


Bikeability in Basel

Working Paper**Author(s):**

Grigore, Elena; Garrick, Norman; Fuhrer, Raphaël; Axhausen, Kay W. 

Publication date:

2018

Permanent link:

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000283763>

Rights / license:

In Copyright - Non-Commercial Use Permitted

Originally published in:

Arbeitsberichte Verkehrs- und Raumplanung 1372

1 **BIKEABILITY IN BASEL**

2

3

4

5 **Elena Grigore**

6 IVT ETH Zurich

7 Stefano-Francini-Platz 5, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland

8 Tel: +41 767 27 8162; Email: grigorelena@gmail.com

9

10 **Norman Garrick, PhD, Professor**

11 University of Connecticut

12 Storrs, CT 06269, USA

13 Tel: 860-486-2990; Email: norman.garrick@gmail.com

14

15 **Raphael Fuhrer, PhD Candidate**

16 IVT ETH Zurich

17 Stefano-Francini-Platz 5

18 8093 Zurich, Switzerland

19 Tel: +41 44 633 67 37; Email: raphael.fuhrer@ivt.baug.ethz.ch

20

21 **Dr.-Ing. Kay W. Axhausen, Professor**

22 IVT ETH Zurich

23 Stefano-Francini-Platz 5

24 8093 Zurich, Switzerland

25 Tel: +41 44 633 31 05; Email: axhausen@ivt.baug.ethz.ch

26

27 Word count: 6,905 words text + 2 tables x 250 words (each) = 7,405 words

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 Submission Date: 01.08.2018

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 “Bikeability” is becoming increasingly relevant in the fields of transport- and urban planning.
3 However, it is not always clear how bikeability is defined, let alone how it can be modeled. The goal of
4 this project is to develop a quantitative method to model bikeability. A case study area in the city of
5 Basel, Switzerland has been selected for assessing the model. Here “bikeability” is understood as the
6 ability and convenience to reach important destinations by bike, based on perceived safety, comfort
7 and attractiveness of the streets and intersections along the routes, as well as the travel distances. The
8 underlying assumption is that cyclists try to minimize the distance traveled and maximize the
9 perceived safety, comfort and attractiveness of their route of choice. Unlike previous bikeability
10 assessments that we have reviewed, our method uses existing route choice studies to quantify the
11 cycling quality, which presumably results in a model, which more accurately reflect real life behavior.
12 Many relevant attributes are included in this work that have not been captured by previous models,
13 such as the gradient, tram tracks and the turn direction at intersections. The method is suitable for a
14 multitude of applications in urban planning, such as the identification of locations that need
15 improvement and the comparison of various planning measures. The current analysis is designed to
16 model conventional bikes being used by commuting cyclists. However, the method can be used for
17 E-bikes and non-commuting cyclists, by applying the appropriate input values.

18

19

20

21 *Keywords:* Bikeability, Perceived distance, Route choice, cycling quality, Sustainable transport, Basel

22

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Cycling has become increasingly relevant in transport- and spatial planning because it has the potential to
3 replace motorized transportation for shorter trips. Many cities aim to increase the local modal share of
4 cycling by improving the attractiveness of their cycling network. However, it is not always clear how to
5 quantify the influence of various cycling measures, nor how to prioritize the locations in the network that
6 need improving.

7 The goal of this work is to develop a method to model bikeability within the Swiss context. It is important to
8 note that there is no consensus in literature about the definition of the term bikeability. In the work of Krenn
9 et al. (1) bikeability is used to assess the perceived comfort and –safety of streets. Lowry et al. (2) define
10 bikeability as the the ability and convenience to reach important destinations by bike. Thus, bikeability
11 depends on the distance to destinations and on the cyclists’ perceived comfort and safety of routes. Their
12 approach in both these studies enables the comparison of various planning measures, by assessing their
13 effect on bikeability. The current work adopts a similar approach. We improve upon the previous state of the
14 art by quantifying the perceived comfort and -safety based on route choice studies found in the literature.
15 Our method includes many relevant attributes of streets and intersections that have not been included in
16 previous assessments of bikeability. The values chosen in this paper are suitable for conventional bikes and
17 commuter cyclists, but the method can be adopted for non-commuters and for E-Bikes.

18 The approach to assessment in this paper consists of three main steps: first, the perceived comfort, -safety
19 and attractiveness for cycling is evaluated for streets and intersections according to a number of attributes.
20 This will be described by the term “cycling quality”. As a second step, a measure of perceived distance for
21 cycling routes is defined according to the cycling quality and the along the actual distance a route. Finally,
22 the perceived distance to the destinations of interest is used to compute bikeability for each cell in the case
23 study area. We define the following terms:

- 24 • Cycling quality: a measure of perceived safety, -comfort, and -attractiveness for cycling on each
25 individual street and intersection.
- 26 • Perceived distance: a measure of perceived safety, comfort, and attractiveness for cycling for each
27 route in the cycling network, based on the cycling quality of each street and intersection along this
28 route, as well as the actual travel distance.
- 29 • Bikeability: a measure of ability and convenience to reach important destinations in the cycling
30 network, based on perceived distances. The underlying assumption is that for each destination,
31 cyclists will choose the route with the shortest perceived distance, which will be referred to as
32 “shortest path”.

