

2015/16 LGIP & Capital Works Strategic Pathways & On-Road Cycle Facilities Subprogram Criteria

Notes:

Scores for any criteria can range from 0 to 10. (10 represents a very high alignment with that particular criteria and 0 represents no alignment with the criteria)
 Weightings account for the relativity of importance between criteria in arriving at a total score.

Changes in version 2

Criteria	Weighting	Specific Guide	Score	Comment		
Community/ Social (Connectivity to trip attractors)	25%	The project services a range of attractors scored as follows:		The score accounts for the number and variety of active transport trip attractors. The project score is improved by being calculated on the proximity to and importance of the various types of attractors. Limits on the score contributed by each type of attractor and to the total score provide balance. The Maximum score for attractor types reflects the relative importance given to the various types of attractors. The types of attractors included in the scoring and the relative importance can be altered if required. Note primary schools do not score for on-road cycle facilities as all active trips to primary schools are assumed to use pathways (adjustment to pathways process)		
		<i>Attractor type</i>	<i>Location within</i>		<i>Points for each</i>	<i>Maximum points for attractor type</i>
		Principal Regional Activity Centre or Major Activity Centre (2.5 points each, max 5 points) GIS Process A	5 km		2.5	5
		School, college, university or TAFE campus (0.7 points each, max 4 points) GIS Process B	3 km		0.7	4
		District centre (1.0 points each, max 2 points) GIS Process D	3 km		1	2
		Local centre, community facility, sports field, district or regional open space, hospital or patrolled beach (0.2 point each, max 2 points) GIS Process E	1 km		0.2	2
		Key public transport station (bus or train) (1.0 point each, max 1 point) GIS Process C	3 km		1	1
		Minimum possible points for project				0
Maximum possible points for project			10			
Corporate Alignment	25%	Project is located on a regional route in the State Regional Principal Cycle Network Plan (draft PCNP 2015)	10	The route hierarchy developed as part of the council endorsed Active Transport Plan is considered an appropriate measure of corporate alignment for each link. Council's active networks are graded in a tertiary system of regional, district and local levels. The regional, district and local routes are scored as having correspondingly lower levels of alignment to corporate active transport goals. Due to the transportation focus of this sub-program, facilities that are purely recreational are scored as having a low level of alignment to corporate active transport goals.		
		Project is located on a SCC regional 'other' route (not identified as Regional PCNP)	8			
		Project is identified as a SCC district route	6			
		Project is identified as a SCC local route	2			
		Project supports mainly recreational purposes with low transport function e.g. trails or predominately recreational sections of the Coastal Pathway. (Post GIS audit of ranked projects)	1			
Demand Density of trip generators)	20%	Within the urban footprint and greater than 15,000 persons per km in a 500m catchment around the project	10	The number of persons within a catchment buffer (effectively population density) is considered the best available measure of potential demand. Equal size catchment buffers are used to provide equitable comparisons. This method is considered the best approximation of demand available until an active trip demand model is developed in future. Projects outside the urban footprint score 0 unless the route is a designated priority route connecting urban Activity Centres.		
		Within the urban footprint and greater than 5,000 persons per km in a 500m catchment around the project	8			
		Within the urban footprint and greater than 500 persons per km in a 500m catchment around the project	6			
		Within the urban footprint and greater than 250 persons per km in a 500m catchment around the project	4			
		Within the urban footprint and less than 250 persons per km in a 500m catchment around the project or outside the urban footprint connecting Activity Centres	2			
		Outside of the urban footprint however part of a designated route connecting activity centres. Route as defined by State and modified as "RouteNo" attribute.	2			
		Outside of the urban footprint not connecting activity centres	0			
Cost Effectiveness	10%	Cost per benefit in lowest 20 percentile	10	A cost effectiveness assessment is made by comparing the overall benefit of a project against the cost. The benefit is defined by a sum of the Community/Social score + Demand score. The higher the connectivity provided and the more people who use the facility the higher the benefit produced by the project. The cost is the unit cost of the project cost per km. The economic benefit score is derived by dividing the unit cost by the overall benefit with the result graded into a range of five values from very high to low (scores of 10 to 2 respectively).		
		Cost per benefit in 20 - 40 percentile	8			
		Cost per benefit in 40 - 60 percentile	6			
		Cost per benefit in lowest 60 - 80 percentile	4			
		Cost per benefit in lowest 80 - 100 percentile	2			
Risk Assessment (Safety)	20%	Project provides highest level of safety for users by providing separated facilities (i.e. separated cycleway, pathway width to suit future demand with minimum of 3.0m, grade separation, signalised intersection, minimal conflicts, minimal crossings, with lighting)	10	Projects are scored on the ability to provide the safest and most secure environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The safest form of facility is a high quality facility with no or limited driveway and side street intersections and conflicts, cycleways and pathways with a minimum width of 3m and protected bike lanes, all with adequate lighting. The level of safety provided by BAZ, uncontrolled crossings and mixed traffic streets varies with route hierarchy with a more appropriate level of safety provided on local routes compared to district and regional routes.		
		Project will significantly improve safety by removing existing conflicts, squeeze points or security risks (e.g. new facility to best practice standard e.g. cycle lanes, green treatments, pathways < 3m, pedestrian crossings, lighting and formal shared zones)	8			
		Project will moderately improve safety by eliminating most existing conflicts, squeeze points or security risks with some compromises on best practice (e.g. cycle parking lanes, cycle bus lanes, sealed shoulders, stairways)	6			
		Project will improve safety by eliminating some existing conflicts, squeeze points or security risks (e.g. installing BAZ, uncontrolled crossings or mixed traffic streets on Local routes)	4			
		Project will marginally improve safety by eliminating a small portion of existing conflicts, squeeze points or security risks (e.g. installing BAZ, uncontrolled crossings or mixed traffic streets on District or Regional routes)	2			