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Top 10 most silent vehicles
(source: informal doc 3 GRB feb 2000)

- Most silent car is a sports car
  - 9.7 dB under the limit!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Noise Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NISSAN</td>
<td>200SX - S14 Series</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NISSAN</td>
<td>QX - A 32 Series 2L</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NISSAN</td>
<td>QX - A 32 Series 3L</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PEUGEOT</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MERCEDES-BENZ</td>
<td>C-Class Estate (S202) Diesel</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERCEDES-BENZ</td>
<td>C-Class Saloon (W202) Diesel</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MITSUBISHI</td>
<td>Space Wagon - N84 Series</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOLVO</td>
<td>S/V70 Model Year 2000</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VOLVO</td>
<td>C70 Coupé/Convertible Model Year</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCC SMART</td>
<td>MCC Smart Coupé (MC01)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relation between price and noise

- Loud vehicles are more expensive!
ACEA study

COSTS – BENEFITS

Reaction on TNO feasibility and effect study
1999(?) New method born

Statements mr Ehinger (Porsche)

If you want more silent traffic: you need this method.

With this method industry will press tyre manufacturers to produce more silent tyres.
Calculations FIGE

Calculation scenarios - noise reduction potential of various solutions roads with a speed of 50 km/h

Steven Sept. 2000
ACEA study (expert opinion)

• The general approach of calculating benefits for noise is rather standard, and as can be expected every possibility is used to keep benefits low:

• Only WTP value: no estimate for health (DALY’s or addition of night noise reduction)

• 25€/dB: the 2001 figure should be corrected for inflation

• Threshold: is 50 dB, so again an underestimate. It is true that the 50-55 is more difficult to obtain from EU-data, but extrapolations from other data could be used.

• The effect of limit reduction is likely to effect the whole distribution, making the final effect larger (eg 5 dB lower limit only 2 dB fleet reduction?)
All in all, the benefits are likely to be underestimated by a factor 2
ACEA study 2 (expert opinion)

The ACEA costs calculation had to adopt some very disputable assumptions to arrive at the astronomic figures for reducing noise. For example, the list of additional costs contain quite a number of measures which are already common. Actually leaving them out would cost more than introducing them. These costs then are thought to persist for 20 years. It is not easy to explain that the development of an absorbing layer continues to burden the manufacturer for 20 years.
ACEA study 3 (expert opinion)

In short:
The undescriminate application of these assumptions lead to a caricature of CBA.
THANK YOU
Mercedes fight to fulfill the limits
Effects of changes in the method

84/372/EEC measure "sportscars" in 3rd gear

assumed introduction 5 speed gearboxes
assumed introduction absorbing test track
96/20/EEC allowance worn tyres

81/334/EEC measure in 2+3 gear
92/97/EEC introduction ISO surface

Limit
VW Polo 33 kW (model year 1998)
Mercedes C 142 kW (model year 1998)