

Summary:

Value of time, safety and environment in passenger transport - Description of data

Data collection for the main parts of the valuation study was organised in these parts:

Wave 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Valuation of travel time, travel time reliability and comfort factors
Wave 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Valuation of loss of life and health in road accidents, and of insecurity• Valuation of loss of life and health in road accidents and because of emissions to air• Study belonging to another project: Valuation of security measures and threats in railway and air transport
Independent of waves 1 and 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Valuation of the loss of life and health caused by emissions to air

The data collection method was a self-administered Internet-based questionnaire that was sent to an Internet panel. Those who completed wave 1, received some days later one of the three parts of wave 2. A group that did not take part in wave 1 received a separate questionnaire concerning emissions to air.

Wave 1 was sent to 47 000 panel members, and 9280 of these completed this part of the study. Wave 2 had approximately 7500 respondents, about 1000 of which got a questionnaire concerning a related project which is not covered here. The separate questionnaire on air quality was sent to 7667 panelists and resulted in 2108 complete answers.

The idea behind the set-up in two waves was to get a data set with respondents that had completed valuation of both time savings and road safety, both valuations being pivoted around the same reference trip. An error committed by a sub-contractor broke the connection between the waves, as some of the respondents of wave 2 got questions and choices based on another respondent's reference trip. Thus the usefulness of the data concerning road safety and insecurity was considerably reduced. Other parts of the survey were not affected. To correct the error, new data were collected in the spring of 2010. This time, the original intention of the two-wave set-up was taken care of, also in the studies of road safety and insecurity.

The supplementary study of 2010 resulted in 7082 respondents, of which 2342 took part in the study of the value of road safety in car travel, 621 in the study of

the value of road safety in bus travel, 1573 in the study of road safety in cycling and 2544 in a multimodal study of traffic safety.

Some of the wave 2 data of 2009 were not affected by the mailing error, as it did not base itself on a reference trip from wave 1. This is the joint valuation of traffic safety and the loss of health from bad air quality. This 2009 survey had 2574 respondents, of which 1271 got a variant of the questionnaire where the cause of death (emissions to air or accident) was not identified at the start of the survey, while 1303 got a variant that identified the cause.

Characteristics of the respondents and the trips of wave 1 were compared with similar data from the Norwegian Travel Survey of 2005. There was a tendency of underrepresentation of the youngest cohort (18-24 years) and a slightly higher income level in our sample than in the Travel Survey, even after adjusting the latter for income growth since 2005. The results with respect to age composition, income composition and trip lengths were used for weighting in the analyses of the value of travel time savings for different modes and trip lengths.

For the valuation of life and health in the context of emissions to air, the sample should represent the entire Norwegian population, not only the travellers. We found the sample to be sufficiently representative even without weighting.