

Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft Confédération suisse Confederazione Svizzera Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation

Federal Department of Finance FDF Federal Finance Administration FFA

### Transport Infrastructure Provision, Congestion and Endogenous Growth

Konferenz «Verkehrsökonomik und –politik» an der TU Berlin, 29. und 30. Juni 2017

Carsten Colombier, Eidgenössisches Finanzdepartment, Bern/ Finanzwissenschaftliches Forschungsinstitut, Universität zu Köln und Thomas Kuhn, TU Chemnitz

#### **Structure of the Presentation**

- 1. Purpose of this paper
- 2. Transport infrastructure in endogenous growth models
- 3. Transport infrastructure as an unpaid factor
- 4. Optimal fiscal policy in a decentralised economy (work in progress)
- 5. Preliminary conclusions

#### 1. Purpose of the paper

- Endogenous growth: generated by including some kind of publicly provided input in the production function
  - Usually non-rivalry, congestion and therefore, market failure involved (Gómez, 2008; Eicher/ Turnovsky, 2000; Bretschger, 1996)
  - Theoretical results are confirmed for transport infrastructure by empirical evidence (Colombier, 2009; Nijkamp and Poot, 2004; Aschauer, 1989)
- However: important shortcoming: congestion of transport infrastructure is exogenously givern in endogenous growth models (e.g. Gómez, 2016, Ott and Turnovsky 2006)
  - ⇒ Degree of congestion is independent from capacity utilsation of transport infrastructure and stays constant
  - ⇒(Note that we consider only that type of congestion what the literature dubbs ,relative congestion')

#### 1. Purpose of this paper

- Literature recommends modelling congestion endogenously (Ott/ Turnovsky, 2006; Eicher/ Turnovsky, 2000)
- Our contribution to the literature
  - Degree of congestion is endogenously determined
    - Based on a proposal by Barro/ Sala-i-Martin (1992)
    - Insights from transport science (Walker, 1995)
  - Modelling transport infrastructure as a rival but nonexcludable good
    - Based on a proposal by Barro/ Sala-i-Martin (1992) and Pickhardt (2003)
- Examination whether closer approximation of transport infrastructure changes policy conclusion (work in progress)

### 2. Transport infrastructure in endogenous growth models

$$Y = K * F\left(\frac{G}{K}\frac{1}{n^{\varepsilon-1}}\right) \text{ with } \varepsilon := \text{degree of congestion}$$
(1)

 $\varepsilon = 1 \Longrightarrow G$  is rival;  $\varepsilon = 0 \Longrightarrow G$  is non - rival

- Fairly standard to model transport infrastructure as a nonrival and congestible input provided by the government (e.g. Gômez, 2016, Ott / Turnovsky, 2006; Fisher/ Turnovsky, 1998)
- Degree of congestion is exogenous and expressed by the degree of rivalry of G (ε=1: complete congestion; ε=0: no congestion)
- Production function exhibits constant returns to scale in private capital (K) and in the publicly provided input (G),
- n household producers

Federal Department of Finance FDF Federal Finance Administration FFA

U

### **3. Transport Infrastructure as an Unpaid** Factor $Y = \gamma(k) K^{1-\alpha} G^{\alpha}$ (2)

With k=K/G;  $\gamma$ := congestion factor;  $\gamma \ge 0$ ;  $\gamma_k < 0$ ;  $\gamma_{kk} < 0$ ;  $\gamma_g > 0$ ;  $\gamma_{gg} < 0$ ;  $\gamma_{gk} > 0$ ;

- Degree of congestion is dependent on the relationship between the total amount of private capital (K) and the total amount of the publicly provided input (G), and is therefore *endogenous* (Walker, 1995; Barro/ Sala-i-Martin, 1992)
- Transport infrastructure can be classified as a production externality that Meade (1952) called *unpaid factor* (Colombier and Pickhardt, 2005)
- Rivalry of transport infrastructure does not depend on the degree of congestion and is given by the way firms use the transport infrastructure (Pickhardt, 2003)

