Appendix G - Prioritisation Framework

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\DMS\Reports\BDRP0004 HIIS Transport Deficit and Schemes_Final.doc

November 2009

Final

URS

Project: HIIS Transport Elements		Contract: 49323910	
Title: Proposed Prioritisation Framework			
Briefing Note Number: PN 015			
Path and Filename: <u>J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS -</u> <u>Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation</u> <u>Framework.doc</u>			
Original Date: 07/08/09	Version: 1.0		Author: Stephen Morris
Last Updated: 17/08/09	Version: 1.1		Author: SM
Last Updated: 09/10/09	Version: 1.2		Author: SM

1. INTRODUCTION

This Briefing Note proposes a framework for use by the HIIS Partners to prioritise interventions. It could be used to prioritise both those listed in the HIIS Transport Technical Report and other schemes that may come forward for consideration in the future. The proposed framework has been devised for use on all types and sizes of interventions.

Not all information will currently be available. Examples include Value for Money assessments for smaller schemes and assessment of contributions to smaller issues. This will require additional work by the Partners (led by the Highway Authority) to allow the framework to be populated effectively.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE FRAMEWORK ELEMENTS

2.1. Principles of Prioritisation

There are a number of key principles that should be considered cornerstones to the prioritisation process. These are:

e) All schemes should be assessed using the same criteria, this includes similar types of schemes being assessed in the same way for individual criteria (such as value for money);

f) Less than rigorous or variable application of the criteria will create inconsistency in the assessment process;

g) As far as practicable the assessment criteria should remain fixed. Changing them could significantly change the prioritisation of schemes, which could introduce contradiction and devalue judgements and decisions both past and present (particularly when delivered in the public domain); and

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.doc

1

h)   A list of key assumptions should be established and included in the same file as the framework before it is populated to ensure a common ground for completion even when different people are involved. Assumptions could include the documented sources that a scheme must feature in for it to be entered into the Prioritisation Framework and guidance on how to assess the score for each criterion.

2.2.   Assessment Criteria

Table 2-1: Framework Assessment Criteria

Criteria	Description
Scheme title	For information
Scheme source	For information. What document does the scheme feature in (e.g. LTP/ RFA). Schemes that do not feature in any documents or lists (both published and unpublished) should not be considered appropriate for entry into the Prioritisation Framework as it indicates that they do not have a sufficiently significant status within the county.
Scheme cost	For information
Scheme funding	For information
Funding shortfall	For information
Funding shortfall as a percentage of cost	Used instead of actual funding shortfall so that large schemes do not get a lower prioritisation simply because of their larger cost.
Alignment with national policy	To what extent does the scheme accord with national guidance and objectives in transport policy.
Alignment with regional policy	The extent to which the scheme accords with regional guidance and objectives in transport policy.
Alignment with HCC policy	To what extent does the scheme accord with county guidance and objectives in transport policy.
Alignment with district policy	The extent to which the scheme accords with district guidance and objectives in transport policy.
Value for money	Major schemes require a Major Scheme Business Case, which assesses this criterion, although a simplified version may be required for this prioritisation process. For smaller schemes, such as road safety treatments, a basic assessment can be used (perhaps applying average accident savings to existing accident rates and using broad cost estimates for implementation) without extensive scheme development being required.

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.doc

2

Criteria	Description
Deliverability	This requires a judgement about how likely it is that the scheme can be taken forward, for example whether there are any high technical risks or strong local objections that could delay or ultimately stop the implementation of a scheme.
Need	An assessment against existing conditions. Where possible this should be based on evidence such as from the East of England Regional Model outputs from HIIS, local network modelling (including using software such as ARCADY). For non-highway schemes passenger load data and other data may be applicable For example a Ratio of Volume to Capacity (or RFC/ VC) over 100 would mean a very high need, 85 to 99 a high need, 70 to 84 a medium need, 50 to 69 a low need and less than 50 a very low need.
Contribution to broader issues including Wider Economic Benefits	For example will a scheme deliver economic, environmental, or quality of life (including health) benefits. The assessment of these should be informed by WebTAG guidance and will need to be more firmly developed before the framework is formally applied. This guidance would need to be incorporated into the key assumptions.
Ruled Out	
Growth item	Whether an intervention is required to cater for growth or not is not considered appropriate as a material consideration for prioritisation. Need should be judged on that required to serve the total population of the county, without preference for those living in the growth communities.
Project Status	It is considered that this would unfairly and inappropriately weigh against schemes where there is otherwise a good case for them. For example using this framework a scheme not yet approved by DfT may have a higher score than one that has approval but could have an unduly reduced score if project status were included in the scoring system

2.3.   Criteria Weighting

Some criteria have been given a higher weighting than others. This is in recognition that they are likely to be more of an issue than others.

