

concept

Morten Welde, Eivind Tveter and
Anne Gudrun Mork

Road projects and local economic impacts

Concept report no. 62



transport
policy
centre
report

Morten Welde, Eivind Tveter and
Anne Gudrun Mork

Road projects and local economic impacts

Concept report no. 62

Concept report no. 62

Road projects and local economic impacts

Morten Welde

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Eivind Tvetter

Møreforskning

Anne Gudrun Mork

Møreforskning

ISSN: 0803-9763 (paper version)

ISSN: 0804-5588 (web version)

ISBN: 978-82-93253-96-9 (paper version)

ISBN: 978-82-93253-97-6 (web version)

© Concept Research Programme. The publication may be quoted freely with attribution

DATE: December 2020

PUBLISHER: Ex ante academic press

Concept Research Programme

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

7491 NTNU – Trondheim

Norway

www.ntnu.no/concept

The responsibility for the information in the reports produced on behalf of the Concept Research Programme is on the commissioned party. Views and conclusions is on account of the authors and not necessarily identical to the views of the Concept Research Programme. All contributions are reviewed in a peer review process.

English summary

This study attempts to document the actual impacts of a sample of road projects. We use different indicators to measure local economic growth and other impacts to which there is political interest. We do not look at wider economic impacts for regions or for the whole country, those can be small and difficult to measure, but rather at impacts for individual municipalities in the area of influence for the road projects that we are studying.

This is an important topic for several reasons. On the one hand, the large government investments in new road and railway projects indicate that there is a need to document the impacts that these projects have. It is important for the realism of plans and goals, and to say something about what it takes for projects to succeed. But it is also important for the public debate, which is partly characterized by assumptions and based on weak documentation of the conclusions drawn. There is a striking imbalance between the number of studies on what we estimate or believe will happen if a project is realized, and studies that document actual results afterwards.

In Chapter 2, we first review how the effects and impacts of road investments normally are calculated. We describe the main content of the impact assessments that are carried out for all large road projects and the role that cost-benefit analysis (CBA) plays in these.

The Norwegian Public Roads Administration, and the other public transport agencies, spend significant resources on CBAs, but several studies have shown that the practical use of the results in actual project selection is limited.

One of the reasons for the lack of use of CBA results in project selection, may be a perception that the CBAs do not always capture important impacts, i.e. that many have a perception that the calculated net benefit may be too low.

For many decades, there was broad agreement among professionals that the calculated user benefits gave a satisfactory representations of the benefit to society, but increasingly both professional communities and decision-makers have pointed out that impacts can also occur in secondary markets through increased competition and agglomeration effects in the labour market. Together,

this can lead to increased productivity, and is often referred to as wider economic impacts. Chapter 2 discusses the development in studies of this phenomenon and changes in guidelines for how wider economic impacts are to be treated in CBAs.

In addition to (and sometimes partly overlapping with) wider economic impacts, road projects often have ambitions related to various political goals such as maintaining or increasing the population in selected areas, reducing insecurity related to landslides and accidents, giving the population access to a better public services, or to link an area together to a common housing and labour market. Achieving such goals can have impacts on the economy, but not necessarily. In many cases, growth in one area will come as a result of redistribution of economic activity from another area. In that case, it is more precise to talk about local goals or gross impacts.

In the chapter, we discuss various goal conflicts in transport projects. For example, the goal of increased settlement in rural areas may be at odds with the goal of increased productivity through agglomeration. In general, it is important to be aware that projects rarely only have positive impacts and that it can be just as relevant to highlight negative externalities as positive ones.

Although the number of ex-post studies of road projects is limited, there is some relevant literature that has documented the impact of previous projects. In Chapter 2, we refer to some of these studies.

In Chapter 3, we take a closer look at the goals and ambitions of a selection of road projects. All large government projects must formulate goals at project-, user- and societal level. Goal formulations are important for management and follow-up of projects. But it is by no means obvious that state agencies can formulate precise and logically coherent goals. In the chapter, we review goal formulations in 55 large road projects and find that the goals in many cases have major weaknesses as they are not measurable, and that the societal goal in several cases are inadequate or consists of a collection of good intentions.

