Regional Land Transport Programme 2012

Regional prioritisation methodology

Prepared by Adam Lawrence
Version 2.0

For more information, contact Greater Wellington:

WGN_DOCS-#907438

Version	Date	Author	Notes
1	3/10/2011	Adam Lawrence	Prioritisation approach as agreed by TWG on 4 Jul 2011
2	16/9/2011	Adam Lawrence	Updates incorporating changes agreed by the TWG on 4 Aug 2011 and editorial changes

Executive summary

This document sets out the prioritisation methodology that has been agreed by and is being used by the Technical Working Group to develop a prioritised list of projects for consideration by the Regional Transport Committee and inclusion in the draft RLTP 2012.

Transport activities and projects must be prioritised in accordance with RLTS Policy 8.8. In summary, the policy generally requires projects to be prioritised as follows:

1. Non-prioritised activities – certain business as usual activities

2. First-priority activities – maintain existing service levels

3. Second-priority activities – low cost activities (<$5m)

4. Third-priority projects – large new projects (>$5m)

Approved Organisations (i.e. local authorities and NZTA) are required to identify and assess their own projects. The assessment of third-priority large new projects must be undertaken in accordance with this prioritisation methodology using an Excel template provided by Greater Wellington. The Technical Working Group will peer review these assessments but otherwise will focus on prioritisation of the third-priority large new projects.

Assessment profiles, based on strategic fit, efficiency and effectiveness will be generated by Approved Organisations for each third-priority large new project as follows:

1. Evaluate effectiveness as Low, Medium or High against the RLTS outcomes, using the regional prioritisation criteria in this document

2. Evaluate efficiency in accordance with NZTA requirements

3. Evaluate strategic fit in accordance with NZTA requirements

Once the assessment profiles have been generated all third-priority large new projects will be prioritised as follows:

1. The NZTA assessment profiles will be used to determine priority order for projects

2. Projects in the same priority band will be ranked based on effectiveness score

3. Projects with the same priority band and effectiveness score will be ranked by efficiency (BCR value)

The prioritisation process will result in a prioritised list of projects for consideration by the Regional Transport Committee. The projects included in the final RLTP will depend on available funding, as identified by NZTA, and any changes made by the Regional Transport Committee.

Contents

1. Introduction

This document sets out the prioritisation methodology that has been agreed by and is being used by the Technical Working Group (TWG) to develop a prioritised list of projects for consideration by the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) and inclusion in the draft RLTP 2012.

This methodology has been developed to provide a simple and transparent decision-making framework that reflects the current political and funding environment. It will continue to be updated as required and is originally based on the *Discussion Document on prioritisation methodology Mark 2* presented to the TWG meeting in July 2011 and replaces the *Draft Prioritisation Methodology – as at June 2011* which was also previously distributed to the TWG.

NB: The TWG identified safety as a key consideration that needs to be given sufficient prominence. The methodology set out in this document does not weight any measures, including safety. This is considered appropriate as most safety projects fall below the $5m threshold for third-priority large new projects and therefore will have by default a higher priority (second priority). Adjustments to ranking may be considered if this does not prove to be the case.

1.1 Background

The Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) requires the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) to prepare a Regional Land Transport Programme (RLTP). Preparation of the RLTP is guided by the prioritisation policies in the Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS). The process requires Approved Organisations (NZTA and Local Authorities) to identify, evaluate and submit activities and projects that they want to be included in the RLTP.

Greater Wellington is responsible for leading the prioritisation of submitted activities and projects in accordance with RLTS, NZTA and LTMA requirements. This is undertaken in partnership with Approved Organisation, with a Technical Working Group (TWG) responsible for finalising and agreeing the detailed prioritisation methodology. Greater Wellington must submit the completed RLTP to NZTA.

The NZTA will then prepare a National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) based all the submitted RLTPs. The NLTP sets out the funding for the next three years and is required to give effect to the GPS and NZTA's Statement of Intent. The NLTP process includes a moderation exercise to ensure consistency between all the RLTPs and ensure the overall programme is delivered in accordance with the GPS funding levels.

2. Programme prioritisation policy

The RLTS programme prioritisation and funding policy (Policy 8.8) provides the general approach required to prioritise transport activities and projects in the region. The LTMA also identifies a number of activities and projects that are not subject to prioritisation. The programme prioritisation requirements are set out in Table 1.

