

## Methodology to LTP Bid

### Introduction

The process taken by the Mole Valley LTS has been to produce a point scoring system that is sensitive to the objectives of the LTP, any history / fears of injury accidents and commitments made to the wider community by officers and members. There is no absolute system, so the method adopted is a best fit.

### Methodology

The method devised is a five part process:

**Stage 1** – All of the known schemes and aspirations were measured against the objectives and targets of the LTP by the use of a simple matrix. The objectives are: integration, environment, safety, economy and accessibility. The targets are: traffic reduction, improved accessibility by non-car modes, more walking cycling and use of public transport, road casualty reduction, reduced vehicle emissions, increased proportion of major developments located in accessible urban networks, improved condition of the highway network and improved provision for freight transport. Where a scheme fit any matching pair of objectives and targets it scored a point. The results of this work can be seen in appendix 2 ( Table One ). The list is in descending numeric order.

**Stage 2** – The Local Transport Plan Group has set six criteria for measuring the effectiveness of the LTP bids against the aspirations of the LTP. The measures they have used are: Integration – across the programme, within a scheme and with topic strategies; compliance with LTP framework, buildability of the scheme and compliance with targets. Each of the schemes from table one were then scored 1 –5 as to their ability to match the criteria. A score of 1 equals a low and 5 a high

**Stage 3** – The scores from table one and two were then added together to create table three, this list was also sorted in descending numeric order.

**Stage 4** – The schemes were then judged as to whether they will have the potential to deliver “casualty reduction benefits” and if there is a community expectation of the scheme. For both issues the schemes were given a flat 10 points each if they met either criteria. It was felt that these two criteria should be given a significantly higher rating than previous marking. Once this was done the schemes were again and for the final time sorted in descending numeric order, see table four – appendix five.

**Stage 5** – The final stage was to add money to each scheme set against a target year and an activity. This is shown in table five – appendix six. The table also shows a running total for each of the LTP years. It was felt unnecessary to produce figures towards the end of the list as these schemes clearly score low and should not form part of any bid.