In some projects, however, the goal formulations suggest a higher level of ambition, such as:

- Expand the labour market / facilitate recruitment of labour / more commuting
- Linking regions together

- Growth in population
- Growth in existing businesses / business start-ups
- Increased specialization in businesses
- Increased tourism
- Increased productivity

In the governing documents of the projects, however, only possible positive impacts were emphasized. The mention of potentially negative impacts was absent.

Chapter 4 presents the data and methodology used in the study. To map impacts, we look both at specific goals, as formulated in the projects' governing documents, and at other impacts that may arise as a result of a new road. To map some of these, there is a need for various measurable indicators as well as estimation strategies that are suitable for measuring in which direction the indicator has changed since the road project was completed.

In the chapter, we discuss goal formulations and how the achievement of these can best be measured. We end up with four indicators that are studied further: New business start-ups, employment, commuting and population. The idea is that these can be linked to the goals of an expanded labour market and a connected housing and labour market, to maintain the settlement pattern, and growth in the local business community.

To estimate impacts, we use a synthetic control method. The method is based on comparing the municipality or municipalities that have been given a new road with comparable municipalities that do not have. The purpose is to solve the counterfactual problem, i.e. what would have happened if the project had not been realized. In practice, it is difficult or demanding to find a municipality that is exactly like the municipality (municipalities) where the road was built. One solution to this problem is to put together the control municipality of different municipalities so that the composite (synthetic) municipality is a satisfactory control unit. Synthetic control method makes this selection based on objective criteria and presents the result in a transparent way since it is easy to see which and how different municipalities are part of the synthetic control municipality.

To investigate the impacts, we use a sample of ten projects. The projects must have the following characteristics:

- Relatively large travel time savings or significant increase in road standard compared to the pre-situation.
- Objectives for positive impacts beyond direct user benefits.
- Opening year between 2000 and 2010 to be able to use accessible data.
- Possible to limit the impacts to one or more municipalities.
- Large enough that it is conceivable that impacts can be identified.

We study the following ten projects: Fv653 Eiksund connection, Fv64 Atlantic tunnel, Fv107 Jondal tunnel, E39 Kvivsvegen, Fv609 Dalsfjordsambandet, Fv616 Bremangersambandet 2, E18 Grimstad-Kristiansand, Rv7 Sokna-Ørgenvika, E39 Klett-Bårdshaug. The projects in the sample are medium sized compared to most current projects. We believe that the method and the sample mean that the results should be relevant for future projects.

In Chapter 5, we present the results. We find that only three projects (E39 Klett – Bårdshaug, E18 Grimstad – Kristiansand and Fv519 Finnfast) have had a significant impact on the number of new business in the municipalities they affect. For three projects (Fv64 Atlanterhavstunnelen, Rv7 Sokna – Ørgenvika and Fv107 Jondalstunnelen) there are signs of a negative effect on new businesses. It is demanding to see clear relationships, but we notice that we find the most positive impacts near the large cities Kristiansand, Trondheim and Stavanger.

Even if the goal of a projects is to increase the number of new businesses, the result can sometimes be the opposite. This shows that there are not necessarily only positive impacts of improved transport infrastructure, but that improved accessibility can also move economic activity to other geographical areas – i.e. a redistribution effect. For the projects that have led to new business start-ups, it takes an average of around five years before the effect occurs. In other words, there is a clear time delay in the impacts.

For commuting, we find few impacts. We see the clearest impacts for the Fv64 Atlantic Tunnel, E18 Grimstad – Kristiansand and E39 Klett-Bårdshaug. With a view to strengthening the labour market, few projects achieve such impacts. This may indicate that the labour market is relatively static, and that it may take time before we see large flows between different labour markets. In addition, more than half of the projects in the sample are partly financed by tolls, which can increase the cost of commuting significantly.