33 This work has been carried out in collaboration with the Office of Mobility of Canton Basel-Stadt and for
34 this reason Basel is used as the case study in developing the model. The City of Basel has the highest modal
35 share of cycling of any city in Switzerland (17% in 2015) and is continuously developing its cycling
36 infrastructure published in the document comparing mobility in Swiss cities of Planungsbüro Jud (3). The
37 goal is that this bikeability framework will provide agencies such as the Basel Office of Mobility with a
38 suitable tool to identify which parts of the cycling network need improvement, and to assess which
39 measures are needed to more effectively improve the attractiveness of their cycling network.

40
41
42
43
44
45

LITERATURE REVIEW

Evaluating the cycling quality

For most existing methods to evaluate cycling quality, various attributes of the street are assessed and each attribute is assigned a number of points, which are combined into a total score. Examples of models using this approach are the Bicycle Compatibility Index (BCI) of Harkey et al. (4), and the bicycle level of service (BLOS), described in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) (5). However, these methods do not include many attributes that are found to be relevant in the route choice of cyclists, such as the gradient, cycle tracks and specific intersection treatments (e.g. bike lanes or bike boxes). Moreover, they have been developed for the US, and their application into the European context must be done with care.

Furthermore, the scores of BCI and BLOS are assigned according to an arbitrary scale, and are not developed based on route choice studies, as can be observed in the Implementation Manual of the BCI of FHWA (6) and in HCM (5). A more suitable method to identify and quantify the attributes important for cyclists is to conduct a route choice study, by comparing GPS traces of the cyclists' actual routes with the shortest possible routes, as has been done by Krenn et al. (1), Winters et al. (7) and Broach et al. (8). Because such an analysis goes beyond the scope of this work, the choice and quantification of attributes will be largely based on the findings of Broach et al. (8). This is the most extensive study found in literature regarding the route choice of cyclists.

Of course, adopting attribute values identified in a different city must be done with care. The analysis of Broach et al. (8) was conducted in Portland, Oregon while the current analysis is for Basel. One could argue that cyclists' expectations in Portland are different than in Basel, since fewer people cycle in Portland. According to Pucher & Buehler (9) the modal share of cycling in Portland amounts to 6%, which is about 3 times lower than in Basel, according to Planungsbüro Jud (3). It is expected that cyclists' safety is higher in Basel, and cyclists in Portland are part of a social group who is more likely to take risks.

Cycling quality attributes of streets

This section presents the attributes selected to assess perceived safety, -comfort and attractiveness of streets for cycling. The selection is based on how influential the attributes are for cyclists, according to existing literature and to existing policy guidelines in Switzerland and other high biking places including the Netherlands and Denmark. Finally, a number of attributes that have not been included in the analysis will be mentioned.

The first attribute selected for inclusion in this model is the street gradient. Cycling uphill requires more physical effort than riding on a flat surface, while cycling downhill can be dangerous due to increased cycling speeds, as found by Pestalozzi und Stäheli (10). Krenn et al. (1), Winters et al. (7) and Broach et al. (8) identify the gradient as one of the most influential attributes in the route choice of cyclists.

The next attributes selected are the type of cycling infrastructure along with the speed limits and the level of motorized traffic volumes. According to the Swiss, Danish and Dutch cycling guidelines, different types of cycling infrastructure are recommended at different speed limits and different levels of motorized traffic volumes, measured as annual average daily traffic (AADT) in vehicles/day (veh./day) (11,12,13). Different widths are recommended for different types of cycling infrastructures, according to Basel's guideline for cycling (14).

The third class of attributes considered are a variety of hazardous conditions. The Swiss Federal Roads Office (ASTRA) (11) specifies that certain street elements and layouts pose danger to cyclists. Examples are the presence of car parking and tram tracks in combination with insufficient space or steep gradients. If the AADT is too high for the given street width, dangerous overtaking situations might take place. Streets with a percentage of heavy traffic higher than 8% should not be included in the cycling network (12). These additional risks will be referred to as "hazards" in the current work.

Finally, the fourth attribute class considered is the attractiveness of the riding environment which from the literature is known to play a role in the route choice of cyclists. Krenn et al. (1) find that cyclists prefer to

1 ride along routes with green and water. Green and water improve the cycling experience due to better
2 aesthetics, but also due to cooling in the summer.
3 Other attributes of streets that are positively perceived by cyclists are smooth surfaces, the presence of
4 lighting, and lack of interruptions, according to ASTRA (11). These appear less frequently in the revealed-
5 and stated preferences studies reviewed. Therefore, they are assumed to be less influential on the cyclists'
6 route choice than the attributes mentioned above, and they will not be included in the analysis.
7

8 **Cycling quality attributes of intersections**

9 This section presents the attributes selected to assess perceived safety, -comfort and attractiveness of
10 intersections for cycling. The selection is based on existing literature and policy guidelines. Attributes that
11 have not been included are mentioned at the end of this section.

12 The first attribute selected is the intersection AADT. Broach et al (8) find that the AADT plays a role in
13 cyclists' route choice for unsignalized intersections (without traffic light), and that its influence depends on
14 the turn's direction, with left turns being more problematic than right turns.

