | 67.3 | 63.5 | 62.0 | 61.7 | 62.1 | 62.9 | 64.2 | 65.7 | 67.6 | 69.7 |
| Medium Rigid | 83.6 | 76.5 | 73.5 | 72.3 | 72.0 | 72.4 | 73.3 | 74.6 | 76.3 | 78.3 |
| Heavy Rigid | 116.7 | 106.0 | 101.6 | 100.2 | 100.4 | 101.7 | 104.0 | 107.0 | 110.7 | 115.0 |
| Heavy Bus | 176.2 | 160.7 | 153.5 | 149.8 | 147.9 | 147.2 | 147.3 | 148.0 | 149.2 | 150.9 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 158.1 | 145.6 | 140.8 | 139.5 | 140.2 | 142.4 | 145.8 | 150.1 | 155.3 | 161.4 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 173.0 | 159.4 | 154.1 | 152.3 | 152.7 | 154.6 | 157.6 | 161.6 | 166.5 | 172.2 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 187.4 | 173.1 | 167.3 | 165.4 | 165.6 | 167.4 | 170.3 | 174.3 | 179.1 | 184.8 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 194.0 | 181.2 | 176.2 | 174.8 | 175.4 | 177.5 | 180.8 | 185.1 | 190.3 | 196.3 |
| B-Double | 223.0 | 207.5 | 201.2 | 198.9 | 198.9 | 200.5 | 203.4 | 207.3 | 212.1 | 217.7 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 217.8 | 203.0 | 197.1 | 195.0 | 195.2 | 197.0 | 200.0 | 204.0 | 208.9 | 214.6 |
| A-Double | 273.3 | 255.1 | 247.4 | 244.2 | 243.6 | 244.8 | 247.3 | 250.8 | 255.3 | 260.7 |
| B Triple | 322.3 | 299.9 | 290.0 | 285.4 | 283.8 | 284.1 | 285.9 | 288.8 | 292.7 | 297.4 |
| A B Combination | 309.6 | 290.4 | 282.2 | 278.8 | 278.1 | 279.1 | 281.6 | 285.1 | 289.7 | 295.1 |
| A-Triple | 351.1 | 329.7 | 320.4 | 316.4 | 315.2 | 316.0 | 318.2 | 321.6 | 326.0 | 331.3 |
| Double B-Double | 352.8 | 332.1 | 323.2 | 319.4 | 318.5 | 319.4 | 321.8 | 325.4 | 330.0 | 335.4 |