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.doc

3

For example, if there is the local will for a scheme then it may be possible to change/ obtain a departure from a local policy but it would be much harder to change national policy if this is causing an obstacle.

Similarly the need for a scheme may be a greater consideration than the value for money or deliverability of a scheme as the solutions to an issue may be varied, but the issue will remain whether the identified solution is deliverable or not. Giving 'Need' a higher weighting recognises this and if a scheme is found to have poor deliverability or value for money then an alternative can be found.

3. THE FRAMEWORK

The assessment values have been kept to 5 to simplify the choice for each criteria but to provide the opportunity for a reasonable level of differentiation between the schemes for clear prioritisation. It is still likely that there will be clusters of schemes with a similar or identical priority value but this is likely to be a fair reflection of reality.

Table 3-1: Framework Scoring & Weighting

Item	Criteria	Values		Weighting
A	Scheme title			0
B	Scheme source			0
C	Scheme cost			0
D	Scheme funding			0
E	Funding shortfall			0
F	Funding shortfall as a percentage of cost	-2	No funding/ don't know	1
		-1	At least 25% funded	
		0	At least 50% funded	
		+1	At least 75% funded	
		+2	100% funded	
G	Alignment with national policy	-2	Badly aligned	3
		-1	Not aligned	
		0	Neutral	
		+1	Some alignment	
		+2	Well aligned	
H	Alignment with regional policy	-2	Badly aligned	2
		-1	Not aligned	
		0	Neutral	
		+1	Some alignment	
		+2	Well aligned	
I	Alignment with HCC policy	-2	Badly aligned	2
		-1	Not aligned	
		0	Neutral	
		+1	Some alignment	
		+2	Well aligned	
J	Alignment with district policy	-2	Badly aligned	1
		-1	Not aligned	

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.doc

4

Item	Criteria	Values		Weighting
		0	Neutral	
		+1	Some alignment	
		+2	Well aligned	
Items G to J are divided by four and multiplied by two to give policy an overall weighting of 2				
K	Value for money	-2	Very low	1
		-1	Low	
		0	Neutral	
		+1	Good	
		+2	Very good	
L	Deliverability	-2	Very low	1
		-1	Low	
		0	Medium	
		+1	High	
		+2	Very high	
M	Need	-2	Very low	2
		-1	Low	
		0	Medium	
		+1	High	
		+2	Very high	
N	Contribution to broader issues	-2	Very low	1
		-1	Low	
		0	Neutral	
		+1	Good	
		+2	Very good	

The priority could be calculated in a simple spreadsheet that would allow the schemes to be presented in a variety of ways (for example by cost or priority) and other information could be added to aid sorting such as the district in which the intervention is located and the mode that the intervention pertains to (e.g. walk, bus, road). The formula that would be used to calculate the priority is shown below (p=prioritisation value).

$$(F*1)+((((G*3)+(H*2)+(I*2)+(J*1))/4)*2)+(K*1)+(L*1)+(M*2)+(N*1) = p$$

Five schemes from the HIIS Transport Technical Report (TTR) have been used as examples to show how the Prioritisation Framework would work. It is not intended that these examples should be considered the most important schemes identified in the TTR nor that the priority scores of each scheme are correct. Hertfordshire County Council and the Partners will ultimately need to populate the framework with consistent judgements and assumptions.

They have been tested in PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.xls, which is reproduced as Figure 3-1. It shows that the schemes with the highest scores are those that best reflect policies promoting sustainable travel for private trips and those schemes considered to have good value for money and a demonstrable need.

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.doc

5

Figure 3-1: Excerpt from Priority Framework Worked Example

Scheme					Policy					VfM	Deliverability	Need	Broader Issues	Priority Score
Title	Source	Cost (£m)	Funding (£m)	Shortfall (£m)	Shortfall	National	Regional	County	District					
Little Hadham Bypass		32.0	32	0	0	-1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	1	5
Smarter Choices		114.7	0	114.7	-2	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	8
Watford Junction Interchange Improvements		32.5	32.5	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	15
M25/ A41 Junction Improvements		5.0	0	5	-2	0	-1	0	0	0	-2	0	0	-4
Hemel Hempstead Bus Interchange Improvement		4.0	2.3	1.7	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	8.5
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!
				0	#DIV/0!									#DIV/0!

J:\Bedford-Jobs\Hertfordshire County Council\49323910 HIIS - Transportation Elements\General\Project Notes\PN015_Proposed Prioritisation Framework.doc

6