> **Note:** NZTA have increased the dollar cut-off amounts from $4.5m to $5.0m since the RLTS was adopted. This higher $5.0m is now used.

Table 1: RLTS priorities for transport activities and projects (from RLTS, Policy 8.8)

Priority	Description	Reference
Not prioritised	Certain activities associated with business as usual. These are: • Local road maintenance and renewals • Local road minor capital works (<$5.0m, no R or C funding) • Existing public transport services (incl. minor PT maintenance) • Existing commitments arising from approved activities	LTMA s16(1)(a) NZTA guidance in regard to existing commitments
First-priority	Activities that are required to maintain the existing level of service of the region's transport network or those necessary to meet statutory transport planning obligations.	RLTS Policy 8.8(b)(i)
Second-priority	Activities that are relatively low cost studies, demand management, walking and cycling activities, minor safety and other improvement works (<$5.0m) that are expected to help the region move quickly toward achieving RLTS outcomes.	RLTS Policy 8.8(b)(ii)
Third- priority	Activities that are high cost "large new projects" (>$5.0m). These third-priority activities and projects must include consideration of the following matters when being prioritised: • Strategic Fit: how the identified problem, issue, or opportunity to be considered by the project or package aligns with the NZ Transport Agency's strategic investment direction which is derived from the Government Policy Statement. • Effectiveness: the extent to which the package or project contributes to the broad policy objectives set out in the RLTS and the effectiveness of the project or package to deliver against the outcomes sought by the RLTS. • Economic efficiency: a rating that demonstrates how well the proposed solution maximises the value of what is produced from the resources used, as measured by a benefit	RLTS Policy 8.8(b)(iii) RLTS Policy 8.8(c)

Priority	Description	Reference
	cost ratio.	
	Particular consideration shall also be given to safety issues when considering the priority order of these activities and projects.	
Note:	Ensure that Western Corridor passenger rail infrastructure and other public transport improvements are in place prior to the opening of the Transmission Gully project.	RLTS Policy 8.8(e)

3. The prioritisation methodology

The prioritisation methodology has been developed to give effect to the programme prioritisation and funding policy of the RLTS (Policy 8.8) and is accordingly the agreed prioritisation methodology.

3.1 General prioritisation process

The general prioritisation process is governed by NZTA requirements and the RLTS programme prioritisation and funding policy. The process is set out in Table 2 and is similar to previous years.

Table 2: General RLTP prioritisation process

Stage	Process steps
Programme setup	1. The TWG agrees the prioritisation methodology for the RLTP – this document
Activity and project development	2. Approved Organisation identify and evaluate the transport activities and projects they want included the RLTP in accordance with NZTA requirements
	3. Approved Organisations enter all activity and project details into TIO (Transport Investment Online, previously LTP Online)
	4. Approved Organisations complete for third-priority large new projects the Excel project assessment template provided by GW and set out the appendices to this document
Programme construction	5. Greater Wellington categorises the activities and projects that were entered into TIO based on the priorities set out in RLTS Policy 8.8
	6. The TWG reviews the activity and project categorisation undertaken by Greater Wellington and adjustments are made as appropriate
	7. Greater Wellington adds the non-prioritised, first-priority and second-priority activities and projects to the draft RLTP in priority order as per above

Stage	Process steps
	8. The TWG prioritises third-priority activities – large new projects – based on the prioritisation methodology for large new projects set out in this document
	9. Greater Wellington adds the third-priority activities and projects to the draft RLTP in priority order as per above
Programme consultation and approval	10. The TWG recommends the draft RLTP to the RTC for public consultation
	11. The RTC will approve the draft RLTP, with any modifications, for public consultation
	12. The TWG will review feedback from public consultation and recommend a final RLTP to the RTC for approval
	13. The RTC will approve the final RLTP, with any modifications, and submit it to NZTA for inclusion in the NLTP
Implementation	14. The NZTA will prepare an NLTP taking account of the RLTP
	15. Activities and projects will be approved and funded in accordance with NLTP as per usual NZTA processes

3.2 Role of Approved Organisations

Approved Organisations (i.e. local authorities and NZTA) are required to identify and then assess their own projects in accordance with NZTA requirements and also for third-priority large new projects this prioritisation methodology.