15 The second and the third attributes selected are the presence of traffic lights and stop signs. Broach et al. (8)
16 find that cyclists in Portland try to avoid traffic lights and stop signs. Carter et al. (15) find that the number
17 of car lanes reduces perceived safety, while Buch and Jensen (16) state that the presence of a car lane
18 turning right can be a source of conflict for cyclists going straight. The number of car lanes and the presence
19 of a car lane turning right will be included in the analysis.

20 Proper intersection treatments can offset the negative effects of these factors. Carter et al. (15) find that bike
21 lanes improve cyclists' comfort, while Dill et al. (17) find that bike boxes increase the cyclists' perceived
22 safety and comfort. The use of bike lanes and bike boxes is prescribed by the Swiss norm regarding
23 intersection design (18) and if there is no space for them, protected spaces for indirect left turns must be
24 provided instead. The presence of bike lanes, bike boxes and spaces for indirect left turns have been
25 selected for the analysis.

26 Other important intersection attributes are the crossing distance (included in BLOS in HCM) (5) and the
27 speed limits, according to Carter et al. (15). Both attributes are expected to be relevant especially for
28 unsignalized intersections with high traffic volumes. The presence of bicycle specific traffic lights is
29 expected to improve perceived comfort, according to Basel's guideline for cycling (14). Nevertheless, there
30 is no quantification found in literature about these three attributes, and bicycle specific traffic lights are
31 found at very few intersections in Basel. In order to keep the analysis simple, they will not be included in
32 this work.
33

34 **Bikeability**

35 Few attempts to compute bikeability incorporate distance to destinations into the calculation. An example is
36 the method of McNeil (19), who calculates accessibility for cyclists by assigning points to various types of
37 destinations within a 20 minutes bicycle ride, based on distance. His method is similar to the Walk Score
38 (20) and does not incorporate the cycling quality. Klobucar and Fricker (21) assume that cyclists make
39 decisions such as to minimize the distance and to maximize the cycling quality. They weigh the length of
40 each link in the network by the Bicycle Compatibility Index (BCI). Lowry et al. (2) take this idea further, by
41 calculating the accessibility to destinations, using the link length times the cycling quality as travel cost.
42 Instead of using BCI, they used BLOS to calculate the cycling quality.

43 The current work builds on the examples of Klobucar and Fricker (21) and Lowry et al. (2), by assuming
44 that cyclists choose their route such as to minimize the distance and to maximize the cycling quality. We
45 improve upon the existing state of art by identifying and quantifying the cycling quality attributes based on
46 existing route choice studies, which more accurately reflect real life behavior. The goal is to find a
47 suitable manner of scaling the actual distance to obtain the perceived distance, based on cyclists' actual
48 route choice. Because the BCI and BLOS scores use an arbitrary scale, they are not very suitable to be
49 multiplied with the distance. For example, a BLOS of 2 for a street segment does not indicate that a cyclist
50 prefers that segment two times more than a segment with a score of 4.
51

METHOD

Overview

The underlying assumption is that cyclists chose their route as to minimize the actual distance and to maximize the quality of streets and intersections along the way. In reality, other factors play a role in cyclists' route choice. Götchi et al. (22) point out the importance of the so called "unreasoned behavior", driven by habits and impulsiveness. However, a quantification of these two factors has not been found in existing literature on route choice, and goes beyond the scope of the current work. Therefore, they will not be included in our method.

It is assumed that, if the route with the shortest actual distance does not provide the desired quality, cyclists are willing to detour from it and travel along a longer route of better quality, as found by Krenn et al., Winters et al., and Broach et al. (1,7,8). The lower the quality of a street or intersection, the longer cyclists are willing to detour from it. Therefore, the quantification of this detour for each street- and intersection attribute will be used to define a cost for each attribute. The separate attribute costs are combined into a total cost for each street and for each intersection. The perceived distance for each route is calculated by scaling the actual distance by the cycling quality costs of the streets and intersections along the way. At the end, bikeability is computed for each cell in the case study area, using the shortest perceived distance to each destination of interest as travel cost.

The case study area is located in the City of Basel (Figure 1). It consists of the part of the city center south of the Rhine River along with the adjacent neighborhood of St. Johann that lies to the northeast of the center. Basel is densely built and there is little space available for new cycling infrastructure. Typical challenges for cyclists in Basel are posed by the presence of tram tracks, high curbs, car parking, as well as hilly topography in the center.




FIGURE 1: Selected case-study area within the City of Basel

1 **Assessing the cycling quality of street segments**

2 The cycling quality of streets will be assessed for each street segment in the case-study area. A segment is
3 defined as having a continuous type of cycling infrastructure, such as a bike lane or a cycle track. If the type
4 of infrastructure changes, a new segment is defined. Moreover, when at least two streets come together (at
5 intersections) new segments are defined.

6 The cycling quality of each segment will be measured by the “perceived length” of the segment. In other
7 words, a segment of good quality is assumed to be perceived as shorter than its actual length, while a
8 segment of lower quality is perceived as longer. To obtain the perceived length, the actual length is
9 multiplied by a scaling factor, called a “cost multiplier”. Cost multipliers greater than 1 indicate that the
10 quality is lower than expected by cyclists and therefore the perceived length will be longer than the actual
11 length. Values lower than 1 indicate good quality (better than expected) and cost multipliers equal to 1
12 indicate neutral or as expected quality.

