Assessing the health benefits of physical activity due to active commuting in a French energy transition scenario

Pierre Barban[1,2,3], Audrey de Nazelle[4], Stéphane Chatelin[5], Philippe Quirion[3], Kévin Jean[1,2,6*]

[1]Laboratoire MESuRS, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France ;
[2]Unité PACRI, Institut Pasteur, Conservatoire national des Arts et Métiers, Paris, France ;
[3]Centre international de recherche sur l'environnement et le développement (CIRED), Centre national de la recherche scientifique, (CNRS), Nogent-sur-Marne, France ;
[4]Centre for Environmental Policy, MRC Centre for Environment and Health, Imperial College London, United Kingdom;
[5]Association negaWatt, Alixan, France;
[6]MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London, United Kingdom.

* Correspondance to:
Kévin Jean
Laboratoire MESuRS, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers, 292 rue Saint Martin, 75003, Paris, France
kevin.jean@lecnam.net

ABSTRACT

Background

Energy transition scenarios are prospective outlooks describing combinations of changes in socio-economic systems that are compatible with climate targets. These changes could have important health co-benefits. We aimed to quantify the health benefits of physical activity caused by active transportation on all-cause mortality in the French negaWatt scenario over the 2021-2050 period.

Methods

Relying on a health impact assessment framework, we quantified the health benefits of increased walking, cycling and E-biking projected in the negaWatt scenario. The negaWatt scenario assumes increases of walking and cycling volumes of +11% and +612%, respectively, over the study period.

Results

As compared to a scenario with no volume increase, we quantified that the negaWatt scenario would prevent 9,797 annual premature deaths in 2045 and translate into a 3-month increase of life expectancy in the general population. These health gains would generate €34 billion of economic benefits from 2045 onwards,

Conclusions

Increased physical activity implied in the negaWatt transition scenario would generate substantial public health benefits, which are comparable to the gain expected by large scale health prevention interventions.

Keywords: health impact assessment; active transportation; transition scenario; climate change mitigation; physical activity

INTRODUCTION

The health impact of climate change have recently become more prominent features of climate change discussions, as exemplified by the World Health Organization active engagement in COP26[1] and the extraordinary joint publication across 200 health journals of a call for urgent climate action to protect health.[2] To mitigate the effects of climate change for current and future generations, countries need to cut their emissions of greenhouse gas (GHG) and reach the global target of net zero emissions by the middle of the 21st century.[3] These efforts could potentially result in important short-term health benefits, especially by improving air quality, housing, and diets, and increasing physical activity.[4] Demonstrating health co-benefits of climate mitigation actions through a rigorous assessment could help make the case for transformative strategies and play a key role in increasing adhesion and commitment of people and their governments in reducing GHG emissions.[5,6]

Government and civil societies can contribute important efforts in exploring and understanding desirable pathways toward carbon neutrality. In France, governmental agencies, non-profit organizations, and other groups of qualified experts developed several carbon neutrality scenarios. These transition scenarios describe various combination of changes in socio-economic systems that are compatible with achieving a climate target. Based on a transdisciplinary approach, these scenarios provide explicit details on the scope and distribution of reduction efforts and on the role of the different levers of change, whether political technological or behavioural.[7,8]

In Europe, transport represents the second sector contributing the most to GHG emissions.[9] In France in particular, transportation contributes to 31% of the national GHG emissions, making it the highest emitter. With about half of these emissions attributable to individual motorized vehicles,[10] modal shifts towards low-carbon transport modes such as public or active transportation constitute an important element for national decarbonisation pathways.

There is compelling evidence that sedentary lifestyles cause a large health burden, especially in high-income countries, and that increasing physical activity could provide important public health benefits [11,12]. Specifically, the potential for active transport modes such as cycling and biking to alleviate mortality and morbidity are now well established.[13,14] Therefore, climate change mitigation actions resulting in increasing active transportation may carry important public health benefits.[4,15,16] However, these benefits have not been quantified, yet, within the framework of a transition scenario describing detailed and credible societal transformations toward carbon neutrality.

In this study, we aimed at quantifying the health benefits of physical activity caused by active transportation on all-cause mortality in a French transition scenario over the 2021-2050 period. To

do so, we relied on the framework of health impact assessment and follows recent guidelines for modelling and reporting health effects of climate change mitigation actions.[17,18]

METHODS

The negaWatt scenario

Since 2003, the negaWatt association develops energy transition scenarios for metropolitan France. These scenarios offer coherence in energy flows and a high level of sectoral detail while providing explicit data on the main physical determinants of energy consumption (heated surfaces, km-passengers) with a yearly time resolution. The latest negaWatt scenario was released in 2021.

