

Ranking and Prioritisation of Cycle Schemes in Herefordshire

Flow Chart for Decision Process

Stage 1: Initial Scheme Information and Assessment

Scheme helps towards LTP Objectives and Targets

Scheme – is it consistent with Strategic Network, Allot report routes and Cycle Forum proposals?

Scheme **must** meet criteria of Coherence, Directness, Attractiveness, Safety, & Comfort

Does it serve traffic generators on route – existing & proposed?

Stage 2: Collect quantitative information

Gather current usage data

Motor traffic counts and speed data
Current cyclist counts

Consider adequate adjustment for suppressed demand

Gather all accident data last 5 years within 50 metres of route

Assess accident data for trends affecting cyclists

Stage 3: Preliminary Design

Consider hierarchy of measures: record decision for each option with reasons

Traffic reduction is first option
Speed reduction is next option
Consider simple infrastructure to make cycling safer/more attractive.
Eg; ASLs, contraflows, cut-throughs, parking, junction treatment
Redistribution of carriageway
Dedicated infrastructure such as shared/segregated cycle tracks are last preference

Stage 4: Calculations for Ranking

Estimate Budget Cost of preferred design

Calculate FYRR for sites with a history of accidents in last 5 years

$FYRR = (\text{Number of accidents}/5) \times (74090/\text{scheme cost}) \times \text{age factor}$ (2 if accidents involve under 18s or over 65s, 1 otherwise)

Calculate Score using Herefordshire Methodology

This provides a more integrated and balanced view than a straight cost/user or FYRR ranking

Stage 5: Make recommendations to proceed

Final Ranking Table compiled by combining* three different rankings:

Rank 1: ranked by FYRR (d), Cost / user (i) , Score (d)

Rank 2: ranked by FYRR (d), Score (d) Cost / user (i)

Rank 3: ranked by Score (d), FYRR(d), Cost / user (i)

Average of Rank 3 with the Average of Ranks 1&2

Stage 6: Send Ranked List to Cabinet Member

Proceed as budget allows

* Note:

Because the averages are based on ranks rather than quantified values, variations in ranking, while negligible for schemes at the top of the table, become more extreme for schemes further down the ranking. As schemes develop and get removed from the table and new ones are added the ranking of lower schemes vary quite dramatically as the table is updated and reviewed.