

## Transport Package and Project Prioritisation Methodology (updated February 2004)

The methodology described in this paper outlines the process and factors taken into account when determining strategic transport package and project priorities. Stages 1-3 are technical analyses undertaken by the RLTC Technical Group. This group will use the best available quantitative data but in many cases must make judgements based on subjective assessments. The rankings determined by this methodology are then recommended for consideration by the RLTC.

### Stage 1 Consistency check with RLTS

<b>Named Proposal</b>	If the project is a named proposal in the RLTS then rank using stage 2 methodology.	If the project is not a named proposal then determine whether it is 'not inconsistent' or prohibited by the RLTS. If it fails this test then the proposal is rejected, if it passes then rank using stage 2 methodology.  Under the consideration of network balance, a proposal that causes significant up or downstream capacity problems is inconsistent with RLTS and therefore the proposal is rejected.
<b>Affordability</b>	Is the proposal affordable in the context of Transfund's total budget and the land transport funding likely to be available within the region?	If the project is affordable then rank using stage 2 methodology. If it is not affordable then the proposal is rejected.

**Stage 2 Priority ranking (weighted attribute method)**

Attribute	Weight	Scoring							
		100	75	50	25	0	-25	-50	-75
<b>Reduces congestion (defined as congestion which occurs regularly during the week, causes long time delays, and has significant economic, social or environmental impacts)</b>	<b>10%</b>	Strategic network congestion reduced very significantly	Strategic network congestion reduced significantly	Strategic network congestion reduced moderately	Strategic network congestion reduced slightly	No effect	Strategic network congestion increased slightly	Strategic network congestion increased moderately	Strategic network congestion increased significantly <b>Rejected in Stage 1</b>
<b>Improves accessibility and mobility</b> <b>Road accessibility &amp; mobility</b>	<b>10%</b>	Significantly expands strategic network, or significantly reduces strategic network as a demand management measure	Slightly expands strategic network, or slightly reduces strategic network as a demand management measure	Enhances existing strategic network; or significantly expands local network, or significantly reduces local network as a demand management measure	Enhances existing local network; or slightly reduces local network as a demand management measure	No effect	Slightly restricts strategic network	Significantly restricts strategic network	Reduces strategic network <b>Rejected in Stage 1</b>
<b>OR</b> <b>PT accessibility &amp; mobility</b>		Significantly expands strategic network	Slightly expands strategic network	Enhances existing strategic network; or significantly expands local network	Enhances existing local network	No effect	Slightly restricts strategic network	Significantly restricts strategic network	Reduces strategic network <b>Rejected in Stage 1</b>
<b>Assists economic development</b>	<b>5%</b>	Quantum leap in regional economic growth	Regionally significant benefits	Regionally moderate benefits	Regionally low benefits	Negligible benefits, no significant downside	Reduces regional attractiveness slightly	Reduces regional attractiveness moderately	Reduces regional attractiveness significantly <b>Rejected in</b>

Attribute	Weight	Scoring								
		100	75	50	25	0	-25	-50	-75	
										<b>Stage 1</b>
<b>Assists freight movements</b>	<b>5%</b>	Assists freight movement very significantly	Assists freight movement significantly	Assists freight movement moderately	Assists freight movement slightly	Neutral	Reduces freight movement slightly	Reduces freight movement moderately	Reduces freight movement significantly	
<b>Economic Efficiency</b>	<b>20%</b>	BCR > 12	BCR <12 >= 8	BCR <8 >=5.0	BCR <5.0 >=3.0	BCR <3.0 >=1.5	BCR <1.5 >=1.0	N/A		BCR <1.0 <b>Rejected in Stage 1</b>
<b>Improves Safety</b>	<b>20%</b>	Saves >30 injury crashes per 5 years	Saves 16-30 injury crashes per 5 years	Saves 8-15 injury crashes per 5 years	Saves 3-7 injury crashes per 5 years	Neutral -2 to +2 change in crashes per 5 years	Increases injury crashes per 5 years by 3-7	Increases injury crashes per 5 years by 8-15	Increases injury crashes per 5 years by > 15	
<b>Improves personal security (mostly peds &amp; cyclists)</b>	<b>5%</b>	Assists personal security very significantly	Assists personal security significantly	Assists personal security moderately	Assists personal security slightly	Neutral	Reduces personal security slightly	Reduces personal security moderately	Reduces personal security significantly	
<b>Reduces fuel use</b>	<b>5%</b>	Reduces fuel use very significantly	Reduces fuel use significantly	Reduces fuel use moderately	Reduces fuel use slightly	Neutral	Increases fuel use slightly	Increases fuel use moderately	Increases fuel use significantly	
<b>Increases public transport use</b>	<b>5%</b>	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly reduces use of public modes	Moderately reduces use of public modes	Significantly reduces use of public modes	
<b>Matches adjacent capacity</b>	<b>5%</b>	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Causes minor up/downstream capacity problems	Causes moderate up/downstream capacity problems	Causes major up/downstream capacity problems <b>Rejected in Stage 1</b>	
<b>Improves network security</b>	<b>5%</b>	Major new alternative	Minor new alternative	New shoulder on existing strategic	Minor new alternative local	Neutral	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Attribute	Weight	Scoring							
		100	75	50	25	0	-25	-50	-75
		strategic route	strategic route, major new alternative local route, new lane on existing strategic route	route	route				
<b>Facilitates walking and cycling</b>	<b>5%</b>	Significantly expands strategic network	Slightly expands strategic network	Enhances existing strategic network; or significantly expands local network	Enhances existing local network	No effect	Slightly restricts strategic network	Significantly restricts strategic network	Reduces strategic network <b>Rejected in Stage 1</b>

### **Stage 3 Technical Group review**

Scoring is completed for each proposal and they are ranked in the descending order of their score (the highest score demonstrating the greatest contribution to the objectives)

The Technical Group:

- reviews the results;
- makes pragmatic adjustments where this is considered necessary (documenting the reasons); and
- recommends priorities to the RLTC.

### **Stage 4 Political consideration of factors**

The Regional Land Transport Committee considers the ranking priority recommended by the Technical Group and will take account of other factors such as the:

- ready to go status;
- urgency;
- perceived safety benefits; and
- any other factors considered appropriate by the Committee.