Double B-Double

| 352.8 | 332.1 | 323.2 | 319.4 | 318.5 | 319.4 | 321.8 | 325.4 | 330.0 | 335.4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient = 0\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 32.9 | 29.7 | 28.3 | 27.7 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 27.8 | 28.2 | 28.8 | 29.4 | 32.8 | 29.8 | 28.4 | 27.8 | 27.6 | 27.6 | 27.9 | 28.3 | 28.8 | 29.5 |
| Medium Car | 45.2 | 40.3 | 38.0 | 36.8 | 36.2 | 36.0 | 36.1 | 36.4 | 36.8 | 37.4 | 45.1 | 40.3 | 38.1 | 37.0 | 36.4 | 36.2 | 36.3 | 36.5 | 36.9 | 37.5 |
| Large Car | 59.8 | 53.0 | 49.8 | 48.0 | 47.1 | 46.6 | 46.4 | 46.5 | 46.8 | 47.3 | 59.7 | 53.1 | 50.0 | 48.3 | 47.3 | 46.8 | 46.6 | 46.7 | 46.9 | 47.3 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 52.3 | 48.0 | 46.1 | 45.2 | 44.9 | 44.9 | 45.2 | 45.8 | 46.5 | 47.4 | 52.3 | 48.0 | 46.2 | 45.4 | 45.2 | 45.4 | 45.9 | 46.7 | 47.6 | 48.8 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 55.0 | 50.7 | 48.9 | 48.0 | 47.8 | 47.9 | 48.2 | 48.8 | 49.6 | 50.6 | 55.0 | 50.8 | 49.0 | 48.3 | 48.2 | 48.5 | 49.0 | 49.9 | 50.9 | 52.2 |
| Light Rigid | 67.3 | 63.5 | 62.1 | 61.8 | 62.2 | 63.0 | 64.2 | 65.7 | 67.6 | 69.7 | 67.3 | 63.5 | 62.2 | 62.0 | 62.5 | 63.5 | 64.9 | 66.7 | 68.8 | 71.1 |
| Medium Rigid | 83.7 | 76.5 | 73.5 | 72.4 | 72.2 | 72.8 | 74.0 | 75.5 | 77.5 | 79.8 | 84.0 | 76.6 | 73.9 | 73.3 | 74.1 | 75.8 | 78.2 | 81.3 | 85.0 | 89.3 |
| Heavy Rigid | 116.8 | 105.9 | 101.6 | 100.3 | 100.8 | 102.5 | 105.2 | 108.7 | 112.9 | 117.9 | 117.2 | 106.0 | 102.3 | 102.1 | 104.0 | 107.6 | 112.5 | 118.5 | 125.7 | 133.8 |
| Heavy Bus | 176.4 | 160.7 | 153.5 | 149.9 | 148.3 | 147.9 | 148.4 | 149.6 | 151.4 | 153.7 | 176.6 | 160.8 | 154.1 | 151.5 | 151.2 | 152.4 | 154.9 | 158.3 | 162.6 | 167.7 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 158.1 | 145.7 | 141.1 | 140.0 | 141.0 | 143.6 | 147.3 | 152.1 | 157.8 | 164.4 | 158.6 | 146.1 | 142.5 | 143.2 | 146.7 | 152.2 | 159.4 | 168.3 | 178.5 | 190.2 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 172.9 | 159.6 | 154.4 | 152.8 | 153.4 | 155.4 | 158.7 | 162.9 | 168.0 | 174.0 | 173.1 | 160.0 | 155.6 | 155.3 | 157.5 | 161.7 | 167.3 | 174.3 | 182.6 | 192.0 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 187.3 | 173.3 | 167.7 | 165.9 | 166.3 | 168.2 | 171.4 | 175.6 | 180.6 | 186.6 | 187.6 | 173.6 | 168.9 | 168.5 | 170.7 | 174.8 | 180.6 | 187.7 | 196.1 | 205.7 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 194.1 | 181.2 | 176.4 | 175.3 | 176.3 | 179.0 | 182.8 | 187.8 | 193.7 | 200.5 | 194.6 | 181.6 | 178.0 | 178.9 | 182.8 | 188.9 | 196.9 | 206.6 | 217.8 | 230.6 |
| B-Double | 223.0 | 207.6 | 201.4 | 199.4 | 199.9 | 202.0 | 205.4 | 210.0 | 215.5 | 222.0 | 223.5 | 207.9 | 203.1 | 203.2 | 206.5 | 212.2 | 219.9 | 229.3 | 240.3 | 252.8 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 217.8 | 203.1 | 197.4 | 195.6 | 196.3 | 198.6 | 202.2 | 207.0 | 212.7 | 219.3 | 218.4 | 203.5 | 199.0 | 199.6 | 203.3 | 209.4 | 217.4 | 227.3 | 238.8 | 251.8 |
| A-Double | 273.4 | 255.1 | 247.6 | 244.9 | 244.9 | 246.8 | 250.1 | 254.6 | 260.3 | 266.9 | 274.2 | 255.5 | 249.6 | 249.8 | 253.7 | 260.4 | 269.4 | 280.5 | 293.5 | 308.3 |
| B Triple | 322.4 | 300.0 | 290.3 | 286.1 | 285.1 | 286.1 | 288.7 | 292.5 | 297.4 | 303.3 | 323.1 | 300.4 | 292.4 | 291.2 | 294.1 | 300.0 | 308.3 | 318.8 | 331.2 | 345.3 |
| A B Combination | 309.8 | 290.4 | 282.4 | 279.6 | 279.6 | 281.7 | 285.3 | 290.2 | 296.3 | 303.4 | 310.7 | 290.7 | 284.8 | 285.6 | 290.7 | 299.1 | 310.2 | 323.7 | 339.4 | 357.3 |
| A-Triple | 351.1 | 329.7 | 320.7 | 317.3 | 317.0 | 318.9 | 322.4 | 327.2 | 333.3 | 340.4 | 352.3 | 330.0 | 323.5 | 324.4 | 330.1 | 339.4 | 351.7 | 366.7 | 384.2 | 404.0 |
| Double B-Double | 352.9 | 332.1 | 323.5 | 320.4 | 320.4 | 322.5 | 326.3 | 331.4 | 337.8 | 345.2 | 354.1 | 332.5 | 326.4 | 327.8 | 334.0 | 343.8 | 356.7 | 372.4 | 390.6 | 411.3 |

Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road

## conditions

| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) | $0 \%$ to $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ to $4 \%$ |  | $4 \%$ to $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ to 8\% |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Curvature (Terrain <br> type) | Straight (0-99'/km) |  | Curvy (100-299'/km) | Very curvy <br> $\left(300^{\prime}+/ k m\right)$ |  |
| Roughness (IRI) | $1-2$ (Very <br> good) | $3-4$ (Good) | $5-6$ (Fair) | $7-8$ (Poor) |  |
| Roughness (NRM) | $0-49$ | $50-99$ | $100-149$ | $150-199$ |  |

IRI $=7$, NRM $=184$; Gradient $=0 \%$; Curvature $=$ Very Curvy/Very Winding(300 -320 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) Speed (km/hr)

