

Transport Package and Project Prioritisation Methodology (updated November 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

Named Proposal	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.
Affordability	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.
Integration	Does the proposal promote integration between and within modes, and with current land use patterns?	If the proposal promotes integration, then rank using stage 2 methodology. If it does not then the proposal is rejected.

Stage 2 Priority ranking (weighted attribute method)

Attribute	Weight	Scoring							
		100	75	50	25	0	-25	-50	-75
Assists economic development (defined by default as congestion which occurs regularly during the week, causes long time delays, and has significant economic, social or environmental impacts)	10%	Strategic network congestion reduced and/or route efficiency improved very significantly	Strategic network congestion reduced and/or route efficiency improved significantly	Strategic network congestion reduced and/or route efficiency improved moderately	Strategic network congestion reduced and/or route efficiency improved slightly	No effect	Strategic network congestion increased slightly and/or route efficiency decreased slightly	Strategic network congestion increased moderately and/or route efficiency decreased moderately	Strategic network congestion increased significantly and/or route efficiency decreased significantly Rejected in Stage 1
Assists regional development	5%	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 Rejected in Stage 1
Improves road accessibility & mobility OR Improves PT accessibility & mobility	10%	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 Rejected in Stage 1
		Significantly expands strategic network	Slightly expands strategic network	Enhances existing strategic network; or significantly expands local	Enhances existing local network	No effect	Slightly restricts strategic network	Significantly restricts strategic network	Reduces strategic network Rejected in Stage 1

Attribute	Weight	Scoring							
		100	75	50	25	0	-25	-50	-75
				network					
Assists freight movements	5%	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
Economic efficiency	20%	BCR > 8	BCR < 8 ≥ 4.0	BCR < 4.0 ≥ 2.0	BCR < 2.0 ≥ 1.0	< 1 reject	-	-	-
Improves safety	20%	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
Improves personal security (mostly peds, cyclists and PT users)	5%	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
Reduces negative environmental & health impacts	5%	Reduces environmental and health impacts very significantly	Reduces environmental and health impacts significantly	Reduces environmental and health impacts moderately	Reduces environmental and health impacts slightly	Neutral	Increases environmental and health impacts slightly	Increases environmental and health impacts moderately	Increases environmental and health impacts significantly
Increases public transport use	5%	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Slightly reduces use of public modes	Moderately reduces use of public modes	Significantly reduces use of public modes

Attribute	Weight	Scoring							
		100	75	50	25	0	-25	-50	-75
Complements adjacent capacity	5%	Very significantly	Significantly	Moderately	Slightly	Neutral	Causes minor up/downstream capacity problems	Causes moderate up/downstream capacity problems	Causes major up/downstream capacity problems Rejected in Stage 1
Improves network reliability	5%	Major new alternative strategic route	Minor new alternative strategic route, major new alternative local route, new lane on existing strategic route	New shoulder on existing strategic route	Minor new alternative local route	Neutral	N/A	N/A	N/A
Improves walking and cycling accessibility	5%	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 Rejected in Stage 1

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.