13 In order to assess the cycling quality of segments, the following attributes have been selected for inclusion
14 in the assessment based on our survey of the literature and the various design standards: the gradient, the
15 type and dimensions of the cycling infrastructure (relative to speed limits and AADT), the presence of
16 hazards, and the esthetic and comfort of the riding environment. For each of these four attributes, a cost is
17 defined guided by our interpretation of the existing literature. The cost multiplier of segments is calculated
18 by adding up the separate costs of each attribute, following the examples of Krenn et al. (1) and Winters et
19 al. (7). The riding environment will be assessed as a benefit instead of a cost, and it will therefore be
20 subtracted from the total. The formula to compute the cost multiplier of segments is given by:

$$21 \quad CM_s = C_{Gr} + C_{Inf} + C_{Hz} - B_{Env} \quad (1)$$

22
23
24 Where CM_s is the cost multiplier of street segments, C_{Gr} is the cost due to gradient, C_{Inf} is the
25 cost due to the type and dimensions of cycling infrastructure, C_{Hz} is the cost of additional hazards,
26 and B_{Env} is the benefit of the riding environment.

27 In order for the costs to add up to 1 for the neutral situation, one attribute (cycling infrastructure) will be
28 assigned a cost of 1 for the neutral condition, while all the others attributes will be assigned a cost of 0 for
29 their corresponding neutral condition. For example, a cost of 1.3 for cycling infrastructure represents a cost
30 increase of 30% in comparison to the neutral situation, while for any other attributes, a 30% increase in cost
31 is given as a score of 0.3.

32 **Quantifying the cycling quality attributes of streets**

33 The first attribute selected for the analysis is the gradient. The gradient cost for uphill slopes is quantified
34 based on a graph that shows how the cycling speed varies with gradient. This graph is found in the Swiss
35 norm regarding bicycle traffic (23). From the speed reduction for each positive gradient, one can deduce by
36 how much the distance covered by the cyclist is lowered, assuming the same physical effort for cycling
37 compared to a level road. Steep negative gradients increase collision risks for cyclists due to higher cycling
38 speeds, but unlike positive gradients, they have not been identified by route choice studies and they are
39 assumed to have a lower cost. Small downhill slopes are expected to have a benefit, due to decreased effort
40 without affecting the safety. Based on these considerations, a gradient cost function is defined (Figure 2).
41
42




FIGURE 2: Gradient cost function

The second attribute included is the cycling infrastructure. This accounts for the type of cycling infrastructure chosen, based on the speed limit and AADT, as well as for the widths of bike lanes and cycle tracks. The types of cycling infrastructure identified in Basel’s guideline for cycling (14) are listed below:

- Bikes + pedestrians
- Bikes + motorized + pedestrians
- Bikes + motorized
- Bike lane
- Bus lane with bikes allowed
- Cycle track
- Bike boulevard

Different types of cycling infrastructure are recommended for different AADT and speed limits, according to the Swiss, Danish and Dutch guidelines (11,12,13). Cost functions are defined for the cycling infrastructure types “Bike + motorized” and for bike lanes, for the speed limits of 30- and 50 Km/h, according to AADT. Bus lanes are considered to be the same as bike lanes.

The first function to be defined is that of “Bikes + motorized” at 30 Km/h. In this case, the neutral condition is assumed to be an AADT of less than 3,000 veh./day, because this traffic volume is found to be acceptable for bikes riding together with cars at 30 Km/h, according to the national Swiss guideline in ASTRA (11). As discussed earlier, this neutral condition is given a score of 1 for cycling infrastructure. The growth rate of the function “Bikes + motorized” at 30 Km/h is defined based on the findings of Broach et al. (8). Segments with higher speeds or with bike lanes are penalized according to the schedule shown in Figure 3. It is assumed that an increase in speed or the addition of a bike lane leads to a change in cost of about 20-30%. This estimation is based on the fact that improvements in cycling infrastructure (such as the addition of a cycle track or a bike boulevard) in the work Broach et al. (8) lead to cost reductions of about 10-20%. Only bike lanes of widths between 1.5 m and 1.8 m are included in this graph.




FIGURE 3: Cycling infrastructure cost functions for the ca “Bikes + motorized” and bike lanes at speeds 30 and 50 Km/h

For the other types of cycling infrastructure, constant costs are assumed. Bike boulevards are assigned a cost of 0.9 based on the findings of Broach et al. (8), while for the cases when bikes ride together with pedestrians, a higher cost of 1 is assumed, due to collision risk with pedestrians. For cycle tracks and bike lanes, the cost depends on the widths: cycle tracks of optimal widths are assigned a cost of 0.8, which has been found by Broach et al. (8) to be the cost of cycle tracks. For narrower widths, higher costs of 0.9 and 1 are assumed. Bike lanes within the recommended widths of 1.5 m -1.8 m are penalized according to the functions shown in Figure 3. Bike lanes narrower than the minimum width of 1.2 m are not included at all, while for widths of 1.2 m -1.5 m, a weighted average is taken between the function of bike lane, and the one of “Bike + motorized” shown in Figure 3. The recommended widths are identified based on Basel’s guideline for cycling (14), Dutch guideline CROW (13) a Swiss norm on cycling (24). A summary of all cycling infrastructure costs is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1 Cycling infrastructure costs