Table 95 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D14

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 33.2 | 30.0 | 28.5 | 27.9 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 28.0 | 28.4 | 28.9 | 29.6 |
| Medium Car | 45.6 | 40.6 | 38.3 | 37.1 | 36.5 | 36.3 | 36.4 | 36.7 | 37.1 | 37.7 |
| Large Car | 60.4 | 53.4 | 50.2 | 48.4 | 47.4 | 46.9 | 46.8 | 46.9 | 47.1 | 47.6 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 53.9 | 49.5 | 47.4 | 46.4 | 45.9 | 45.7 | 45.8 | 46.1 | 46.6 | 47.2 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 55.8 | 51.6 | 49.7 | 48.8 | 48.4 | 48.4 | 48.7 | 49.2 | 49.8 | 50.6 |
| Light Rigid | 70.8 | 66.4 | 64.6 | 64.0 | 64.1 | 64.7 | 65.6 | 66.9 | 68.4 | 70.1 |
| Medium Rigid | 91.3 | 83.8 | 80.4 | 78.7 | 77.9 | 77.7 | 78.0 | 78.6 | 79.4 | 80.5 |
| Heavy Rigid | 141.5 | 130.3 | 125.0 | 122.3 | 120.8 | 120.1 | 120.1 | 120.4 | 121.1 | 122.1 |
| Heavy Bus | 195.5 | 181.1 | 173.6 | 168.8 | 165.4 | 162.6 | 160.2 | 158.0 | 156.0 | 154.0 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 195.1 | 180.4 | 174.0 | 171.1 | 170.2 | 170.6 | 172.0 | 174.2 | 177.1 | 180.6 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 216.3 | 201.1 | 194.3 | 191.1 | 189.8 | 189.8 | 190.8 | 192.4 | 194.7 | 197.5 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 233.6 | 218.0 | 210.9 | 207.4 | 205.8 | 205.4 | 206.0 | 207.2 | 208.9 | 211.2 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 259.4 | 244.9 | 238.4 | 235.2 | 233.9 | 233.8 | 234.5 | 235.9 | 237.9 | 240.3 |
| B-Double | 291.8 | 275.2 | 267.3 | 263.1 | 260.8 | 259.7 | 259.4 | 259.7 | 260.5 | 261.7 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 289.0 | 272.8 | 265.4 | 261.6 | 259.8 | 259.2 | 259.5 | 260.5 | 262.1 | 264.2 |
| A-Double | 363.8 | 344.5 | 334.8 | 329.0 | 325.2 | 322.4 | 320.3 | 318.7 | 317.4 | 316.3 |
| B Triple | 417.2 | 394.0 | 382.0 | 374.4 | 368.9 | 364.5 | 360.8 | 357.4 | 354.2 | 351.2 |
| A B Combination | 423.0 | 401.8 | 390.9 | 384.0 | 379.1 | 375.3 | 372.1 | 369.2 | 366.6 | 364.0 |
| A-Triple | 484.8 | 460.5 | 448.0 | 439.9 | 434.1 | 429.4 | 425.4 | 421.7 | 418.2 | 414.8 |
| Double B-Double | 491.2 | 467.3 | 455.1 | 447.4 | 441.9 | 437.7 | 434.1 | 430.9 | 428.1 | 425.3 |

Double B-Double


| IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient = 4\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IR $=7$, NRM $=184$; Gradient $=4 \%$; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 33.1 | 30.0 | 28.6 | 27.9 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 28.0 | 28.4 | 28.9 | 29.6 | 33.1 | 30.0 | 28.7 | 28.1 | 27.8 | 27.9 | 28.1 | 28.5 | 29.0 | 29.6 |
| Medium Car | 45.6 | 40.6 | 38.4 | 37.2 | 36.6 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.7 | 37.1 | 37.6 | 45.5 | 40.7 | 38.5 | 37.4 | 36.8 | 36.5 | 36.5 | 36.7 | 37.1 | 37.6 |
| Large Car | 60.3 | 53.5 | 50.2 | 48.5 | 47.5 | 47.0 | 46.8 | 46.9 | 47.1 | 47.5 | 60.2 | 53.6 | 50.5 | 48.7 | 47.7 | 47.2 | 47.0 | 46.9 | 47.1 | 47.4 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 53.9 | 49.5 | 47.4 | 46.4 | 45.9 | 45.8 | 45.9 | 46.1 | 46.6 | 47.2 | 53.9 | 49.5 | 47.6 | 46.6 | 46.2 | 46.1 | 46.3 | 46.7 | 47.3 | 47.9 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 55.8 | 51.6 | 49.7 | 48.8 | 48.5 | 48.5 | 48.8 | 49.3 | 50.0 | 50.8 | 55.8 | 51.6 | 49.8 | 49.1 | 48.9 | 49.0 | 49.5 | 50.2 | 51.1 | 52.2 |
| Light Rigid | 70.7 | 66.5 | 64.7 | 64.1 | 64.1 | 64.6 | 65.4 | 66.5 | 67.8 | 69.4 | 70.6 | 66.6 | 64.9 | 64.3 | 64.3 | 64.8 | 65.5 | 66.5 | 67.7 | 69.2 |
| Medium Rigid | 91.1 | 83.9 | 80.5 | 78.8 | 78.0 | 77.8 | 78.0 | 78.4 | 79.2 | 80.1 | 90.9 | 84.1 | 81.0 | 79.4 | 78.8 | 78.6 | 78.9 | 79.5 | 80.3 | 81.4 |
| Heavy Rigid | 141.3 | 130.3 | 125.1 | 122.3 | 120.9 | 120.2 | 120.1 | 120.4 | 121.0 | 121.9 | 141.0 | 130.5 | 125.6 | 123.0 | 121.7 | 121.1 | 121.0 | 121.4 | 122.0 | 123.0 |
| Heavy Bus | 195.5 | 181.1 | 173.6 | 168.8 | 165.4 | 162.7 | 160.4 | 158.3 | 156.4 | 154.5 | 195.5 | 181.1 | 173.9 | 169.5 | 166.4 | 164.2 | 162.4 | 161.0 | 159.7 | 158.6 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 194.5 | 180.6 | 174.3 | 171.3 | 170.0 | 169.9 | 170.6 | 172.0 | 173.9 | 176.3 | 193.9 | 180.9 | 175.0 | 172.1 | 170.9 | 170.8 | 171.4 | 172.6 | 174.4 | 176.5 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 215.6 | 201.3 | 194.7 | 191.4 | 189.8 | 189.4 | 189.8 | 190.7 | 192.2 | 194.1 | 214.8 | 201.7 | 195.5 | 192.2 | 190.5 | 189.8 | 189.8 | 190.2 | 191.1 | 192.3 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 232.9 | 218.2 | 211.3 | 207.8 | 205.9 | 205.1 | 205.2 | 205.7 | 206.8 | 208.3 | 232.2 | 218.6 | 212.1 | 208.7 | 206.8 | 205.9 | 205.6 | 205.9 | 206.6 | 207.6 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 258.9 | 244.9 | 238.6 | 235.6 | 234.4 | 234.3 | 235.1 | 236.5 | 238.5 | 241.0 | 258.4 | 245.0 | 239.2 | 236.8 | 236.2 | 236.8 | 238.4 | 240.8 | 243.8 | 247.4 |
| B-Double | 291.4 | 275.1 | 267.5 | 263.5 | 261.5 | 260.7 | 260.8 | 261.5 | 262.8 | 264.5 | 290.9 | 275.2 | 268.1 | 264.8 | 263.4 | 263.4 | 264.4 | 266.0 | 268.4 | 271.3 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 288.5 | 272.8 | 265.6 | 262.0 | 260.4 | 260.0 | 260.5 | 261.7 | 263.5 | 265.8 | 288.0 | 273.0 | 266.3 | 263.3 | 262.2 | 262.5 | 263.8 | 265.8 | 268.5 | 271.7 |
| A-Double | 363.4 | 344.4 | 335.1 | 329.7 | 326.3 | 324.0 | 322.6 | 321.6 | 321.1 | 320.8 | 363.0 | 344.6 | 335.9 | 331.3 | 328.9 | 327.9 | 327.8 | 328.4 | 329.5 | 331.2 |
| B Triple | 416.6 | 393.9 | 382.3 | 375.0 | 369.8 | 365.8 | 362.5 | 359.5 | 356.9 | 354.3 | 416.2 | 394.1 | 383.1 | 376.6 | 372.2 | 369.1 | 366.9 | 365.1 | 363.8 | 362.7 |
| A B Combination | 422.4 | 401.9 | 391.3 | 384.8 | 380.1 | 376.5 | 373.4 | 370.8 | 368.4 | 366.1 | 422.0 | 402.2 | 392.3 | 386.3 | 382.3 | 379.3 | 377.0 | 375.2 | 373.7 | 372.3 |
| A-Triple | 484.2 | 460.7 | 448.5 | 440.7 | 434.9 | 430.3 | 426.2 | 422.4 | 418.9 | 415.3 | 483.7 | 461.4 | 449.8 | 442.3 | 436.9 | 432.5 | 428.7 | 425.2 | 421.9 | 418.6 |
| Double B-Double | 490.6 | 467.6 | 455.7 | 448.3 | 443.0 | 438.9 | 435.4 | 432.4 | 429.6 | 426.9 | 490.2 | 468.2 | 456.9 | 450.0 | 445.1 | 441.3 | 438.3 | 435.6 | 433.3 | 431.0 |