The effect on population also varies. Four of the projects (Fv519 Finnfast, E18 Grimstad – Kristiansand, E39 Klett – Bårdshaug and Fv 653 Eiksundsambandet) have led to a significant increase in the population in some of the municipalities they affect. There are also signs of negative population development as a result of three of the projects. The projects that lead to positive population development are projects in connection with cities and regional centres, but even in such areas the effect is not unambiguous. It seems that the population only increases where smaller municipalities are linked to larger municipalities. In several cases, we see that the population decreases in the largest municipality and increases in the smaller municipality. It is a sign that it is first and foremost urban sprawl that is happening. Projects that connect sparsely populated areas do not have positive impacts on settlement.

Our results do not provide a clear answer as to whether road projects are a suitable tool for fulfilling political goals of increased regional integration, and growth in the form of more businesses and an increased population. With one possible exception for Fv519 Finnfast, there are no projects that score positively on all the impacts we have looked at.

We find several examples of significant negative impacts as a result of road investments, so although the impacts in many areas are positive, there is no evidence to say that road investments are a generally potent tool for achieving positive local impacts.

In Chapter 6, we summarize the results. We point out that although many road projects are estimated to be economically unprofitable at the time of the investment decision, the goals of the projects were often linked to assumed positive local impacts. The results show that these are not always realized, and that the impacts in some cases are negative.

If we are to achieve positive impacts of road projects, in addition to the direct user impacts, it is probably better to invest in projects that link peripheral municipalities with relatively populous areas. The impact of better roads in sparsely populated areas is small.

The reasons why the impact of better transport infrastructure in most cases are quite modest, are probably several. In Chapter 6, we point out some possible explanations:

- In most countries with a relatively well-developed transport network, there is a declining marginal utility of infrastructure investments. The best projects, with the most positive impacts, are probably already built.
- The direct transport costs make up (on average) a smaller share of the companies' total costs.
- Companies' and employees' ability to take advantage of improvements as reduced travel time varies, and it can take a long time before the impacts materialize.

Finally, we discuss the need for further research. We point out, among other things, the usefulness of more ex-post studies that can provide a basis for a generalization of prerequisites for achieving growth, and testing of different methods for evaluation.

Concept report series

Paper version: ISSN 0803-9763

Web version: ISSN 0804-5585

Norwegian version: <https://www.ntnu.no/concept/concept-rapportserie>

English version: <https://www.ntnu.edu/concept/concept-report-series>

Report	Title	Author (-s)
No 1	Styring av prosjektporteføljer i staten. Usikkerhetsavsetning på porteføljenivå <i>Project Portfolio Management. Estimating Provisions for Uncertainty at Portfolio Level.</i>	Stein Berntsen and Thorleif Sunde
No 2	Statlig styring av prosjektleidelse. Empiri og økonomiske prinsipper. <i>Economic Incentives in Public Project Management</i>	Dag Morten Dalen, Ola Lædre and Christian Riis
No 3	Beslutningsunderlag og beslutninger i store statlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Decisions and the Basis for Decisions in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Stein V. Larsen, Eilif Holte and Sverre Haanæs
No 4	Konseptutvikling og evaluering i store statlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Concept Development and Evaluation in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Hege Gry Solheim, Erik Dammen, Håvard O. Skaldebø, Eystein Myking, Elisabeth K. Svendsen and Paul Torgersen
No 5	Bedre behovsanalyser. Erfaringer og anbefalinger om behovsanalyser i store offentlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Needs Analysis in Major Public Investment Projects. Lessons and Recommendations</i>	Petter Næss
No 6	Målformulering i store statlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Alignment of Objectives in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Ole Jonny Klakegg
No 7	Hvordan tror vi at det blir? Effektvurderinger av store offentlige prosjekter <i>Up-front Conjecture of Anticipated Effects of Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Nils Olsson
No 8	Realopsjoner og fleksibilitet i store offentlige investeringsprosjekt <i>Real Options and Flexibility in Major Public Investment Projects</i>	Kjell Arne Brekke