Type of cycling infrastructure	Cycling infrastructure costs
Bike + motorized at 30 Km/h	Figure 3
Bike + motorized at 50 Km/h	
Bike lane (1.5 -1.8 m) / bus lane at 30 Km/h	
Bike lane (1.5 -1.8 m) / bus lane at 50 Km/h	
Bike lane (< 1.2 m)	The same as “Bike + motorized”
Bike lanes (1.2 -1.5 m)	Weighted average between “Bike + motorized”- and bike lane functions at each speed limit
Bike + pedestrians	1
Bike + motorized + pedestrians	1
Bike boulevard	0.9
Cycle track of 3.0 m (one direction) or 3.4 m (bidirectional)	0.8
Cycle track 2.6 – 2.9 m (one direction) Or 2.8 – 3.3 m (bidirectional)	0.9
Cycle track < 2.6 m (one direction) Or < 2.8 m (bidirectional)	1
Bike lanes > 1.8 m	1


1 The third attribute included are the hazards discussed earlier. The list of hazards and their costs is shown in
 2 Table 2. These are identified based on the recommendations of ASTRA (11) and Pestalozzi and Stäheli (10).
 3 Tram tracks and high curbs are found at many places in Basel and are typical of European cities. Because
 4 they increase the collision risk for cyclists and are negatively perceived, their planning requires special
 5 attention.

6 A previous quantification of the hazards listed below has not been found in existing literature on cyclists’
 7 route choice. A maximum penalty of 50% has been chosen. It is not expected that cyclists detour longer than
 8 50% from the shortest route, because according to Broach et al. (8) the average detour of commuter cyclists
 9 amounts to 11%. If there are more hazards along a segment, the maximum cost value of any of the given
 10 hazard will be used as the hazard cost for that segment.

11
 12 **TABLE 2 Chosen hazards and their costs**

Hazard	Hazard cost ()
Longitudinal parking + Bike lane closer than 50 cm	0.2
Longitudinal parking + Bike lane closer than 50 cm + Gradient < -4% or Gradient > 4%	0.5
Longitudinal parking + tram tracks closer than 2.65 m	0.3
Longitudinal parking + tram tracks closer than 2.65 m + Gradient < -4% or Gradient > 4%	0.5
Longitudinal parking + „Bike + motorized“ + Gradient < -4% or Gradient > 4%	0.3
Angular or perpendicular parking	0.2
High curbs along tram stops without bike specific measures	0.2
Percentage of heavy traffic > 8% of AADT (traffic oriented streets)	0.2
AADT too high for the given street width	0.2

13
 14 The fourth and final attribute used to assess the cycling quality of segments in this paper is the riding
 15 environment. Erath et al. (25) find that the presence of greenery leads to a reduction of 20% in the perceived
 16 travel time for pedestrians, in comparison to the actual travel time. Because directness is more important for
 17 commuting cyclists than for pedestrians, a maximum decrease in cost of 10% is assumed. The benefit
 18 function is based on the coverage of green and water within a buffer of 20 m around the center of the
 19 roadway. The benefit function is given in Figure 4.



21
 22 **FIGURE 4: Benefit of the riding environment**
 23


1 **Assessing the cycling quality for intersections**

2 In order to assess the cycling quality of intersections, turn costs are defined, corresponding to the distance
 3 cyclists are willing to detour from the shortest route, in order to avoid taking that turn. The following
 4 attributes are identified and quantified as turn cost components based on the findings of Broach et al. (8):
 5 basic turn, traffic light, AADT and stop signs. The basic turn cost accounts for the fact that cyclists always
 6 try to avoid turns. If the intersection is signalized, a traffic light cost (except for right turns) is added to the
 7 basic turn cost. If it is unsignalized, an AADT cost is added instead, depending on the AADT of the
 8 intersection and the turn direction. A stop sign cost is added, if necessary.

9 The next step is to account for intersection treatments and layout characteristics, using the following
 10 attributes: bike lanes, bike boxes, spaces for indirect left turns, number of car lanes (for direct left turns),
 11 and the presence of a car lane turning right at unsignalized intersections (for bicycle traffic going straight).
 12 Because there is no quantification of these attributes found in cycling route choice studies, these attributes
 13 will be quantified in comparison to each other, based on existing literature. For example, indirect left turns
 14 are generally avoided by cyclists, as mentioned in the Swiss norm regarding intersection design (18),
 15 therefore their benefit is assumed to be lower than that of bike lanes or bike boxes. A so called “layout
 16 multiplier” has been defined, to quantify the influence of these factors.

17 The procedure to compute the turn cost is shown in Figure 5. First, the basic turn is added to the traffic light
 18 cost (for signalized intersections), or to the AADT cost (unsignalized intersections). A stop sign cost is
 19 added if necessary. Afterwards, the result is multiplied with the layout multipliers corresponding to the
 20 intersection characteristics shown in Figure 5.

