

Consultation on the Implementation Report of the Environmental Noise Directive (END) and on the EU Noise Policy

Who are you?	
In which capacity are you participating in this consultation? -single choice reply- (compulsory)	As an organisation
Please specify the type of your organisation: -single choice reply- (compulsory)	NGO, civil society, environmental group, charity
Please give the name of the organisation which you represent: -open reply- (compulsory)	BI "Liesing gegen Fluglärm und die 3. Piste"
Please give your name (Title, First Name, Last Name): -open reply- (compulsory)	Dr. Martin Tögel
Please indicate the country where you reside: -single choice reply- (compulsory)	Austria
1 - Policy context	
How important to your quality of life is the level of noise in your surroundings? -single choice reply- (optional)	
Noise from neighbours -single choice reply- (optional)	3
Noise from bars or restaurants or shops in your vicinity -single choice reply- (optional)	5
Noise from motor vehicles -single choice reply- (optional)	2
Noise from aircrafts -single choice reply- (optional)	1
Noise from trains -single choice reply- (optional)	3
Noise from industrial installations -single choice reply- (optional)	4
Other -single choice reply- (optional)	
If you chose "other", please specify: -open reply- (optional)	
What do you think of the level of noise	Moderate

<p>pollution near your home? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	
<p>How much do you know about the environmental noise legislation in your country? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Much</p>
<p>EU legislation on noise includes directives that provide a framework for monitoring and where necessary reducing environmental noise and directives that control the level of noise emissions from specific sources. How much do you know about the relevant EU noise legislation (which is an important basis for national legislation)? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Much</p>
<p>2 - Strategy/approach of the environmental noise directive (END)</p>	
<p>The use of noise mapping, the preparation of action plans and the reporting to the public and to the EU: -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>A little</p>
<p>Noise limit values: -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>Moderately</p>
<p>If you do not consider the current approach to limit values appropriate, which of the following alternatives would in your view be best: -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>3) EU limit value (if the value is exceeded in any location, action must be taken and the value must be attained)</p>
<p>If you wish to outline an alternative position or expand on the issue please do so. -open reply-(optional)</p>	
<p>EU limit value (if the value is exceeded in any location, action must be taken and the value must be attained)</p>	
<p>The END aims at providing a basis for developing (separate) EU measures to reduce noise emitted by major sources, in particular road and rail vehicles and associated infrastructure, aircraft, outdoor and industrial equipment and mobile machinery. Do you think that the END has provided a good basis for developing source-based regulatory measures? -single choice reply-(optional)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p></p>	

Please explain your reply in both cases; particularly if no, please suggest how the END could serve this aim in a better manner? -open reply-(optional)

The END aims at protecting areas within and outside cities where the noise quality is good.

Are you aware of any quiet areas in the vicinity of your home?

-single choice reply-(optional)

3 - Assessment/reporting

Are you aware of any noise mapping in your city, region or country?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Much

If yes, do you consider that the results of maps accurately reflect the reality of noise exposure in your city or region?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Poorly

In 2008, Commission efforts started on developing harmonized methods for assessing noise exposure. A project entitled "CNOSSOS-EU" (Common Noise Assessment Methods in Europe) led by DG Environment and DG Joint Research Centre provided the technical basis for preparing an agreed method to be used by MS in future rounds of noise mapping.

Are you aware of CNOSSOS-EU?

-single choice reply-(optional)

No

If yes, and based on your current understanding, do you think that the CNOSSOS-EU methodological framework will improve comparability and consistency in strategic noise mapping in the EU? -single choice reply-

(optional)

Do you think that the 5 years cycle in between the noise mapping rounds is appropriate?

-single choice reply-(optional)

No

Please explain your reply: -open reply-(optional)

Do you consider the period of one year between making the noise maps and drawing up the action plans is sufficient? -single choice reply-(optional)

No

Please explain your reply: -open reply-(optional)

The European Environment Agency's tool Reportnet has been developed since 2000. Reportnet was initially used for reporting environmental data to the European Environment Agency, but now also hosts some of DG Environment's reporting tasks, including those related to the Environmental Noise Directive and its associated compliance checks.

