



**Alliance for a HGV charge throughout Europe  
Bündnis LSVA für Europa e.V.**

Heike Aghte, Secretary General  
Griebenow-Str.22, D-10435 Berlin  
Tel: 0049-170-5389971,  
email: Heike.Aghte@lsva.eu  
Internet: [www.lsva.eu](http://www.lsva.eu)

**Eurovignette III – important aspects for the EP’s second reading**

28.1.2011

Dear Ms/Mr .....,

We are writing to you after having followed the TRAN discussion on Tuesday, 25.1.2011, on the “Eurovignette III”, second reading.

We fully agree with you that the EP must concentrate on a few aspects to achieve good results as you are confronted with a council, who is not really burning for action. Considering the main aspects we feel that the TRAN committee should place emphasis on what is necessary for the inhabitants of the EU.

External costs are citizens’ costs. They are concrete and every day’s costs (paid by taxes, by health insurances, sometimes by losses in value for their houses, sometimes costs because of health damages or accidents, sometimes by costs because of nature catastrophies due to climate change).

External costs should therefore be considered prominently. And we believe this might not be too difficult as the integration of external costs is what the amending process of the whole directive is mainly meant to be. Therefore, there might even be some good support from the EU commission.

**Forgotten aspects of the external costs?**

During tuesday’s discussion, the **mark-ups for ecologically sensitive regions** (like the Alps) were hardly mentioned at all. However, this aspect is essential for about 14 million inhabitants of the Alpine region and maybe more mountainous regions in Europe. Many of the inhabitants are heavily affected by transit freight traffic, with external costs being much higher than in lowland regions. Should the mark-ups disappear this would mean a loss of incentives for the transport sector to act more responsible in Europe’s most sensitive regions.

The EP has repeatedly supported initiatives for the protection of mountainous regions (see their efforts for the Alpine Convention) and therefore we hope very much that this issue will once more be supported as focal point.

**Categories of external costs – Annex IIIa:**

As we got some piece of information concerning cost factors “air pollution” and “noise” we learned that several details had been changed by the Council. We are concerned that the total of the Council’s changes might lead to massive dilutions conferred to the EP’s report.

But noise and pollution are among Europe’s greatest health or well-being problems. For that reason we ask you to keep a close eye on this aspect and make sure that there will be no regression. Instead, we think that any improvement on these aspects will result in good incentives for better vehicles, shorter distances, and a shift to non-polluting transport modes.

**Other important aspects.**

- We agree that the minimum vehicles’ weight (3,5 tons or 12 tons) is a very important issue for the second reading.
- And we very much appreciate the idea of promoting another amending process of the directive within short, including clear aims for more sustainability, better regulations for all categories of external costs and a phasing-out process for the old time-based “Eurovignette”.

May we ask you to consider the inclusion of the focal points mentioned above into your proposal for the EP’s reading.

In case of any questions please don’t hesitate to contact us.

We are looking forward to an interesting discussion.

Yours sincerely,

Heike Aghte, Secretary general