In order to reach net zero emissions in 2050, the negaWatt approach combines energy sufficiency (favouring behaviours and activities that are intrinsically low on energy use, at individual and collective levels),[19] energy efficiency and renewable sources. For the transportation sector, the scenario classifies trips based on their motives (commuting, occasional leisure, professional, etc.), lengths, and locations (urban centres, rural areas, etc.).

The negaWatt scenario activates several levers to decarbonize the transportation sector.[20] First, the scenario assumes an overall decrease in transportation demand, mostly driven by a decrease in long-distance trips, an increase in teleworking, and an overall relocation of activities. Then, ambitious fiscal measures would integrate all externalities of transportation (CO_2, air pollution, noise) while accounting for social and territorial inequalities issues. These measures would allow important investments in public and active transportation infrastructures, such as railways and bike lanes. These would yields to large modal shifts from individual motorized vehicles toward public and active transportation, especially for short trips. Motorized vehicles would remain the most common transport mode in terms of km-passengers (Supplementary figure 1), but decarbonisation is achieved assuming a reduction of cars weights, a higher vehicle occupancy rate (carsharing), and lastly a shift toward renewable energy, such as electricity and biogas.
The evolution of walking and cycling mileage between projected in the negaWatt scenario for 2021-2050 is presented in Figure 1. The weekly number of kilometres walked per inhabitant increases slightly and regularly, with an overall increase of +11% over the study period. The distance cycled increases most dramatically between 2021 and 2040, from 2.4 $km.inh^{-1}.week^{-1}$ to 17.1 $km.inh^{-1}.week^{-1}$ (+612%), it peaks at 17.5 $km.inh^{-1}.w^{-1}$ in 2045, and then decreases back to 17.1 $km.inh^{-1}.week^{-1}$ in 2050. This global increase of distances cycled is distributed between classical bike and E-bike, with an overall contribution of E-bikes increasing from 3.3% of the kilometres cycled in 2021 to 70% in 2040, this later proportion being kept constant over 2040-2050. The increase in distances cycled together with the relative decrease in the contribution of classical bikes explains the inverse U-shape peaking

in 2032 that is observed for classical bike. As a comparison, the average distance travelled by car (regardless of the energy used) decreases by nearly 40% between 2021 to 2050 (from approximatively 12,000 to 7,500 $km.inh^{-1}.y^{-1}$).

Age-distribution of cycling

There is currently a scarcity of reliable data regarding the frequency, volume (mileage) and age-distribution of active transportation in France. Results of the most recent nationally representative surveys have been released in early 2022, but at the time we conducted this analysis, the most recent nationally representative data was collected in 2008 and documented a biking mileage that was largely concentrated in young men aged <25 years.[21] Investment in active transportation promotion and infrastructure, as well as technological development (notably E-bikes) are expected to have flattened this distribution. Moreover, a large increase in active transportation such as the one projected in the negaWatt scenario implies that all age groups would be affected. We thus used the age-distribution of walking and cycling mileage reported from Denmark, one of the country with the highest cycling level in Europe, as a target distribution to allocate the yearly global mileage projected by the negaWatt scenario across ages. The Danish age-distribution of active transportations mileage for 2016-2019 was obtained from the Danish National Travel Survey.[22] We assumed the overall relative increase in walking and cycling to affect all ages homogeneously. However, for cycling, we attributed the total number of kilometres cycled between E-bike and classical bike differentially across age group in order to both reproduce : i) the 6.7 years difference observed in the mean age of E-bikers and cyclists reported in a recent multi-country study,[23] and ii) the time-changing relative contribution of E-bike to the total cycling mileage assumed in the negaWatt scenario. Further details and formulas are detailed in Supplementary Text 1. For the reference (or business as usual) scenario we assumed the same relative age-distribution of active travel as detailed above, but the total mileage of active travel was assumed to be the same as in our base year, 2021.