21
22



23
24
25
26
27


FIGURE 5: Procedure to compute the turn cost

1 Perceived distance

2 The perceived distance along a route is defined by the sum of the all perceived lengths of the segments (m)
 3 and the all turn costs (m) along the route. This can be written formally as:

$$4 \quad P_{ij} = \sum_{s \in R_{ij}} (M_s L_s) + \sum_{t \in I_{ij}} C_t \quad (2)$$

6 where P_{ij} is the perceived distance along the route from i to j , s is a segment along the route, R_{ij}
 7 is the subset of segments along the route, M_s is the cost multiplier of each segment, L_s is the
 8 actual length of each segment, t represents each turn along the route, I_{ij} is the subset of
 9 intersections along the route, and C_t is the turn cost.



12
 13 **FIGURE 6: Actual distance vs. perceived distance along a route**

14 Mapping bikeability

15 Once the cycling quality has been calculated and important destinations have been identified, bikeability
 16 can be computed for each 100 m x 100 m cell in the case-study area. This section explains the rationale
 17 behind the calculation and the equation.

18 For this analysis, workplaces have been chosen as destinations, because the case study is done for
 19 commuter cyclists. Nevertheless, any type of destinations could be used to assess bikeability.

20 As explained earlier, it is assumed that cyclists choose the route with the shortest perceived distance, which
 21 is referred to as “shortest path”. Bikeability is computed as the average of the perceived distances along the
 22 shortest paths to all destinations of interest, weighted by the intensity of activities at destinations (number of
 23 workplaces). Normalizing by the number of workplaces is necessary, so that bikeability depends only on
 24 perceived distances, and not on the absolute number of workplaces. This rationale can be written formally
 25 as:
 26

$$27 \quad b_i = \frac{\sum_{j \in D} (w_j \times p_{ij})}{\sum_{j \in D} w_j} \quad (3)$$

28 where b_i is the bikeability of source i , j represents each destination hectare center in the subset D , w_j is the
 29 intensity of activity (number of workplaces) at the destination j , and p_{ij} is the perceived shortest path
 30 (measured in m) from source i to each destination j .

31 Although the cycling quality of segments and intersections is assessed only for the case study area, all the
 32 workplaces in the canton of Basel-Stadt will be included in the computation. This includes the City of Basel
 33 and two nearby villages, Riehen and Bettingen. Outside the case study area, the average cost multiplier of
 34 segments and the average turn cost found within the case study area will be used for calculations.
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39

RESULTS

Overview

This section presents first the results for the cycling quality of streets and intersections as maps. Afterwards, the bikeability map will be presented.

Cycling quality of streets

The cycling quality of streets for the case study area can be seen in Figure 7 for both directions of travel.

The coloured segments represent the streets included the case study area, while the black ones are located outside of this area, but within the canton Basel-Stadt. The light grey area is located in Switzerland, while darker surface is in France. Green segments indicate high cycling quality (lower cost multipliers), while the red ones represent lower quality (high cost multipliers).




FIGURE 7 Cycling quality for segments in the case study area for both directions of travel

Residential streets generally have higher quality than traffic oriented ones, except when they are located along steep slopes. Cost multipliers higher than 2 are due either to high gradients, or to high AADT and speed limits for the case when bikes ride together with cars.

Cycling quality of intersections

Because each intersection consists of more than one turn, it is not possible to visualize all turn costs in one map. However, it is possible to visualize any separate attribute, by depicting the number of turns having that attribute for each intersection. In this case, a visualization based on the number of left turns without cycling infrastructure (bike lane or –box) for traffic streets, as well as the intersection AADT is made. This helps us visualize problematic turns, since left turns are more negatively perceived at high AADT than going straight or turning right, as found by Broach et al. (8), and their cost reaches a value of 885 m by an AADT > 20,000 veh./day for unsignalized intersections.

The visualization is shown in Figure 8. The color represents the number of traffic streets without bike lanes or bike boxes for left turns at the intersection, while the bullet size shows the AADT of the intersection.




FIGURE 8 Number of traffic streets without cycling infrastructure for direct left turns, for each intersection in the case study area

A number of intersections can be observed, for which there is no cycling infrastructure for left turns along traffic streets available. These are not comfortable for cyclists, especially by high AADT. Moreover, one can observe many large yellow dots along the middle axes. These are problematic for cyclists turning left towards the residential streets.

1 **Bikeability**

2 Bikeability is calculated with the method described earlier and is mapped in Figure 9 for the case study area.
3 Green represents higher bikeability, corresponding to a shorter average perceived distance to workplaces,
4 while orange indicates lower bikeability due to longer perceived distances.
5
6



7 7700 m 4'400 m 3'300 m
8 **FIGURE 9 Bikeability for the case study area**
9

10 As expected, better values are found in the city center, because the distances to all workplaces in the canton
11 are shorter. Because this measure is strongly dependent on the actual distance, a new measure is needed that
12 removes this dependency, and enables the identification of places where improvements in the bicycling
13 network are necessary.

