



Lower Order Unsealed Roads Upgrade Plan Assessment and Prioritisation Procedure

Introduction

Council adopted the *Lower Order Unsealed Roads Upgrade Plan 2016 – 2026* on 25 January 2017 and the CEO was requested by Council to develop an Assessment and Prioritisation Procedure.

The following *Assessment and Prioritisation Procedure* is to be applied and supports the attached score sheet *Lower Order Unsealed Roads Upgrade Plan – Criteria, Unit and Multiplier Factor Score Sheet*.

Two categories are considered in the assessment process.

- Amenity, and
- Council and Community Benefit.

The total score is the sum of these two categories. If external funding is contributed from residents then a multiplying factor is applied depending on the percentage of the total cost contributed by the residents

1. Amenity

1.1 Number of Houses

1.1.1 **Total number of houses serviced from the road**

No multiplying factor is to be applied. In some situations there are houses that do not abut the gravel road to be upgraded but use it as access to their property located in a court that gains access from the gravel road. For example if 10 properties were in the court that is accessed from the road to be sealed it would contribute 80 VPD to the traffic volume

in addition to the traffic generated from the road to be sealed.

1.1.2 **Number of houses located less than 40 metres from road**

A weighting of 5 is applied to the number of houses located less than 40m from the gravel road. This takes into account the potential impact on the lifestyle of the residents due to dust generation.

1.2 Traffic Volume

Assign eight trips per day generated by the residents of each house. This is a total of houses abutting the gravel road plus any other houses that use the gravel road for access. A weighting of 10 is applied to the total average daily traffic.

2. Council and Community Benefit

2.1 Benefit to Council and Community

Apply a score of 1 for each of the following items, if applicable:

- Gravel/Seal intersection improvements needed (the current transition from the gravel road to the sealed road is not considered to be of good construction).
- Completes seal (small section of road remaining unsealed or a single short road in a sealed road network).
- Road surface frequently scours during rain events (requires frequent maintenance to maintain a suitable road surface).

- Inappropriate geometry for traffic volume/type (improvement would assist in lowering road safety risks).

Score 0 where there is no perceived benefit. A weighting of 5 is to be applied to the raw score.

2.2 Maintenance Cost

Apply a score of 1 for each item, if applicable:

- High cartage costs for the supply of pavement maintenance gravel due to distance from supply source.
- High establishment costs of maintenance plant due to isolated location.
- High re-establishment of plant costs due to frequency of maintenance required. Score 0 for all of the above if low level of safety maintenance is required.

A weighting of 5 is to be applied to the raw score. This takes into consideration the importance of future savings to Council on maintenance costs of between \$6,000 and \$8,000 per kilometre per grade per annum. This scoring is undertaken in consultation with the Coordinator Maintenance Delivery.

3. Funding Source

As stated earlier in the report there are three options for funding with external funding attracting a weighting.

3.1 Full External Funding

As there are no costs to Council, other than administration costs, there is no need to apply a multiplying factor or weighting and the project should proceed.

No work will proceed without Council receiving all estimated costs from the residents.

The design will need to be included in the current program, which could take several months.

The construction has to be scheduled, with works to be undertaken at an appropriate time of the year. Consideration has to be given to any effect the scheduling will have on the current committed construction program.

3.2 Part External Funding / Part Council funding

– the sub total of **Amenity and Council and Community Benefit Criteria** attracts a weighting based on the percentage of external funding.

Percentage external funding	Weighting
0%	1
10%	1.5
20%	2.0
30%	2.5
40%	3.0
50%	3.5
60%	4.0
70%	4.5

Where an intermediate percentage of external contributions is proposed, then the weighting is to be interpolated.

The Divisional Councillor and Transport Infrastructure Management branch community engagement officer will be involved in engagement and consultation where residents partially or fully fund the construction.

Any contribution from Councillor Divisional Funds is considered a Council contribution towards the cost of the project and not as external funds.

3.3 Community Engagement

Where required, a public information session will be held on site. This is to be attended by the Divisional Councillor and a representative from Transport Infrastructure Management Branch.

**Lower Order Unsealed Roads Upgrade Plan
Criteria, Unit and Multiplier Factor Score Sheet**

Road..... Locality..... Length Cost.....

Criteria	Unit	Quantity	Weighting	Score
Amenity				
Number of Houses	Total number of houses accessed from the road Houses.....		X 1	
Number of houses <40m from road	Total number of houses less than 40 metres from the road		X 5	
Traffic Volume	Average daily traffic volume (ADT) (total in both directions) 8 trips per residence		ADT/10	
Council and Community				
Benefit to Council and Community	Score 0 or 1 for each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gravel/seal intersection improvements needed • Isolated unsealed road in a sealed road network • Road surface frequently scours during rain events • Inappropriate geometry for traffic volume/type (improvement would assist in lowering road safety risks) • Completes seal (e.g. small section of road remaining unsealed) 		X 5	
Maintenance Cost	Score 0 or 1 for each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cartage costs due to distance from supply source • High establishment of plant costs due to isolated location • Hi re-establishment of plant costs due to frequency of maintenance required Score 0 if low level of maintenance required		X 5	
Sub Total of Amenity and Council and Community Criteria				
Funding Source				
Source of Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full external funding • Part council funding and part resident funding. Divide the residents' contribution by the total cost of the project as a percentage and apply the relevant multiplying factor to the sub total of amenity and community criteria. 		N/A 0% x 1.0 10% x 1.5 20% x 2.0 30% x 2.5 40% x 3.0 50% x 3.5 60% x 4.0 70% x 4.5	Proceed with project
Total Score				

Completed by..... Date.....