Health Impact Assessment

The scope of the study is metropolitan France and the time-period of the analysis is 2021-2050. Projection of demographic data for population size, age distribution and mortality rates used in the negaWatt scenario and in the HIA were obtained from the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies.[24]

We relied on the framework of the Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) developed by the World Health Organization to estimate the number of deaths prevented by active transportation.[25] Based on the meta-analysis by Kelly et al for the reduction in all-cause mortality from walking and cycling,[14] we assumed a reduction by 10% in all-cause mortality (95% confidence interval, CI: 6-13%) for a weekly exposure of 100 minutes of cycling, and a reduction of 11% (95% CI: 4-17%) for a weekly exposure of 168 minutes of walking. Both of these reference volumes represent a metabolic equivalent of task hours per week of 11.25 MET.hour.week^{-1}, independently of other physical activity, which correspond to the level of physical activity recommended by international guidelines.[26] As the meta-analysis by Kelly et al considered all-cause mortality, negative sides of active transportation via road safety and increased exposure to air pollution were controlled for. We assumed that the physical activity required for an E-bike was 90% of the one required for a classical bike.[16] Risk reduction estimates were scaled at the yearly level of the corresponding active travel using a linear dose-response function (DRF) which was capped at a maximum level of risk reduction (45% for cycling and 30% for walking).[14] In the main analysis, the age range considered for a reduction of mortality attributable to physical activity increase was 20-84 years. Younger and older ages were disregarded because the evidence for the health effects of physical activity was not as large as that for the 20-84 years.

Yearly distances travelled by cycling, E-bike or walking were converted into times of exposure considering an average speed of 14.9 km.h^{-1}, 18.1 km.h^{-1} and 4.8 km.h^{-1}, respectively.[16,25] We assumed the same values for E-bike speed and E-bike-to-classical-bike MET ratio as those recently identified in the literature by Egiguren et al.[16] The scaled values of risk reduction were then applied to the projections of the age-specific (1-year age bands) mortality rate in both (ie. negaWatt and reference) scenarios for each year from 2022 to 2050. This allowed to estimate, for both scenarios, the yearly number of premature deaths averted by active transportation for each age. Based on the yearly projected value of life-expectancy, we also calculated the years of life lost (YLL) averted by active transportation associated with each scenario and for each travel mode, age and year. The health impact of the increase in active transportation in the negaWatt scenario as compared to the reference scenario was estimated as the difference of the number of deaths averted and YLL between the negaWatt and the reference scenario. We lastly used age- and year-specific death rates in each scenario to estimate the increase in life expectancy due to active transportation in the negaWatt scenario.

Health economics evaluation

To estimate the economic health benefits of active transportation implied by the negaWatt scenario, we used the standard value of statistical life year (VSLY) that was recommended in 2013 in France for the socioeconomic evaluation of public investments.[27] The recommended VSLY was 139k€ in 2020, and the values recommended for projections account for economic growth (publicly available here: https://www.strategie.gouv.fr/sites/strategie.gouv.fr/files/atoms/files/20181214_complement_b_valeurs_tutelaires.xlsx). All amounts were expressed in Euros 2020.

Sensitivity analysis

We conducted several alternative analyses in order to assess the sensitivity of our results to specific parameters values or assumptions. The various alternative assessments we conducted considered : i) no age difference between classical bike and E-bike users; ii) a ratio of MET.hour of 0.78 for the physical activity required for an E-bike vs a classical bike, as assumed by Bouscasse et al;[28] iii) an age limit of 75 years above which physical activity doesn't decrease the mortality risk ; iv) a reduction by 19% (95% CI: 9% - 29%) of the risk of mortality for an exposure of 11.25 MET.hour.week^{-1}, as recently documented by the meta-analysis by Zhao et al,[29] that we also used to scale the risk reduction for E-bike.

All estimates were provided together with uncertainty intervals (UI) calculated using the lower and upper bounds of the 95% CI reported for the reduction of the mortality risk for each active transportation mode. Analysis were conducted using the R software version 4.1.2. All codes are publicly available at: https://github.com/pbarban/HIA_Transport_Transition.

RESULTS

The distribution of weekly active transportation durations across age groups is presented in Figure 2. Based on the shape of the distribution observed in Denmark, walking is distributed fairly homogeneously across age groups. The total cycling distribution is more heterogeneous, with the 20-29 years-old group contributing the most to the global mileage. Although the increase over time of walking and cycling is assumed to be proportional across each age group, the age-specific evolution is different when considering classical vs. E-bike. While E-bike exposure is projected to be low across all age groups in 2025, we assume the increases over time to be proportionally higher in the older vs. younger age groups in comparison with the increase in classic cycling. For instance, in 2045, 58% of distances cycled is attributed to E-bike for the 15-19 years-old group, and 81% among the 65-69 years-old group.