14
15 **ANALYSIS**

16
17 **Identifying locations that need improvement**

18 This section presents a procedure to identify locations that need improvement. First, this procedure will be
19 explained in detail. Afterwards, a map depicting the locations to be improved will be shown.
20 The procedure can be summarized as follows: first, bikeability is computed for each cell. Afterwards, the
21 average distance to all destinations along the shortest possible routes is calculated. As a next step, the
22 average distance is scaled and then it is subtracted from bikeability for each cell in the case study area.
23 The rationale behind this can be explained by looking at the growth rate of the (scaled) actual distance and
24 the perceived distance during a cycling trip shown in Figure 10. The actual distance increases linearly
25 during the trip, while the perceived distance increases according to the cycling quality of each segment.
26 Along segments of lower quality than average, it increases at higher rate, and along segments of higher
27 quality it increases at lower rate than the actual distance. When the cyclist rides from a lower quality to a
28 higher quality segment, the perceived distance becomes higher than the actual distance, as seen in Figure 10.
29 The same is true at network level: if, for a particular cell in the area, bikeability is higher than the scaled
30 average distance to destinations (along the shortest possible route), it means that the outgoing segments
31 from that cell are of lower quality than the average. These poorly connected spots are shown in orange in
32 Figure 10. Similarly, green spots are well connected and their outgoing segments are of high quality.
33




FIGURE 10: Comparison between the cumulative cost of a cycling trip based on the (scaled) actual distance and cumulative cost of a cycling trip based on perceived distance

Therefore, the average (scaled) distance to destinations is subtracted from bikeability. The result is mapped in Figure 11 and is expressed in meters. Orange cells represent the larger values greater than 0 (around 1,000 m), and are the less well-connected to the surrounding cells than the rest. Green shows values lower than 0, corresponding to the cells that are better connected than the others. Yellow represents values greater than 0 that are not very large (around 0 - 500 m). These cells are not very well connected, but they are not the most problematic in the area.



FIGURE 11 Subtraction of scaled average distance to workplaces from bikeability to workplaces

1 Identifying locations that need improvement is relevant in the planning process. The cycling quality maps
2 of segments and intersections show locations of poor quality, but they do not tell us where improvements
3 are relevant. For example, if a cyclists can choose between two parallel routes that are significantly
4 different in quality but comparable in distance, improving the route with lower quality might not bring any
5 appreciable advantage for most cyclists.
6

7 **Sensitivity analysis**

8 A sensitivity analysis has been carried out for the case study area, whereby improvements in cycling
9 infrastructure has been proposed at the locations identified in Figure 11 (e.g. adding cycle tracks). It has
10 been found that improvements in cycling infrastructure have limited impact on the average bikeability score
11 of the area. Possible explanations for this are that the score is more influenced by the actual distance and by
12 the gradient than by the cycling infrastructure. Nevertheless, cells located in the vicinity of the proposed
13 measures show high reductions in perceived distances to workplaces. An analysis of all perceived distances
14 to workplaces from one cell shows a maximum reduction of 881 m in perceived distance compared to the
15 base scenario. A more detailed explanation of the sensitivity will not be presented, because it goes beyond
16 the scope of this paper.
17

18 **Applications in urban planning**

19 The current method is suitable for a multitude of applications in urban planning, such as:

- 20 • Visualize the quality of both streets and intersections
- 21 • Identify locations where improvements in the cycling quality are necessary
- 22 • Compare different planning measures by assessing their impact on bikeability
- 23 • Provide insight into which streets are suitable to be included in the cycling network of a city
- 24 • Assess and compare different neighborhoods according to their bikeability level
25

26 **Strengths and comparison to other methods**

27 The framework developed has several advantages compared to the previous state of the art. First, the cycling
28 quality is quantified according to route choice studies, while the methods of Lowry et al. (2) and Klobucar
29 and Fricker (22) use the arbitrary scales of BLOS and BCI, which are less suitable for routing calculations.
30 Second, the method includes relevant attributes that are not included in BLOS and BCI, such as the
31 gradient, the hazards, the presence of tram tracks for segments, as well as bike lanes, bike boxes and indirect
32 left turns for intersections. Furthermore, the method presented here takes into account separate turn
33 directions at intersections in the routing calculation, while previous analyses assess intersections as a
34 whole. Finally, the method enables the identification of locations for which improvements are necessary,
35 and is suitable for other applications in planning named above.
36

37 **CONCLUSION**

38 The bikeability framework proposed provides planners with a powerful tool in assessing the impact of
39 different planning measures on cycling, as well as identifying relevant locations for improvement. It relies
40 on a holistic approach, because it considers relevant attributes for both streets and intersections. Although
41 the analysis has been conducted only for commuter cyclists and conventional bikes, the method can be
42 applied for non-commuters and E-bikes, by using different values for the cycling quality attributes.
43 Furthermore, the assessment can be carried out for different areas and different types of destinations.
44 Further refinement of this approach should focus on conducting stated- or revealed preferences surveys, in
45 order to help refine the identification and quantification of the cycling quality attributes, for the location to
46 be analyzed. This can be done by comparing GPS traces of the actual routes chosen by cyclists with the
47 shortest possible routes, following the examples of Krenn et al. (1), Winters et al. (7) and Broach et al. (8).
48 More sensitivity analyses are necessary to investigate the influence of each quality attribute on the final
49 score. Finally, one could investigate the relationship between bikeability and the modal share of cycling.
50
51

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 This project has been carried out in collaboration with the Office of Mobility of Canton Basel-Stadt. GIS
3 data regarding the cycling network and a number of attribute values have been provided.