## 3. Transport infrastructure as an unpaid factor

- Case I: non-excludable unpaid factor
- Case II: excludable unpaid factor => imposing a user fee is feasible
- Assumptions of the model
  - Production technology as described above
  - Standard CES utility function
  - Each household supplies one unit of labour inelastically
  - No population growth => n is constant

$$\max_{C,G} U_0 = \int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} \frac{C(t)^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} dt, \text{ w.r.t.}$$
$$\dot{K}(t) = Y(t) - C(t) - G(t)$$
$$\text{with} : \beta > 0; 0 < \sigma < 1 \qquad (3)$$

### 3. Transport infrastructure as an unpaid factor

Social optimum

U

congestion effect<0 no congestion=0

$$\psi = \frac{\dot{C}}{C} = \frac{\dot{c}}{c} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( (1 - \alpha) + \eta_{\gamma,k} \right) \frac{\gamma}{k_{j}^{\alpha}} - \beta$$

(4)

Social marginal productivity of capital

with 
$$\eta_{\gamma,k} = \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial k} \frac{k}{\gamma} \wedge \frac{d\psi}{dk} < 0$$

### 3. Transport infrastructure as an unpaid factor

 Prerequisite for endogenous growth: Social marginal productivity of capital has to be constant and above the rate of time preference β.

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}}_{\mathbf{K}} = (\hat{\mathbf{K}} - \hat{\mathbf{G}}) \left( 1 - \frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{Y}} \right) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \hat{\mathbf{K}} = \hat{\mathbf{G}}$$
(5)

- Endogenous growth can be generated with congestible transport infrastructure if the unpaid factor grows at the same rate as private capital
- In contrast to the literature (e.g. Eicher and Turnovsky, 2000) :
  - Steady-state growth rate is determined by capacity utilisation
  - Degree of congestion is endogenously determined and has no impact on returns to scale (no scale effects)

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = ((1-\alpha) + \eta_{\gamma,k})\hat{\mathbf{K}} + (\alpha + \eta_{\gamma,G})\hat{\mathbf{G}} \text{ with } \eta_{\gamma,G} = -\eta_{\gamma,k} \quad (6)$$

# 4. Optimal fiscal policy in a decentralised economy (work in progress)

- Assumptions:
  - Total amount of unpaid factor is exogenous to the representative household (Barro/ Sala-i-Martin, 1992)
  - Congestion effect is ignored by representative household
  - The government balances the budget
  - The government has an Income tax and excise duty (e.g. fuel tax) at their disposal
- Optimal fiscal policy (preliminary results)
  - Growth rate of social optimum can be attained
  - Income tax rate internalizes congestion
  - Excise duty simulates marginal cost pricing
  - Income tax rate and excise duty equate marginal social costs of using transport infrastructure

### **5.** Preliminary conclusions

- Our paper shows that a steady-state growth rate can be achieved with congestible publicly provided unpaid factor, i.e. transport infrastructure
- The optimal degree of congestion is determined endogenously
  - The government has to keep the proportion between the unpaid factor and private capital constant
  - Optimal degree of capacity utilisation (K/G)
- Given the plethora of fiscal rules in the EU governments are well-advised to maintain and increase the provision of transport infrastructure in line with private capital accumulation to achieve stable long-run growth path

### **5. Preliminary conclusions**

- Preliminary results with respect to optimal tax policy suggest that income tax rate are advisable to internalise congestion effect efficiently (work in progress)
  - In line with the results of endogenous-growth models with exogenous congestion (e.g. Gómez, 2012; Ott and Turnovsky, 2006)
- Further proceeding:
  - Analyse policy implications of an excludable unpaid factor
  - Include the unpaid factor as a stock, possible network effects and negative externality on the environment
  - Make a distinction between users and non-users of the transport infrastructure