No

Do you support the idea to make Reportnet the mandatory reporting tool to submit information to the Commission pursuant to the END?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Please explain your reply: -open reply-(optional)

According to the latest WHO recommendations, adverse health effects due to night time noise exposure can commence to occur at 40 dB Lnight. The current reporting neglects the fact that there is a considerable share of EU population exposed to noise pollution at levels lower than 50 dB which are still likely to cause harmful effects on health. Though, the current noise assessment methods do not allow assessing accurately exposure to such low levels.

Yes

Would it result in any benefit to lower the reporting thresholds according to WHO recommendations?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Please explain your reply: -open reply-(optional)

Air craft noise can be calculated for 40 dBA LEQ and below for day, evening and night. And there has been found a linear increase in health risk starting for every Decibel above 35,25 dBA LEQ(24h) and 40 dBA LEQ(6-22h) respectively.

A number of possible technical improvements to

Yes

the END were identified including clarifications of the definitions and obligations related to agglomerations, quiet areas, major roads, major railways, major airports, industrial noise and action plans.

Do you think that a revision of these definitions or unclear provisions needs to be done?

-single choice reply-(optional)

If yes, in what time frame? -single choice reply-(optional)

One year

If you wish, you can give your view in your own words here: -open reply-(optional)

Could the INSPIRE Directive (OJ L 108/1, 25.04.2007. p1) be used as a basis when modifying the data needed of END?

No opinion

-single choice reply-(optional)

If you wish, you can give your view in your own words here: -open reply-(optional)

4 - Noise management in Member States

Do you agree that the END has had sufficient impact in your country/region to reduce noise levels so far?

-single choice reply-(optional)

Totally disagree

Do you think that the EU should have more influence regarding measures within Member States? -single choice reply-

(optional)

More influence

If yes, please indicate in what way the EU should take a more active role: -open reply-(optional)

Die angegebenen Lärmwerte müssen korrekt sein und bis zu jenem Niveau gehen, wo Lärm störend und damit ziemlich sicher gesundheitsschädlich ist. Es darf nicht sein, dass Lärmkarten von Österreich erstellt werden, wo es auf Grund viel zu hoher Grenzwerte nur 7 Fluglärm-betroffene rund um einen Großflughafen gibt, während in Wahrheit 100.000e betroffen sind. Gebiete mit zahlreichen Beschwerden und Bürgerinitiativen gegen Fluglärm wie Wien-Liesing oder Wien-Favoriten müssen jedenfalls vollständig erfasst sein.

Many aspects of the Directive were not prescribed in detail or leave room for interpretation. Many Member States suggested that these issues could be addressed through dedicated action assisting in the implementation and compliance at EU level,

such as the development of guidance documents, the information exchange of best practices or the organisation for specific workshops and training courses.

Are you aware of any guidance documents, internet pages or workshops related to noise mapping or action planning? If yes please specify. -open reply-(optional)

Do you think there are synergies in air quality and noise management that should be better exploited in EU policy?

Yes

-single choice reply-(optional)

If yes, please indicate how: -open reply-(optional)

Aircraft and road traffic are responsible for noise and dangerous particle emissions. An Aviation fuel tax or other measure leading to better cost transparency would minimize both.

5 - Public information and dissemination

...in your neighbourhood? -single choice reply-(optional)

Somewhat too little

...in your region? -single choice reply-(optional)

Somewhat too little

...in the EU? -single choice reply-(optional)

Somewhat too little

Has the population been consulted by the relevant authorities in your country concerning noise mapping and action planning? -single choice reply-(optional)

No

Do you consider that products including private vehicles and outdoor equipment should be labelled according to their noise emission level, so that consumers are appropriately informed? -single choice reply-(optional)

Yes

Do you think that dwellings in residential areas should have a noise label, similar to the energy label? -single choice reply-(optional)

Yes

6 - Governance

How effective has the EU noise legislation (END) been as a driver for national, regional and local authorities to take action for reducing noise exposure where needed? -single choice reply-
(optional)

Not at all effective

7 - Your most important issues

If you have a view on improvements of the directive and that you would like to be considered in the review, please describe it in your own words in the text box below. Please express your view concisely, in less than 300 words and preferably in English, German or French.