Health impact assessment

The health impact estimated for active transportation over the 2021-2050 period are presented in Figure 3. As compared to a reference scenario in which walking and cycling mileage were maintained constant at their 2021 levels, the increased use of active transportation could prevent a cumulative 213,000 (UI: 122,000 -283,000) premature deaths across France from 2021 to 2050, with a yearly impact peaking at 9,825 [5,538-13,143] premature deaths prevented in 2045. The contribution of each transport mode varied across time (Figure 4). Over the whole study period, relatively to the cumulative number of death prevented, walking contributed to 11.3%, classical bike to 22.7%, and E-bike to 66.0%; these contribution were 8.7%, 27.9% and 63.4%, respectively, relatively to the cumulative number of YLL prevented.

Death prevented were largely distributed among older age groups, especially among the 70-79 years-old group. For instance, in 2045, this age group concentrated 37.2% of premature death averted despite their contribution to only 9.1% of all km travelled, regardless of travel mode. In contrast, the distribution of YLL prevented was more widely distributed across age groups, and its mode was the 55-59 years-old group (Figure 5).

By considering age at death, we assessed that increased active transportation could prevent a cumulative 4.34 (UI: 2.52 – 5.74) millions of YLL over the study period), with a yearly amount peaking at 204 (UI: 116-271) thousands YLL prevented in 2045. We further estimated that the increased use in active transportation implied by the negaWatt scenario could result in a life expectancy gain of 3.39 (UI: 1.93-4.53) months over the general population in 2045 (Supplementary Figure 2).

Based on recommended values of statistical life year, we estimated the corresponding total economic health benefits that progressively increases to peak at €37.6 (UI: 21.5-49.9) billion in 2045, then plateauing after 2045. This represented a cumulative economic health benefits of €749 (UI: 433-990) billion over the 2021-2050 time period.

Sensitivity analysis

Sensitivity of our results depending on the choice of the parameters are presented in Table 1. Assuming that there are no difference in age between bike vs E-bike users, or considering an alternative lower value of the E-bike-to-classical-bike MET ratio did not impact massively our results. Considering an age limit below 75 y. (vs. 85y. in the main analysis) to consider health benefits for physical activity decreased the estimated yearly and cumulative death prevented by approximatively 35%. However, the impact on the monetized health benefits was more limited (an approximated 10%

decrease). Indeed, monetized health benefits calculation were based on YLL, and deaths prevented between 75 and 85 years are not those contributing the most to the overall YLL prevented by physical activity. Lastly, the parameters that appeared to have the largest impact on our results was the RR considered for bike (and consequently for E-bike as we maintained the same ratio for physical activity between bike and E-bike as in the main analysis). Using the more favourable value recently reported in the meta-analysis by Zhao et al[29] leads to approximately doubling the estimates of health benefits, be it in terms of death prevented, YLL prevented, or life expectancy gain.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we estimated the health impact of active transportation as projected in the negaWatt transition scenario, France. We estimate that increased use of walking and cycling could prevent up to 10,000 (between 5,000 and 13,000, approximatively) premature deaths and 190,000 YLL (between 105,000 and 250,000, approximatively) yearly in 2045. The uncertainty interval of these estimates reflects that surrounding the dose-response function linking physical activity and mortality. The health benefits could result in a life expectancy gain of about 3 months in 2045 for the general population. The health economic benefits generated by this burden alleviation could represent a cumulative €696 (between 403 and 919) billion over the 2022-2050 time period and an approximate €35 billion annually from 2045 onwards. To our knowledge, this study constitutes the first one to assess the health co-benefits of a credible pathway to net zero emission at the level of a country.

The negaWatt scenario we assessed assumes several mobility behavioural changes. First, it assumes a small but sustained increase of walking over the study period (+11%). This increase could be achieved by modal shifts from motorized vehicles to walking for short trips, or more broadly to public transportation, as this mode implies a certain amount of walking.[30] The projected increase of cycling in the scenario is much larger (+612%). As France lags behind many countries on the current levels of cycling,[31] the highest value of cycling volume projected for 2045 (62 min.week^{-1}) in our scenario was still not dramatically higher than current average cycling in Denmark (45 min.week^{-1}) and remains below the average cycling duration in the Netherlands (74 min.week^{-1} in 2010-2013).[22,32] Moreover, this overall increase in cycling was mostly driven by E-bikes, projected to represent up to 70% of all kilometres cycled from 2040 onwards. Indeed, according to recent studies E-bike constitutes a promising transportation mode for many, especially for older adults, allowing longer trips than classical bikes and thus having a fair potential for car trips substitution.[23,33,34]
Cycling, either classical or E-bike, represented the largest health benefits in our study. Our results were therefore sensitive to the DRF chosen to quantify reductions of all-cause mortality by increased

