

## Prioritisation Criteria For Strategic Network (Non Block) Projects

The Regional Land Transport Technical Group is responsible for considering priorities in stages 1 through 3.

### Stage 1 Consistency check with the Regional Land Transport Strategy (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?	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)

Each project is assessed for its contribution to achieving Regional Land Transport objectives and scored in accordance with the following table.

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>Improve accessibility (measure by the change in total trips in network)</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</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>Facilitates 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 Stage 1</b>

		<b>Scoring</b>							
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-25</b>	<b>-50</b>	<b>-75</b>
<b>Benefit Cost Ratio</b>	<b>25%</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>Reduce Injury crashes</b>	<b>25%</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>Reduce 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>Reduces emergency risk</b>	<b>5%</b>	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
<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 Consideration of timing factors**

Scores from stage 2 are entered into a spreadsheet and weighted accordingly. The RLTC Technical Group considers the calculated ranking and may recommend an alternative ranking if practical timing or sequencing issues are a significant technical consideration.

### **Stage 4 Consideration of other factors**

The Regional Land Transport Committee considers the ranking priority recommended by the technical group and may take account of other factors such as the 'ready to go status' of the project. The Committee determines the regional priorities. These priorities are subsequently submitted to the organisations that invited comment, for their consideration.