Table 96 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D15

| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 33.6 | 30.4 | 29.0 | 28.3 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 28.3 | 28.6 | 29.1 | 29.8 |
| Medium Car | 46.3 | 41.3 | 39.0 | 37.7 | 37.1 | 36.8 | 36.8 | 37.0 | 37.4 | 37.8 |
| Large Car | 61.0 | 54.1 | 50.9 | 49.1 | 48.1 | 47.6 | 47.3 | 47.4 | 47.6 | 47.9 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 55.9 | 51.8 | 49.8 | 48.6 | 47.9 | 47.5 | 47.2 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 57.7 | 53.3 | 51.3 | 50.3 | 49.8 | 49.6 | 49.7 | 49.9 | 50.3 | 50.8 |
| Light Rigid | 74.9 | 70.6 | 68.7 | 67.8 | 67.6 | 67.7 | 68.1 | 68.8 | 69.7 | 70.7 |
| Medium Rigid | 99.0 | 91.5 | 88.0 | 86.2 | 85.3 | 85.1 | 85.2 | 85.7 | 86.4 | 87.3 |
| Heavy Rigid | 163.0 | 151.6 | 146.0 | 142.8 | 140.8 | 139.5 | 138.7 | 138.2 | 138.0 | 137.9 |
| Heavy Bus | 212.0 | 198.0 | 190.4 | 185.1 | 180.8 | 176.9 | 173.2 | 169.5 | 165.8 | 161.9 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 226.8 | 211.8 | 204.5 | 200.4 | 197.9 | 196.4 | 195.5 | 195.0 | 194.9 | 195.1 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 252.9 | 237.5 | 230.2 | 226.3 | 224.0 | 222.8 | 222.4 | 222.4 | 222.9 | 223.8 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 273.9 | 258.0 | 250.4 | 246.2 | 243.8 | 242.4 | 241.8 | 241.7 | 242.0 | 242.7 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 313.6 | 298.1 | 290.9 | 287.0 | 284.9 | 284.0 | 283.8 | 284.2 | 285.1 | 286.4 |
| B-Double | 349.8 | 332.0 | 323.3 | 318.3 | 315.3 | 313.4 | 312.2 | 311.6 | 311.3 | 311.4 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 349.1 | 331.8 | 323.6 | 319.2 | 316.7 | 315.4 | 315.0 | 315.1 | 315.8 | 316.9 |
| A-Double | 438.4 | 416.6 | 405.6 | 398.9 | 394.3 | 390.9 | 388.2 | 386.0 | 384.1 | 382.4 |
| B Triple | 495.0 | 468.7 | 455.0 | 446.1 | 439.6 | 434.2 | 429.5 | 425.1 | 420.9 | 416.7 |
| A B Combination | 514.5 | 489.5 | 478.1 | 472.5 | 470.1 | 469.6 | 470.7 | 472.8 | 475.9 | 479.8 |
| A-Triple | 591.8 | 563.7 | 552.2 | 548.2 | 548.4 | 551.6 | 557.0 | 564.4 | 573.4 | 584.0 |
| Double B-Double | 602.3 | 574.9 | 564.4 | 561.5 | 563.0 | 567.8 | 575.1 | 584.5 | 595.9 | 609.0 |