280 cycling. Our main analysis, relied on a DRF reported in a meta-analysis synthetizing the results 7
281 prospective studies and widely used in cycling-related HIAs.[25,28,32,35] The more favourable DRF
282 documented by the recent meta-analysis by Zhao et al used in our sensitivity analysis led to a
283 doubling of the health impact estimates. Our approach built on the HEAT framework by explicitly
284 accounting for age.[25] In a conservative assumption, HEAT assumes no reduction in mortality due to
285 physical activity beyond 65 years, while our main analysis assumed such a preventive effect up to 84
286 years. Indeed, both meta-analyses used in our assessment included studies providing data beyond
287 age 65. Moreover, there is increasing evidence that regular physical activity in older people can
288 reduce the risk of falls and fractures, and thus may reduce mortality.[36]

289 Several studies have previously assessed the health benefits of increased active transportation for
290 France. Praznoczy estimated in 2012 that physical activity induced by a shift of 20% of modal share
291 toward biking could prevent ~3,000 premature deaths in 2020 in Ile-de-France (12.2 million inh.,
292 ~20% of the population considered here).[37] More recently, Egiguren et al estimated that a high-biking
293 scenario could prevent ~2,600 annual premature deaths in France in 2030.[16] However, direct
294 comparisons with our results are not straightforward as these studies relied on different
295 geographical scope and on various assumptions, especially regarding the evolution of cycling mileage
296 and modal share. In addition to the existing literature, our study highlights the potential of active
297 transportation promotion policies to yield important public health benefits in the medium and long
298 term.[38] We estimated that active transportation implied by the negaWatt scenario may prevent up to
299 10,000 deaths annually from 2045 onwards. For comparison, efforts in road safety made in France
300 over the past 10 years may have prevented about 1,500 deaths yearly ; and public health policies
301 aiming at decreasing alcohol consumption by 20% in France would result in approximatively 7,000
302 deaths prevented a year.[39,40]

303 This assessment carries various limitations. On the one hand, we estimated the health impact of the
304 negaWatt scenario as compared to a business-as-usual scenario that considered the level of active
305 transportation constant from 2021 onward. Disregarding possible increases in cycling, as those
306 having been reported in many French cities may have conducted to overestimated health impact.[41]
307 However, these recent increases have been partly linked to conjectural factors, such as the Covid-19
308 impact on public transportation, and one can question there durability in the absence of dedicated
309 policies. On the other hand, the negaWatt scenario assumes a strong and continuous increase of
310 cycling between 2021 and 2040. This increase could be partly hampered by increasing frequency and
311 duration of heat waves that are predicted in the near and medium term due to climate warming.[42]
312 Our study assessed the health impact of active transportation for those exposed to these modes
313 only. Pedestrian and bike-users are also exposed to negative health outcomes, such as increased risk

314 of traffic injury and increased exposure to air pollution. The DRF for all-cause mortality we used
315 captures both positive and negative effects of cycling and walking. The present analysis therefore
316 implicitly accounted for the detrimental effects of walking and cycling. However, active
317 transportation also carries altruistic health benefits beyond the groups of pedestrians and bike-users,
318 such as reduced overall air or noise pollution. These altruistic benefits are not included in the present
319 analysis, mostly for methodological issues. The health benefits we document here may thus have
320 been underestimated. Indeed, In a multi-country analysis, Hamilton et al estimated that the benefits
321 resulting from improve air quality implied by the Paris Agreement may be of the same order of
322 magnitude than those resulting from active travel (although this ratio varied largely across
323 countries).[4]

324 This study documents that physical activity due to increased active transportation projected in a
325 transition scenario would generate substantial public health benefits, which may be comparable to
326 the gains expected by large-scale health prevention interventions. The present study shows that
327 these health gains may translate into important monetised health benefits on the short term, thus
328 providing further arguments in favour on ambitious climate mitigation investment and policies. The
329 fact that an energy transition scenario assuming increasing active transportation may generate
330 health benefits is itself unsurprising and expectable. However, the rigorous quantification of such
331 benefits offers more detailed elements, especially to weights the costs of policies promoting active
332 transportation with regards to their benefits. Furthermore, several levers may be activated to
333 decarbonize the transportation sector. For instance, some other French transition scenarios rely
334 much more widely on the electrification of the vehicle fleet than the negaWatt scenario does.[43] The
335 present study thus suggests than betting on vehicle electrification only may miss the opportunity of
336 large public health benefits generated by increased physical activity.