No 9	<p>Bedre utforming av store offentlige investeringsprosjekter. Vurdering av behov, mål og effekt i tidligfasen</p> <p><i>Improved Design of Public Investment Projects. Up-front Appraisal of Needs, Objectives and Effects</i></p>	<p>Petter Næss med bidrag fra Kjell Arne Brekke, Nils Olsson and Ole Jonny Klakegg</p>
No 10	<p>Usikkerhetsanalyse – Kontekst og grunnlag</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Context and Foundations</i></p>	<p>Kjell Austeng, Olav Torp, Jon Terje Midtbø, Ingemund Jordanger, and Ole M Magnussen</p>
No 11	<p>Usikkerhetsanalyse – Modellering, estimering og beregning</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Modeling, Estimation and Calculation</i></p>	<p>Frode Drevland, Kjell Austeng and Olav Torp</p>
No 12	<p>Metoder for usikkerhetsanalyse</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Methodology</i></p>	<p>Kjell Austeng, Jon Terje Midtbø, Vidar Helland, Olav Torp and Ingemund Jordanger</p>
No 13	<p>Usikkerhetsanalyse – Feilkilder i metode og beregning</p> <p><i>Uncertainty Analysis – Methodological Errors in Data and Analysis</i></p>	<p>Kjell Austeng, Vibeke Binz and Frode Drevland</p>
No 14	<p>Positiv usikkerhet og økt verdiskaping</p> <p><i>Positive Uncertainty and Increasing Return on Investments</i></p>	<p>Ingemund Jordanger</p>
No 15	<p>Kostnadsusikkerhet i store statlige investeringsprosjekter; Empiriske studier basert på KS2</p> <p><i>Cost Uncertainty in Large Public Investment Projects. Empirical Studies</i></p>	<p>Olav Torp (red.), Ole M Magnussen, Nils Olsson and Ole Jonny Klakegg</p>
No 16	<p>Kontrahering i prosjektets tidligfase. Forsvarets anskaffelser.</p> <p><i>Procurement in a Project's Early Phases. Defense Aquisitions</i></p>	<p>Erik N. Warberg</p>
No 17	<p>Beslutninger på svakt informasjonsgrunnlag. Tilnærminger og utfordringer i prosjekters tidlige fase</p> <p><i>Decisions Based on Scant Information. Challenges and Tools During the Front-end Phases of Projects</i></p>	<p>Kjell Sunnevåg (red.)</p>

No 18	<p>Flermålsanalyser i store statlige investeringsprosjekt</p> <p><i>Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis In Major Public Investment Projects</i></p>	<p>Ingemund Jordanger, Stein Malerud, Harald Minken and Arvid Strand</p>
No 19	<p>Effektvurdering av store statlige investeringsprosjekter</p> <p><i>Impact Assessment of Major Public Investment Projects</i></p>	<p>Bjørn Andersen, Svein Bråthen, Tom Fagerhaug, Ola Nafstad, Petter Næss and Nils Olsson</p>
No 20	<p>Investorers vurdering av prosjekters godhet</p> <p><i>Investors' Appraisal of Project Feasibility</i></p>	<p>Nils Olsson, Stein Frydenberg, Erik W. Jakobsen, Svein Jessen, Roger Sørheim og Lillian Waagø</p>
No 21	<p>Logisk minimalisme, rasjonalitet - og de avgjørende valg</p> <p><i>Major Projects: Logical Minimalism, Rationality and Grand Choices</i></p>	<p>Knut Samset, Arvid Strand and Vincent F. Hendricks</p>
No 22	<p>Miljøøkonomi og samfunnsøkonomisk lønnsomhet</p> <p><i>Environmental Economics and Economic Viability</i></p>	<p>Kåre P. Hagen</p>
No 23	<p>The Norwegian Front-End Governance Regime of Major Public Projects – A Theoretically Based Analysis and Evaluation</p>	<p>Tom Christensen</p>
No 24	<p>Markedsorienterte styringsmetoder i miljøpolitikken</p> <p><i>Market oriented approaches to environmental policy</i></p>	<p>Kåre P. Hagen</p>
No 25	<p>Regime for planlegging og beslutning i sykehusprosjekter</p> <p><i>Planning and Decision Making in Hospital Projects. Lessons with the Norwegian Governance Scheme.</i></p>	<p>Asmund Myrbostad, Tarald Rohde, Pål Martinussen and Marte Lauvsnes</p>
No 26	<p>Politisk styring, lokal rasjonalitet og komplekse koalisjoner. Tidligfaseprosessen i store offentlige investeringsprosjekter</p> <p><i>Political Control, Local Rationality and Complex Coalitions. Focus on the Front-End of Large Public Investment Projects</i></p>	<p>Erik Whist and Tom Christensen</p>
No 27	<p>Verdsetting av fremtiden. Tidshorisont og diskonteringsrenter</p>	<p>Kåre P. Hagen</p>