Double B-Double

| 602.3 | 574.9 | 564.4 | 561.5 | 563.0 | 567.8 | 575.1 | 584.5 | 5959 | 609.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient = 6\%; Curvature = Curvy/Hilly/Winding ( 120 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | IRI $=7$, NRM = 184; Gradient $=6 \%$; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle class | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 33.6 | 30.5 | 29.0 | 28.4 | 28.1 | 28.1 | 28.3 | 28.6 | 29.1 | 29.7 | 33.6 | 30.5 | 29.1 | 28.5 | 28.2 | 28.2 | 28.4 | 28.7 | 29.2 | 29.7 |
| Medium Car | 46.2 | 41.3 | 39.0 | 37.8 | 37.2 | 36.9 | 36.8 | 37.0 | 37.3 | 37.8 | 46.2 | 41.4 | 39.1 | 37.9 | 37.3 | 37.0 | 37.0 | 37.1 | 37.4 | 37.8 |
| Large Car | 60.9 | 54.2 | 50.9 | 49.2 | 48.2 | 47.6 | 47.4 | 47.4 | 47.5 | 47.9 | 60.8 | 54.3 | 51.1 | 49.4 | 48.4 | 47.8 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 47.6 | 47.9 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 55.8 | 51.8 | 49.8 | 48.7 | 48.0 | 47.5 | 47.2 | 47.0 | 46.9 | 46.9 | 55.8 | 51.8 | 49.9 | 48.8 | 48.1 | 47.7 | 47.4 | 47.2 | 47.1 | 47.1 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 57.7 | 53.3 | 51.3 | 50.3 | 49.8 | 49.7 | 49.7 | 50.0 | 50.4 | 50.9 | 57.6 | 53.4 | 51.5 | 50.5 | 50.1 | 50.0 | 50.2 | 50.6 | 51.2 | 51.8 |
| Light Rigid | 74.8 | 70.6 | 68.8 | 67.9 | 67.6 | 67.6 | 67.9 | 68.4 | 69.1 | 69.9 | 74.7 | 70.7 | 68.9 | 68.1 | 67.7 | 67.6 | 67.8 | 68.2 | 68.7 | 69.3 |
| Medium Rigid | 98.9 | 91.5 | 88.1 | 86.3 | 85.4 | 85.0 | 85.1 | 85.4 | 85.9 | 86.7 | 98.6 | 91.7 | 88.4 | 86.7 | 85.8 | 85.4 | 85.4 | 85.6 | 86.0 | 86.6 |
| Heavy Rigid | 162.9 | 151.6 | 146.1 | 143.0 | 141.0 | 139.9 | 139.2 | 138.8 | 138.8 | 138.9 | 162.8 | 151.6 | 146.4 | 143.6 | 142.1 | 141.4 | 141.3 | 141.6 | 142.3 | 143.2 |
| Heavy Bus | 212.0 | 198.0 | 190.3 | 185.0 | 180.7 | 176.8 | 173.1 | 169.4 | 165.6 | 161.7 | 211.9 | 198.1 | 190.5 | 185.4 | 181.3 | 177.8 | 174.4 | 171.1 | 167.8 | 164.3 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 226.2 | 211.8 | 205.0 | 201.2 | 198.9 | 197.7 | 197.1 | 197.0 | 197.2 | 197.8 | 225.7 | 212.2 | 205.8 | 202.5 | 200.8 | 200.1 | 200.1 | 200.6 | 201.6 | 202.9 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 252.4 | 237.4 | 230.5 | 226.9 | 225.2 | 224.5 | 224.7 | 225.4 | 226.7 | 228.3 | 251.9 | 237.6 | 231.2 | 228.2 | 227.1 | 227.2 | 228.2 | 229.9 | 232.2 | 235.0 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 273.4 | 257.9 | 250.6 | 246.9 | 245.0 | 244.3 | 244.3 | 245.0 | 246.3 | 247.9 | 273.0 | 258.0 | 251.3 | 248.2 | 247.1 | 247.2 | 248.2 | 250.0 | 252.4 | 255.4 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 313.1 | 298.2 | 291.4 | 288.0 | 286.4 | 285.9 | 286.4 | 287.4 | 289.0 | 291.1 | 312.6 | 298.4 | 292.3 | 289.6 | 288.9 | 289.5 | 291.0 | 293.4 | 296.4 | 300.0 |
| B-Double | 349.1 | 332.0 | 323.8 | 319.3 | 316.6 | 315.2 | 314.6 | 314.5 | 314.9 | 315.7 | 348.7 | 332.3 | 324.8 | 321.0 | 319.2 | 318.7 | 319.1 | 320.2 | 321.8 | 324.0 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 348.5 | 331.9 | 324.1 | 320.2 | 318.2 | 317.5 | 317.7 | 318.6 | 320.1 | 322.0 | 348.1 | 332.2 | 325.2 | 322.0 | 321.0 | 321.3 | 322.7 | 324.9 | 327.8 | 331.4 |
| A-Double | 437.8 | 417.0 | 406.5 | 400.2 | 396.0 | 393.0 | 390.8 | 389.0 | 387.6 | 386.4 | 437.3 | 417.5 | 407.8 | 402.1 | 398.4 | 395.9 | 394.2 | 393.0 | 392.2 | 391.7 |
| B Triple | 494.3 | 469.1 | 455.9 | 447.4 | 441.1 | 435.9 | 431.4 | 427.2 | 423.1 | 419.1 | 493.8 | 469.8 | 457.3 | 449.1 | 443.1 | 438.1 | 433.6 | 429.5 | 425.5 | 421.5 |
| A B Combination | 514.0 | 490.1 | 479.7 | 474.9 | 473.4 | 474.0 | 476.2 | 479.6 | 484.1 | 489.5 | 513.8 | 491.2 | 481.7 | 478.1 | 477.7 | 479.6 | 483.2 | 488.2 | 494.4 | 501.8 |
| A-Triple | 591.5 | 564.8 | 554.6 | 551.8 | 553.5 | 558.3 | 565.6 | 575.0 | 586.3 | 599.4 | 591.5 | 566.3 | 557.5 | 556.3 | 559.8 | 566.7 | 576.3 | 588.3 | 602.5 | 618.7 |
| Double B-Double | 602.1 | 576.1 | 566.9 | 565.5 | 568.8 | 575.5 | 584.9 | 596.8 | 610.9 | 627.0 | 602.0 | 577.7 | 570.1 | 570.5 | 576.0 | 585.1 | 597.3 | 612.4 | 629.9 | 649.9 |