337 The primary novelty of this study is that our estimates are based on detailed and internally consistent
338 scenario detailing an explicit pathway toward carbon neutrality at the scale of a country. The
339 negaWatt association has developed these energy scenarios since 2003 and their influence on
340 government policies have grown since then. Government agencies such as the French Agency for
341 ecological transition have now produced energy scenarios quite similar to the negaWatt scenarios, in
342 particular with regards to growth in active transportation. Previous similar health impact assessment
343 of ambitious climate targets consisted in evaluating co-benefits of these targets once they were
344 reached, with no consideration of the pathway.[4,15] This study is a demonstration that realistic
345 scenarios to reach net zero for climate change purposes can generate benefits far beyond reductions
346 in GHG only. This is the type of evidence that can help create alliances across sectors and garner
347 support for much needed transitions.[6] In other words, this contribution may help engage the climate

change and public health scientific communities, along with the broader civic society, to promote health-enhancing pathways to net zero emissions.

REFERENCES

1 World Health Organization. COP26 Health Programme. 2021.URL https://www.who.int/initiatives/cop26-health-programme.

2 Atwoli L, Baqui AH, Benfield T, et al. Call for emergency action to limit global temperature increases, restore biodiversity, and protect health. *BMJ* 2021;374:n1734.

3 Rogelj J, Shindell D, Jiang K, et al. Mitigation Pathways Compatible with 1.5°C in the Context of Sustainable Development. *Global warming of 15 °C* 2018;93–174.

4 Hamilton I, Kennard H, McGushin A, et al. The public health implications of the Paris Agreement: a modelling study. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 2021;5:e74–83.

5 Flahault A, Schütte S, Guégan J-F, Pascal M, Barouki R. Health can help saving negotiation on climate change. *The Lancet* 2015;385:e49–50.

6 Negev M, Zea-Reyes L, Caputo L, Weinmayr G, Potter C, de Nazelle A. Barriers and Enablers for Integrating Public Health Cobenefits in Urban Climate Policy. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2021. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-052020-010820.

7 Guivarch C, Lempert R, Trutnevyte E. Scenario techniques for energy and environmental research: An overview of recent developments to broaden the capacity to deal with complexity and uncertainty. *Environmental modelling & software* 2017;97:201–210.

8 Elsawah S, Hamilton SH, Jakeman AJ, et al. Scenario processes for socio-environmental systems analysis of futures: A review of recent efforts and a salient research agenda for supporting decision making. *Science of the Total Environment* 2020;729:138393.

9 European Environment Agency. Annual European Union greenhouse gas inventory 1990–2018 and inventory report 2020. Copenhagen, Denmark: European Environment Agency, 2020URL https://www.eea.europa.eu//publications/european-union-greenhouse-gas-inventory-2020 Accessed 14 January 2022.

10 The High Council on Climate (HCC). Renforcer l'atténuation, engager l'adaptation [Reinforce mitigation, engage adaptation]. Paris, France, 2021URL https://www.hautconseilclimat.fr/publications/rapport-annuel-2021-renforcer-lattenuation-engager-ladaptation/ Accessed 14 January 2022.

11 Katzmarzyk PT, Friedenreich C, Shiroma EJ, Lee I-M. Physical inactivity and non-communicable disease burden in low-income, middle-income and high-income countries. *Br J Sports Med* 2021;bjsports-2020-103640.

12 Strain T, Brage S, Sharp SJ, et al. Use of the prevented fraction for the population to determine deaths averted by existing prevalence of physical activity: a descriptive study. *The Lancet Global Health* 2020;8:e920–30.

13 Hamer M, Chida Y. Walking and primary prevention: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2008;42:238–43.

14 Kelly P, Kahlmeier S, Götschi T, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of reduction in all-cause mortality from walking and cycling and shape of dose response relationship. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2014;11:132.

15 Woodcock J, Edwards P, Tonne C, et al. Public health benefits of strategies to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions: urban land transport. *Lancet* 2009;374:1930–43.