4
5 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT**

6 The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception and design: Elena Grigore,
7 Norman Garrick, Raphael Fuhrer; data collection: Elena Grigore; analysis and interpretation of results:
8 Elena Grigore, Norman Garrick, Raphael Fuhrer, Kay W. Axhausen; draft manuscript preparation: Elena
9 Grigore, Norman Garrick. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the
10 manuscript.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2
- 3 1. Krenn, P. J., P. Oja, and S. Titze. Development of a Bikeability Index to Assess the
4 Bicycle-Friendliness of Urban Environments. *Open Journal of Civil Engineering*, 2015. 05:
5 451–459.
- 6 2. Lowry, M.B. , D. Callister, M. Gresham and B. Moore. Using Bicycle Level of Service to Assess
7 Community-wide Bikeability. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation*
8 *Research Board*, 2012. 2314: 41-48.
- 9 3. Planungsbüro Jud: *Städtevergleich Mobilität. Vergleichende Betrachtung der Städte Basel, Bern,*
10 *Luzern, St.Gallen, Winterthur und Zürich im Jahr 2015.* ActivPrint AG, Zürich, 2017.
- 11 4. Harkey D., D.W. Reinfurt and M. Knuiman. Development of the Bicycle Compatibility Index.
12 *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1998. 1636:
13 13-20.
- 14 5. *2010 Highway Capacity Manual.* Transportation Research Board, 2011.
- 15 6. FHWA. The Bicycle Compatibility Index. A Level of Service Concept, Implementation Manual,
16 1998.
- 17 7. Winters, M., E.M. Setton, K. Teschke and M. Brauer. Mapping bikeability: a spatial tool to support
18 sustainable travel, *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 2013. 40: 865 – 883.
- 19 8. Broach, J., J. P. Gliebe, and J. Dill. Bicycle Route Choice Model Developed from
20 RevealedPreference GPS Data. Paper presented at the 90th Annual Meeting of the Transportation
21 Research Board, Washington D.C., 2011.
- 22 9. Pucher J. and R. Buehler. *City Cycling.* MIT Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- 23 10. Pestalozzi & Stäheli *Technischer Bericht zum Teilrichtplan Basel-Stadt.* Department of
24 Construction and Civil Engineering Basel-Stadt (BVD), Basel, 2012.
- 25 11. Swiss Federal Roads Office (ASTRA), SchweizMobil, Road Safety Fund. *Planung von*
26 *Velorouten. Handbuch.* ASTRA, Bern, 2008.
- 27 12. Celis Consult. *Håndbog i cykeltrafik en samling af de danske vejregler på cykelområdet.* Celis
28 Consult, Egå, 2014.
- 29 13. CROW. *Design Manual for Bicycle Traffic.* CROW, Ede, 2007.
- 30 14. Baker, J., and M. Schmidt. *Planungshilfe für die Gestaltung von Anlagen des Fuss- und*
31 *Veloverkehrs. Grundsätze und Projektierung.* Department of Construction and Civil Engineering
32 Basel-Stadt (BVD), Basel, 2017.
- 33 15. Carter, D.L., W.W. Hunter, C.V. Zegeer and J.R. Stewart. *Pedestrian and Bicyclist Intersection*
34 *Safety Indices.* Turner-Fairbank Highway Research Center. *Federal Highway Administration,*
35 *FHWA-HRT-06-130*, 2007.
- 36 16. Buch, T. S., and Jensen, S. U. *Sikkerhedseffekter af tilbagetrukne stopstreger - før-efter*
37 *uheldsevaluering af 123 signalregulerede kryds.* Trafitec, Copenhagen, 2012.
- 38 17. Dill, J., C.M. Monsere and N. McNeil. *Evaluation of Bike Boxes at Signalized Intersections.*
39 Transportation Research and Education Center (TREC), University of Portland, Portland, 2011.
- 40 18. Swiss Association of Road and Traffic Professionals (VSS) *SN 640 252: Knoten Führung*
41 *des Veloverkehrs,* Zurich, 2017.
- 42 19. McNeil, N. Bikeability and the Twenty-Minute Neighborhood: How Infrastructure and
43 Destinations Influence Bicycle Accessibility. Paper presented at the 90th Annual Meeting of the
44 Transportation Research Board, Washington D, 2011.

- 1 20. Walk Score. Walk Score Methodology, <https://www.walkscore.com/methodology.shtml>, 2018,
2 accessed on 25.06.2018.
- 3 21. Klobucar, M., and J. Fricker. Network Evaluation Tool to Improve Real and Perceived Bicycle
4 Safety. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2007.
5 2031: 25-33.
- 6 22. Götschi, T., de Nazelle, A., Brand, C., Gerike, R., & PASTA Consortium. Towards a
7 comprehensive conceptual framework of active travel behavior: A review and synthesis of
8 published frameworks. *Current environmental health reports*, 2017. 4: 286-295.
- 9 23. Swiss Association of Road and Traffic Professionals (VSS). *SN 640 060 Leichter Zweiradverkehr*
10 *Grundlagen*. Zürich, 1994.
- 11 24. Swiss Association of Road and Traffic Professionals (VSS). *SN 640 262: Knoten, Knoten in einer*
12 *Ebene (ohne Kreisverkehr)*. Zürich, 1999.
- 13 25. Erath, A., M.A.B. van Eggermond, S.S. Ordonez and K.W. Axhausen. *Introducing the Pedestrian*
14 *Accessibility Tool (PAT): open source GIS- based walkability analysis*. ETH Zurich, Zurich, 2016.
15