Table 97 Vehicle operating costs for rural roads (cents/km) - D16

| IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient = 8\%; Curvature = Straight (20 degrees / km) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 34.7 | 31.5 | 30.0 | 29.2 | 28.9 | 28.8 | 28.9 | 29.1 | 29.4 | 29.9 |
| Medium Car | 47.6 | 42.6 | 40.3 | 39.0 | 38.2 | 37.8 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 37.7 | 38.0 |
| Large Car | 62.5 | 55.6 | 52.3 | 50.4 | 49.3 | 48.6 | 48.3 | 48.1 | 48.1 | 48.3 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 58.1 | 54.2 | 52.3 | 51.1 | 50.2 | 49.6 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 48.1 | 47.7 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 60.0 | 55.9 | 53.9 | 52.8 | 52.1 | 51.7 | 51.4 | 51.3 | 51.2 | 51.3 |
| Light Rigid | 79.8 | 75.4 | 73.4 | 72.4 | 71.8 | 71.6 | 71.6 | 71.7 | 72.0 | 72.5 |
| Medium Rigid | 107.3 | 99.9 | 96.4 | 94.4 | 93.4 | 92.8 | 92.6 | 92.6 | 92.9 | 93.3 |
| Heavy Rigid | 187.5 | 175.3 | 169.3 | 165.6 | 163.2 | 161.4 | 160.1 | 159.1 | 158.3 | 157.6 |
| Heavy Bus | 230.5 | 216.6 | 208.5 | 202.3 | 196.9 | 191.6 | 186.3 | 180.7 | 174.9 | 168.6 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 263.1 | 246.3 | 238.0 | 233.2 | 230.2 | 228.2 | 226.9 | 226.0 | 225.5 | 225.3 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 294.0 | 277.3 | 269.2 | 264.6 | 261.9 | 260.3 | 259.4 | 259.0 | 259.1 | 259.4 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 319.2 | 302.0 | 293.6 | 288.8 | 285.8 | 284.0 | 282.9 | 282.4 | 282.2 | 282.4 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 375.3 | 357.6 | 349.6 | 345.7 | 344.0 | 343.7 | 344.5 | 346.0 | 348.2 | 351.1 |
| B-Double | 415.4 | 395.1 | 385.6 | 380.5 | 377.7 | 376.4 | 376.1 | 376.6 | 377.7 | 379.3 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 417.5 | 397.9 | 388.9 | 384.3 | 382.1 | 381.4 | 381.8 | 383.0 | 384.9 | 387.3 |
| A-Double | 522.8 | 497.8 | 487.2 | 482.8 | 481.9 | 483.4 | 486.7 | 491.5 | 497.5 | 504.7 |
| B Triple | 582.5 | 552.7 | 539.7 | 534.0 | 532.3 | 533.2 | 536.1 | 540.7 | 546.6 | 553.7 |
| A B Combination | 617.6 | 591.9 | 584.9 | 586.8 | 594.5 | 606.6 | 622.4 | 641.5 | 663.8 | 689.0 |
| A-Triple | 714.0 | 687.7 | 684.6 | 693.4 | 710.4 | 734.0 | 763.3 | 798.0 | 837.7 | 882.3 |
| Double B-Double | 729.6 | 704.6 | 703.0 | 713.6 | 732.7 | 758.7 | 790.9 | 828.8 | 872.1 | 920.7 |