16 Egiguren J, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ, Rojas-Rueda D. Premature Mortality of 2050 High Bike Use Scenarios in 17 Countries. *Environ Health Perspect* 2021;129:127002.

17 Mindell J, Ison E, Joffe M. A glossary for health impact assessment. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2003;57:647–51.

18 Hess JJ, Ranadive N, Boyer C, et al. Guidelines for Modeling and Reporting Health Effects of Climate Change Mitigation Actions. *Environ Health Perspect* 2020;128:115001.

19 Toulouse E, Le Dû M, Gorge H, Semal L. Stimulating energy sufficiency: Barriers and opportunities. In: *ECEEE Summer Study*. ECEEE Toulon, 2017; 59–70.

20 Association négaWatt. Scénario négaWatt 2022 - Le scénario en détails. Alixan, France, 2022URL https://www.negawatt.org/IMG/pdf/scenario-negawatt-2022-rapport-complet-partie4.pdf.

21 Papon F, De Solère R. Les modes actifs: marche et vélo de retour en ville. *La revue, Commissariat général au développement durable-Service de l'observation et des statistiques* 2010.

22 Center for Transport Analytics, Transport DTU. The Danish National Travel Survey (TU) - Latest dataset. URL https://www.cta.man.dtu.dk/english/national-travel-survey/latest_dataset Accessed 14 January 2022.

23 Castro A, Gaupp-Berghausen M, Dons E, et al. Physical activity of electric bicycle users compared to conventional bicycle users and non-cyclists: Insights based on health and transport data from an online survey in seven European cities. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives* 2019;1:100017.

24 National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE). Projections de population 2007-2060 pour la France métropolitaine. *Insee Résultats* 2010.URL https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/1281151?sommaire=2020101.

25 Götschi T, Kahlmeier S, Castro A, et al. Integrated Impact Assessment of Active Travel: Expanding the Scope of the Health Economic Assessment Tool (HEAT) for Walking and Cycling. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020;17:7361.

26 World Health Organization. Global Recommendations on Physical Activity for Health. Geneva, Switzerland, 2010URL https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241599979.

27 Quinet E. Cost benefit assessment of public investments. *Final Report Summary and recommendations Paris, France: CGSP (Policy Planning Commission)* 2013.URL https://www.strategie.gouv.fr/sites/strategie.gouv.fr/files/archives/CGSP_Evaluation_socioeconomique_17092013.pdf.

28 Bouscasse H, Gabet S, Kerneis G, et al. Designing local air pollution policies focusing on mobility and heating to avoid a targeted number of pollution-related deaths: Forward and backward approaches combining air pollution modeling, health impact assessment and cost-benefit analysis. *Environ Int* 2021;159:107030.

29 Zhao Y, Hu F, Feng Y, et al. Association of Cycling with Risk of All-Cause and Cardiovascular Disease Mortality: A Systematic Review and Dose–Response Meta-analysis of Prospective Cohort Studies. *Sports Med* 2021;51:1439–48.

30 Rissel C, Curac N, Greenaway M, Bauman A. Physical Activity Associated with Public Transport Use—A Review and Modelling of Potential Benefits. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2012;9:2454–78.

31 Goel R, Goodman A, Aldred R, et al. Cycling behaviour in 17 countries across 6 continents: levels of cycling, who cycles, for what purpose, and how far? *Transport Reviews* 2021;0:1–24.

32 Fishman E, Schepers P, Kamphuis CBM. Dutch Cycling: Quantifying the Health and Related Economic Benefits. *Am J Public Health* 2015;105:e13-15.

33 de Haas M, Kroesen M, Chorus C, Hoogendoorn-Lanser S, Hoogendoorn S. E-bike user groups and substitution effects: evidence from longitudinal travel data in the Netherlands. *Transportation* 2021. doi:10.1007/s11116-021-10195-3.

34 Van Cauwenberg J, Schepers P, Deforche B, de Geus B. Effects of e-biking on older adults' biking and walking frequencies, health, functionality and life space area: A prospective observational study. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 2022;156:227–36.

35 Giallouros G, Kouis P, Papatheodorou SI, Woodcock J, Tainio M. The long-term impact of restricting cycling and walking during high air pollution days on all-cause mortality: Health impact Assessment study. *Environment International* 2020;140:105679.