Valuing the future. Time Horizon and Discount Rates

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| No 28 | Fjorden, byen og operaen. En evaluering av Bjørvikautbyggingen i et beslutningsteoretisk perspektiv <i>The Fjord, the City and the Opera. An Evaluation of Bjørvika Urban Development</i> | Erik Whist and Tom Christensen |
| No 29 | Levedyktighet og investeringstiltak. Erfaringer fra kvalitetssikring av statlige investeringsprosjekter

<i>Sustainability and Public Investments. Lessons from Major Public Investment Projects</i> | Ola Lædre, Gro Holst Volden and Tore Haavaldsen |
| No 30 | Etterevaluering av statlige investeringsprosjekter. Konklusjoner, erfaringer og råd basert på pilotevaluering av fire prosjekter

<i>Evaluating Public Investment Projects. Lessons and Advice from a Meta-Evaluation of Four Projects</i> | Gro Holst Volden and Knut Samset |
| No 31 | Store statlige investeringers betydning for konkurranse- og markedsutviklingen. Håndtering av konkurransemessige problemstillinger i utredningsfasen

<i>Major Public Investments' Impact on Competition. How to Deal with Competition Issues as Part of the Project Appraisal</i> | Asbjørn Englund, Harald Bergh, Aleksander Møll and Ove Skaug Halsos |
| No 32 | Analyse av systematisk usikkerhet i norsk økonomi.

<i>Analysis of Systematic Uncertainty in the Norwegian Economy.</i> | Haakon Vennemo, Michael Hoel and Henning Wahlquist |
| No 33 | Planprosesser, beregningsverktøy og bruk av nytte-kostnadsanalyser i vegsektoren. En sammenlikning av praksis i Norge og Sverige.

<i>Planning, Analytic Tools and the Use of Cost-Benefit Analysis in the Transport Sector in Norway and Sweden.</i> | Morten Welde, Jonas Eliasson, James Odeck and Maria Börjesson |
| No 34 | Mulighetsrommet. En studie om konseptutredninger og konseptvalg

<i>The Opportunity Space. A Study of Conceptual Appraisals and the Choice of Conceptual Solutions.</i> | Knut Samset, Bjørn Andersen and Kjell Austeng |
| No 35 | Statens prosjektmodell. Bedre kostnadsstyring. Erfaringer med de første | Knut Samset and Gro Holst Volden |