| Double B-Double | 729.6 | 704.6 | 703.0 | 713.6 | 732.7 | 758.7 | 790 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IRI = 7, NRM = 184; Gradient $=8 \%$; Curvature $=$ Curvy/Hilly/Winding (120 degrees $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Vehicle class | Speed $(\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{hr})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| Small Car | 34.6 | 31.5 | 30.0 | 29.3 | 28.9 | 28.8 | 28.9 | 29.1 | 29.3 | 29.7 |
| Medium Car | 47.5 | 42.7 | 40.4 | 39.1 | 38.3 | 37.8 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 37.6 | 37.8 |
| Large Car | 62.5 | 55.7 | 52.4 | 50.5 | 49.4 | 48.7 | 48.3 | 48.1 | 48.0 | 48.1 |
| Courier Van-Utility | 58.0 | 54.3 | 52.3 | 51.1 | 50.2 | 49.6 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 48.1 | 47.7 |
| 4WD Mid-Size Petrol | 60.0 | 56.0 | 54.0 | 52.8 | 52.1 | 51.7 | 51.4 | 51.3 | 51.2 | 51.2 |
| Light Rigid | 79.6 | 75.5 | 73.5 | 72.4 | 71.8 | 71.5 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 71.5 | 71.7 |
| Medium Rigid | 107.1 | 99.9 | 96.5 | 94.5 | 93.4 | 92.8 | 92.4 | 92.4 | 92.5 | 92.7 |
| Heavy Rigid | 187.4 | 175.3 | 169.4 | 165.8 | 163.5 | 161.9 | 160.7 | 159.9 | 159.2 | 158.8 |
| Heavy Bus | 230.4 | 216.6 | 208.4 | 202.3 | 196.8 | 191.6 | 186.2 | 180.6 | 174.7 | 168.4 |
| Artic 4 Axle | 262.4 | 246.7 | 239.0 | 234.4 | 231.5 | 229.5 | 228.2 | 227.2 | 226.6 | 226.2 |
| Artic 5 Axle | 293.3 | 277.4 | 269.9 | 265.7 | 263.4 | 262.1 | 261.6 | 261.6 | 262.1 | 262.9 |
| Artic 6 Axle | 318.5 | 302.0 | 294.2 | 289.9 | 287.4 | 286.1 | 285.5 | 285.5 | 285.9 | 286.7 |
| Rigid + 5 Axle Dog | 374.6 | 358.0 | 350.7 | 347.5 | 346.5 | 346.9 | 348.5 | 351.0 | 354.2 | 358.0 |
| B-Double | 414.7 | 395.5 | 386.7 | 382.3 | 380.2 | 379.5 | 380.0 | 381.2 | 383.2 | 385.7 |
| Twin steer+5 Axle Dog | 416.8 | 398.3 | 390.0 | 386.1 | 384.6 | 384.6 | 385.7 | 387.8 | 390.6 | 394.0 |
| A-Double | 522.2 | 498.7 | 489.2 | 486.0 | 486.3 | 489.2 | 494.1 | 500.5 | 508.5 | 517.7 |
| B Triple | 582.1 | 553.9 | 542.2 | 537.8 | 537.5 | 540.0 | 544.7 | 551.2 | 559.2 | 568.7 |
| A B Combination | 617.4 | 593.7 | 588.5 | 592.6 | 602.8 | 617.7 | 636.7 | 659.5 | 685.8 | 715.4 |
| A-Triple | 714.4 | 690.7 | 690.2 | 702.0 | 722.4 | 750.0 | 783.9 | 823.7 | 869.1 | 920.1 |
| Double B-Double | 729.9 | 707.6 | 708.7 | 722.4 | 745.2 | 775.5 | 812.5 | 855.9 | 905.3 | 960.6 |


| Use this page to look up VOC values for the following highlighted road <br> conditions |
| :--- |
| Gradient (Rise and <br> fall) |
| Curvature (Terrain <br> type) |
| Straight (0-99'/km) $2 \%$ |

IRI =7, NRM =184; Gradient = 8\%; Curvature = Very Curvy/Very Winding(300-320 degrees / km)