36 de Souto Barreto P, Rolland Y, Vellas B, Maltais M. Association of Long-term Exercise Training With Risk of Falls, Fractures, Hospitalizations, and Mortality in Older Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179:394–405.

37 Praznoczy C. Les bénéfices et les risques de la pratique du vélo—Évaluation en Ile-de-France. *Pollution Atmosphérique* 2012;4:57.

38 Schwarz E, Leroutier M, Quirion P, Jean K. Cycling for climate and public health: a missed opportunity for France. *medRxiv* 2022;2022.04.14.22273838.

39 Observatoire national interministériel de la sécurité routière (ONISR). Bilan 2020 de la sécurité routière. 2021URL https://www.onisr.securite-routiere.gouv.fr/etat-de-l-insecurite-routiere/bilans-annuels-de-la-securite-routiere/bilan-2020-de-la-securite-routiere.

40 Bonaldi C, Hill C. Alcohol-attributable mortality in France in 2015. *Bulletin Épidémiologique Hebdomadaire* 2019;97–108.

41 Vélo & Territoires. Bulletins fréquentations vélo en France. Plateforme nationale des fréquentations. 2022.URL https://www.velo-territoires.org/observatoires/plateforme-nationale-de-frequentation/bulletins-frequentations-velo/ Accessed 20 January 2022.

42 Bernard P, Chevance G, Kingsbury C, et al. Climate Change, Physical Activity and Sport: A Systematic Review. *Sports Med* 2021;51:1041–59.

43 ADEME - Agence de la transition écologique. Transition(s) 2050. 4 scenarios to achieve carbon neutrality. https://transitions2050.ademe.fr/en. 2022.

TABLES AND FIGURES



Figure 1 : Evolution of weekly walking and cycling mileage (left) and duration (right) (negaWatt scenario, 2020-2050).

Calculation of duration assumed an average speed of 4.8 $km.h^{-1}$, 14.9 $km.h^{-1}$, 18.1 $km.h^{-1}$ for walking, cycling and E-biking, respectively.



Figure 2 : Evolution of weekly walking and cycling duration by age (negaWatt scenario, 2020-2050).



Figure 3 : Premature deaths prevented (top), years of life lost (YLL) prevented (middle) and monetised health benefits (bottom) of active transportation (negaWatt scenario, 2020-2050).

Health benefits are calculated based on the value of statistical life year.



Figure 4 : Premature deaths (top) and years of life lost (YLL, bottom) prevented per type of active transportation (negaWatt scenario, 2020-2050).



Figure 4 : Contribution of the different age groups to premature deaths (top) and years of life lost (YLL, bottom) prevented by active transportation (negaWatt scenario, 2020-2050).

Table 1: Sensitivity analysis

Description	Premature deaths prevented		Years of life lost prevented		Monetised health benefits		Gain in life expectancy in 2045
	Annual, 2045 (UI)	Cumulative, 2021-2050, in thousands (UI)	Annual, 2045, in thousand (UI)	Cumulative, 2021-2050, in million (UI)	Annual, 2045, in billions € (UI)	Cumulative, 2021-2050, in billions € (UI)	In months (UI)
Main analysis	9,825 [5538-13143]	213 [122-283]	204 [116-271]	4.34 [2.52-5.74]	37.6 [21.5-49.9]	749 [433-990]	3.39 [1.93-4.53]
No difference of mean age of classical vs. E-bike users	10,144 [5730-13558]	221 [127-293]	208 [119-276]	4.44 [2.57-5.86]	38.3 [21.9-50.9]	765 [443-1011]	3.47 [1.98-4.63]
Ratio of E-bike MET to bike MET.hour = 0.78 (Bouscasse et al)[28]	8,841 [4948-11864]	195 [111-259]	184 [104-245]	3.98 [2.3-5.26]	33.9 [19.3-45.1]	684 [395-906]	3.06 [1.73-4.09]
No protective health effects of physical activity above 74 y old	6,402 [3667-8503]	143 [83-189]	176 [101-234]	3.83 [2.23-5.05]	32.5 [18.7-43.1]	658 [382-869]	2.75 [1.58-3.65]
Reported a value of 9% for 5MET.w-1, corresponding to RR=0.81 (Zhao et al)[29]	17,409 [7846-26262]	386 [175-582]	367 [166-554]	7.96 [3.62-11.99]	67.8 [30.7-102.2]	1,370 [622-2064]	6.12 [2.75-9.26]

RR : risk ratio, UI : uncertainty interval.