	investeringstiltakene som har vært gjennom ekstern kvalitetssikring	
No 36	Investing for Impact. Lessons with the Norwegian State Project Model and the First Investment Projects that Have Been Subjected to External Quality Assurance	Knut Samset and Gro Holst Volden
No 37	Bruk av karbonpriser i praktiske samfunnsøkonomiske analyser. En oversikt over praksis fra analyser av statlige investeringsprosjekter under KVV-/KS1-ordningen. <i>Use of Carbon Prices in Cost-Benefit Analysis. Practices in Project Appraisals of Major Public Investment Projects under the Norwegian State Project Model</i>	Gro Holst Volden
No 38	Ikke-prissatte virkninger i samfunnsøkonomisk analyse. Praksis og erfaringer i statlige investeringsprosjekter <i>Non-Monetized Impacts in Economic Analysis. Practice and Lessons from Public Investment Projects</i>	Heidi Bull-Berg, Gro Holst Volden and Inger Lise Tyholt Grindvoll
No 39	Lav prising – store valg. En studie av underestimering av kostnader i prosjekters tidligfase <i>Low estimates – high stakes. A study of underestimation of costs in projects' earliest phase</i>	Morten Welde, Knut Samset, Bjørn Andersen and Kjell Austeng
No 40	Mot sin hensikt. Perverse insentiver – om offentlige investerings-prosjekter som ikke forplikter <i>Perverse incentives and counterproductive investments. Public funding without liabilities for the recipients</i>	Knut Samset, Gro Holst Volden, Morten Welde and Heidi Bull-Berg
No 41	Transportmodeller på randen. En utforsking av NTM5-modellens anvendelsesområde <i>Transport models and extreme scenarios. A test of the NTM5 model</i>	Christian Steinsland and Lasse Fridstrøm
No 42	Brukeravgifter i veisektoren <i>User fees in the road sector</i>	Kåre Petter Hagen and Karl Rolf Pedersen
No 43	Norsk vegplanlegging: Hvilke hensyn styrer anbefalingene <i>Road Planning in Norway: What governs the selection of projects?</i>	Arvid Strand, Silvia Olsen, Merethe Dotterud Leiren and Askill Harkjerr Halse

No 44	<p>Ressursbruk i transportsektoren – noen mulige forbedringer</p> <p><i>Resource allocation in the transport sector – some potential improvements</i></p>	James Odeck (ed.) and Morten Welde (ed.)
No 45	<p>Kommunale investeringsprosjekter. Prosjektmodeller og krav til beslutningsunderlag.</p> <p><i>Municipal investment practices in Norway</i></p>	Morten Welde, Jostein Aksdal and Inger Lise Tyholt Grindvoll
No 46	<p>Styringsregimer for store offentlige prosjekter. En sammenliknende studie av prinsipper og praksis i seks land.</p> <p><i>Governance schemes for major public investment projects: A comparative study of principles and practices in six countries</i></p>	Knut F. Samset, Gro Holst Volden, Nils Olsson and Eirik Vårdal Kvalheim
No 47	<p>Governance Schemes for Major Public Investment Projects. A comparative study of principles and practices in six countries.</p>	Knut F. Samset, Gro Holst Volden, Nils Olsson and Eirik Vårdal Kvalheim
No 48	<p>Investeringsprosjekter og miljøkonsekvenser. En antologi med bidrag fra 16 forskere.</p> <p><i>Environmental Impact of Large Investment Projects. An Anthology by 16 Norwegian Experts.</i></p>	Kåre P. Hagen and Gro Holst Volden
No 49	<p>Finansiering av vegprosjekter med bompenger. Behandling av og konsekvenser av bompenger i samfunnsøkonomiske analyser.</p> <p><i>Financing road projects with tolls. The treatment of and consequences of tolls in cost benefit analyses.</i></p>	Morten Welde, Svein Bråthen, Jens Rekdal and Wei Zhang
No 50	<p>Prosjektmodeller og prosjekteierstyring i statlige virksomheter.</p> <p><i>Project governance and the use of project models in public agencies and line ministries in Norway.</i></p>	Bjørn Andersen, Eirik Vårdal Kvalheim and Gro Holst Volden
No 51	<p>Kostnadskontroll i store statlige investeringer underlagt ordningen med ekstern kvalitetssikring.</p> <p><i>Cost performance in government investment projects that have been subjected to external quality assurance.</i></p>	Morten Welde
No 52	<p>Statlige investeringer under lupen. Erfaring med evaluering av de 20 første KS-prosjektene.</p>	Gro Holst Volden and Knut Samset