| Speed (km/hr) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 30 |


| Speed (km/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 | 110 |
| 34.6 | 31.5 | 30.1 | 29.4 | 29.0 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 29.0 | 29.2 | 29.5 |
| 47.4 | 42.8 | 40.5 | 39.2 | 38.4 | 37.9 | 37.6 | 37.5 | 37.4 | 37.5 |
| 62.3 | 55.8 | 52.6 | 50.7 | 49.5 | 48.8 | 48.3 | 48.0 | 47.8 | 47.7 |
| 58.0 | 54.3 | 52.3 | 51.2 | 50.3 | 49.7 | 49.2 | 48.8 | 48.4 | 48.1 |
| 60.0 | 56.0 | 54.1 | 53.0 | 52.3 | 51.9 | 51.7 | 51.7 | 51.7 | 51.8 |
| 79.5 | 75.6 | 73.7 | 72.6 | 71.9 | 71.5 | 71.2 | 71.1 | 71.0 | 71.0 |
| 106.9 | 100.0 | 96.7 | 94.8 | 93.6 | 92.9 | 92.5 | 92.3 | 92.2 | 92.3 |
| 187.1 | 175.4 | 169.8 | 166.7 | 164.9 | 163.8 | 163.3 | 163.1 | 163.3 | 163.7 |
| 230.3 | 216.6 | 208.6 | 202.5 | 197.2 | 192.1 | 186.9 | 181.5 | 175.8 | 169.7 |
| 262.0 | 247.5 | 240.4 | 236.2 | 233.6 | 231.9 | 230.7 | 230.0 | 229.5 | 229.3 |
| 292.8 | 277.9 | 271.0 | 267.5 | 265.7 | 265.1 | 265.3 | 266.0 | 267.3 | 269.0 |
| 317.9 | 302.4 | 295.3 | 291.6 | 289.9 | 289.3 | 289.6 | 290.6 | 292.1 | 294.0 |
| 374.3 | 358.8 | 352.4 | 350.0 | 349.9 | 351.4 | 354.2 | 357.9 | 362.6 | 368.0 |
| 414.2 | 396.3 | 388.3 | 384.7 | 383.4 | 383.6 | 385.1 | 387.4 | 390.5 | 394.3 |
| 416.4 | 399.1 | 391.8 | 388.7 | 388.1 | 389.2 | 391.5 | 394.8 | 399.0 | 404.0 |
| 522.2 | 500.1 | 491.9 | 490.0 | 491.8 | 496.3 | 503.0 | 511.4 | 521.6 | 533.3 |
| 581.9 | 555.5 | 545.2 | 542.2 | 543.5 | 547.8 | 554.5 | 563.1 | 573.6 | 585.8 |
| 617.7 | 596.2 | 593.3 | 600.1 | 613.4 | 632.0 | 655.2 | 682.7 | 714.2 | 749.6 |
| 715.1 | 694.2 | 697.0 | 712.6 | 737.6 | 770.6 | 810.6 | 857.3 | 910.4 | 969.8 |
| 730.8 | 711.5 | 716.0 | 733.8 | 761.5 | 797.4 | 841.0 | 891.7 | 949.3 | 1013.6 |

Table 98 Fuel consumption for rural roads (L/100km)


## Appendix E Key indices

Table 99 Key indices for back-casting and forecasting

| Indices | Actuals |  |  |  |  |  | Forecast |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | 2022-23 |
| CPI Sydney | 105.23 | 107.25 | 108.88 | 111.08 | 113.35 | 114.75 | 117.05 | 119.68 | 122.37 | 125.43 |
| CPI Private Motoring | 102.33 | 98.65 | 97.23 | 97.23 | 100.00 | 101.83 | 103.86 | 106.20 | 108.59 | 111.30 |
| CPI Maintenance \& Repair | 103.00 | 101.43 | 104.55 | 105.43 | 106.55 | 108.00 | 110.16 | 112.64 | 115.17 | 118.05 |
| CPI Motor vehicles | 95.55 | 95.68 | 97.20 | 95.15 | 93.48 | 92.73 | 94.58 | 96.71 | 98.88 | 101.36 |
| AWE NSW (\$) | 1440.05 | 1502.20 | 1534.15 | 1540.80 | 1585.90 | 1614.10 | 1654.45 | 1699.95 | 1750.95 | 1803.48 |
| PPI road freight | 106.28 | 107.20 | 105.45 | 106.53 | 108.60 | 111.00 | 113.22 | 115.77 | 118.37 | 121.33 |
| Fuel cost exc GST (cent/L) petrol | 90.56 | 75.71 | 61.76 | 60.25 | 68.74 | 69.94 | 71.34 | 72.95 | 74.59 | 76.45 |
| Fuel cost exc GST (cent/L) diesel | 93.99 | 76.23 | 57.26 | 58.68 | 69.02 | 70.23 | 71.64 | 73.25 | 74.90 | 76.77 |

Sources: Estimated by Evaluation and Assurance, TfNSW. (1) ABS Series ID A2325806K. CPI forecast from 2019/20 NSW Treasury Budget Paper 1. (2) ABS Series ID
A2326616R. Assume growth by Sydney CPI 2019/20 NSW Treasury Budget Paper 1. (3) ABS Series ID A2328771A. Assume growth by Sydney CPI 2019/20 NSW Treasury
Budget Paper 1. (4) ABS Series ID A2328591T. Assume growth by Sydney CPI 2017/18 NSW Treasury Budget Paper 1. (5) ABS Series ID A84994877K. Assume growth by NSW wage price index from NSW Treasury Budget Paper 1. (6) ABS Series ID A2314058K. Assume growth by Sydney CPI 2017/18 NSW Treasury Budget Paper 1. (7) Average of actual Sydney monthly fuel prices from Exxon Mobil TGP. Assume growth by Sydney CPI 2019/20 NSW Treasury Budget Paper 1.
Note: * 2018-19 data escalated to June 2019.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The National Association of Australian State Road Authorities is now Austroads.

[^1]:    2 BITRE (2007) Estimating urban traffic and congestion cost trends in Australian cities. Working paper 71, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics. Values indexed from June 2005 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).

[^2]:    3 BITRE (2016) Estimating urban traffic and congestion cost trends in Australian cities. Working paper 74, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics Values indexed from June 2010 prices to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325846C).
    4 This method was originally developed by PwC Australia.
    5 BITRE (2007) Estimating urban traffic and congestion cost trends in Australian cities. Working paper 71, Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics.

[^3]:    Sources: *Guide to Project Evaluation, Part 4, Project Evaluation Data, Austroads, 2012; ** North West Rail Economic Evaluation.
    Values indexed to June 2019 prices (ABS Series ID A2325806K).
    Note: Noise externalities and urban separation are not applicable for rural areas.

[^4]:    Source: (Douglas Economics, 2008)