You may wish to comment on:

- *Overall approach of the EU noise policy*
- *Consistency with other policy fields*
- *The concept of guideline, threshold, target, limit values*
- *The concept of exposure reduction targets*
- *Link to the source legislations (e.g.: noise from cars or trains)*
- *Reporting*
- *Guidance on action planning and quiet areas*
- *The added value of the CNOSSOS-EU methodological framework over existing noise assessment methodologies used in EU Member States*
- *Differences between Member States in taking action where noise reduction is needed*
- *Public information*
- *Public participation (e.g.: on development of noise action plans)*

If you wish you can give your view in your own words here: -open reply-(optional)

Die Anzahl der Fluglärm-betroffene ist im Sinne des ausgewogenen Ansatzes auf möglichst wenig Personen zu reduzieren, welche fair zu entschädigen sind. Fluglärm ist besonders schädlich, er beinhaltet die besonders schädlichen tiefen Frequenzen und er kommt von oben, keine Schallschutzmauer hilft. Die derzeitige EU-Umgebungslärmrichtlinie und ihre Umsetzung in nationales Recht schafft es nicht, die gesundheitlichen Schäden durch Fluglärm abzuwenden. Die österreichische Regierung hat die Lärmschwellenwerte (statt Lärmgrenzwerten) für Fluglärm viel zu hoch angesetzt (höher als anderer, weniger störender Verkehrslärm). Die WHO empfiehlt hingegen bei Lärm viel tiefere Werte und zusätzlich sagt sie, dass bei einem Anteil von tiefen Frequenzen, sowie bei intermittierendem Lärm noch strengere Grenzwerte anzunehmen wären. Die besonders lärmempfindlichen Kinder werden nicht berücksichtigt (diese sind weder in Kindergärten noch Schulen noch im eigenen Garten vor zu hohem Lärm geschützt) Die externen Kosten für Krankheiten die durch Lärm entstehen und die Wertvernichtung der Liegenschaften werden nicht berücksichtigt. Bedenkenlos sind Flugrouten quer über die dichtbevölkerte Stadt Wien gelegt worden und sie sollen nach dem Bau der 3. Piste noch dichter befliegen werden. Mit Dauerschallpegeln werden die gesundheitlichen und wirtschaftlichen Belastungen der betroffenen Menschen nicht genügend berücksichtigt. Menschen reagieren auf die Anzahl und Intensität der Einzelschallereignisse und daran müssen sich Lärmobergrenzen orientieren. So wird bei den Überflügen eine Verdoppelung der Einzelschallereignisse, da sie ja hintereinander passieren, als Verdoppelung der Lärmbelastung empfunden. Das entspräche einer Zunahme um 10 dB und nicht, wie nach der derzeitigen Leq

Berechnung, einer Zunahme um nur 3 dB (wie korrekter Weise bei 2 gleichzeitigen Schallquellen). Vor allem müssen die Ergebnisse neuer Gesundheitsstudien zu Lärmbelastungen in der Umgebungsrichtlinie berücksichtigt werden. Das persönliche Leid und die Behandlungskosten für durch Fluglärm entstehende Krankheit wie Bluthochdruck, erhöhtes Schlaganfall-Risiko und sogar Krebs usw. - siehe Studien von Prof. Dr. E. Greiser, sind höher zu bewerten als wirtschaftlicher Gewinn der Fluglobby. Der aktuelle Kommissionsvorschlag für lärmbedingte Betriebsbeschränkungen auf Flughäfen widerspricht jedenfalls den Bemühungen zum Lärmschutz, er verharmlost die Gesundheitsgefährdung durch Lärm. Er ist abzulehnen.

8 - Your own involvement

As an individual, what are you prepared to do to reduce noise exposure?

Please tick as appropriate:

-multiple choices reply-(optional)