	<i>A Close-up on Public Investment Cases. Lessons from Ex-post Evaluations of 20 Major Norwegian Projects</i>	
No 53	<p>Fremsynsmetoder <i>Foresight methods</i></p>	Tore Sager
No 54	<p>Neglected and underestimated impacts of transport investments</p>	Petter Næss, Gro Holst Volden, James Odeck and Tim Richardson
No 55	<p>Kostnadsstyring i entreprisekontrakter <i>Cost performance in construction contracts</i></p>	Morten Welde, Roy Endre Dahl, Olav Torp and Torbjørn Aass
No 56	<p>Erfaringer fra styring og gjennomføring av store statlige IKT-prosjekter <i>Experiences from governance and implementation of major public ICT projects</i></p>	Håkon Finne
No 57	<p>Effektivitet og produktivitet i norsk veibygging 2007-2016 <i>Efficiency and productivity in Norwegian road construction 2007-2016</i></p>	Kenneth Løvold Rødseth, Rasmus Bøgh Holmen, Finn R. Førstund and Sverre A.C. Kittelsen
No 58	<p>Mandater for konseptvalgutredninger. En gjennomgang av praksis. <i>The Terms of Reference Document for Conceptual Appraisal. A Review of Current Practice.</i></p>	Knut Samset and Morten Welde
No 59	<p>Estimering av kostnader i store statlige prosjekter: Hvor gode er estimatene og usikkerhetsanalysene i KS2-rapportene? <i>Estimating costs in large government investment projects. How good are the estimates and uncertainty analyses in the QA2-reports?</i></p>	Morten Welde, Magne Jørgensen, Per Fridtjof Larsen and Torleif Halkjelsvik
No 60	<p>Noen krevende tema i anvendte samfunnsøkonomiske analyser. En undersøkelse av praksis i Statens prosjektmodell <i>Salient topics in cost-benefit analyses of major public projects in Norway</i></p>	Haakon Vennemo, Jens Furuholmen, Orvika Rosnes and Leonid Andreev
No 61	<p>Samspill i bygg- og anleggsbransjen <i>Partnering in construction projects</i></p>	Svein Bråthen, Maria Laingen, Paul Torgersen and Merethe Kristin Woldseth

No 62 Vegprosjekter, verdiskaping og lokale mål
Road projects and local economic impacts

Morten Welde, Eivind
Tveter and Anne Gudrun
Mork

Forskningsprogrammet Concept skal utvikle kunnskap som sikrer bedre ressursutnytting og effekt av store, statlige investeringer. Programmet driver følgeforskning knyttet til de største statlige investeringsprosjektene over en rekke år. En skal trekke erfaringer fra disse som kan bedre utformingen og kvalitetssikringen av nye investeringsprosjekter før de settes i gang.

Concept er lokalisert ved Norges teknisk- naturvitenskapelige universitet i Trondheim (NTNU), ved Fakultet for ingeniørvitenskap og teknologi. Programmet samarbeider med ledende norske og internasjonale fagmiljøer og universiteter, og er finansiert av Finansdepartementet.

Address:

The Concept Research Program
Høgskoleringen 7A
N-7491 NTNU
Trondheim
NORWAY

ISSN: 0803-9763 (paper version)
ISSN: 0804-5588 (web version)
ISBN: 978-82-93253-96-9 (paper version)
ISBN: 978-82-93253-97-6 (web version)

The Concept research program aims to develop know-how to help make more efficient use of resources and improve the effect of major public investments. The Program is designed to follow up on the largest public projects over a period of several years, and help improve design and quality assurance of future public projects before they are formally approved.

The program is based at The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Faculty of Engineering Science and Technology. It cooperates with key Norwegian and international professional institutions and universities, and is financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Finance.