For third-priority large new projects Approved Organisations will be required to fill and submit to Greater Wellington an Excel template provided by Greater Wellington, based on the assessment forms in Appendix A of this prioritisation methodology.

3.3 Role of the Technical Working Group

The primary role of the Technical Working Group (TWG) is to agree the prioritisation methodology (this document) and recommend a prioritised draft RLTP to the RTC for review and approval.

The prioritisation methodology for non-prioritised, first-priority and second-priority activities and projects is rather straight-forward and will primarily be undertaken by Greater Wellington based on information provided by the Approval Organisations and reviewed by the TWG.

The prioritisation methodology for third-priority activities – large new projects – is rather more complicated and will require significant TWG input to agree the methodology and carry out the prioritisation. A detailed methodology for third-priority – large new projects – is set out below.

The TWG will also consider any other relevant matters, including changes to activities and projects and potential packaging as appropriate.

4. Prioritisation of large new projects

Large new projects (>$5.0) are third-priority and will be allocated funding only after all non-prioritised, first-priority and second-priority activities and projects are funded (subject to NZTA category funding limits).

The RLTS (Policy 8.8) requires the prioritisation of large new projects to consider strategic fit, effectiveness and economic efficiency. The RLTS definition of strategic fit and economic efficiency is the same as that of NZTA but the definition of effectiveness is not. The RLTS evaluation measures effectiveness against the RLTS objectives and outcomes whereas the NZTA evaluation measures effectiveness against strategic fit. This revised measure of effectiveness is where the regional "flavour" can be added to the RLTP and is the focus of the large new project prioritisation process.

4.1 Creating an assessment profile

To best take into account regional priorities all large new projects in the third-priority category will be evaluated against the assessment factors set out in the RLTS in the following order:

1. Effectiveness – alignment with the broad policy objectives and outcomes of the RLTS

2. Economic efficiency – calculated benefit-cost ratio in accordance with NZTA requirements

3. Strategic fit – problem/issue /opportunity alignment with NZTA and GPS requirements

Projects will be evaluated as Low, Medium or High against each of these assessment factors with the combined rating being the assessment profile for the project. For example, a RONS project may score Medium for effectiveness, Low for economic efficiency and High for strategic fit which would mean an assessment profile of "HLM" (noting that irrespective of assessment order profiles are reported in order of strategic fit, effectiveness, efficiency).

The assessment profile template in Appendix A will need to be completed for each project being assessed. Greater Wellington will provide an Excel template that each Approved Organisation will need to complete.

4.1.1 Assessing effectiveness

The effectiveness assessment considers the contribution the proposed solution makes towards achieving the objectives and outcomes of the RLTS. This differs from NZTA's assessment of effectiveness which is discussed in Appendix D.

The assessment of effectiveness will be undertaken against each of the RLTS outcomes. The RLTS objectives are also taken into account through the evaluation of these outcomes. The RLTS outcomes and objectives, and the links between them, are set out in Appendix B.

There are two main steps in assessing effectiveness:

- Step 1: Determine project effectiveness ratings against each RLTS outcome area

- Step 2: Calculate the project's overall effectiveness rating

These are discussed below.

(a)   Step 1: Determine project effectiveness ratings against each RLTS outcome area

The first step is to determine an effectiveness rating for each project based on its performance against each of the following RLTS outcome areas:

- 1.1 Increased peak period public transport mode share

- 2.1 Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists

- 3.1 Reduced greenhouse gas emissions

- 4.1 Reduced severe road congestion

- 5.1 Improved regional road safety

- 6.1 Improved land use and transport integration

- 7.1 Improved regional freight efficiency

- 8.1 Improved safety, efficiency and reliability of strategic road, public transport and freight links to the north of the region

The effectiveness analysis will be undertaken for each RLTS outcome area set out in Assessment Form A-2 in Appendix 1. The effectiveness ratings are then used in step 2 to calculate the overall effectiveness rating (refer next section).

> **Note:** The relevant project outcomes column provides a list of project outcomes that are relevant for consideration when assessing that outcome area. The assessment will need to take into account whether a project is providing a small contribution to a large number of project outcomes or a large contribution to a limited number of project outcomes; as either case may justify a higher rating.

(b) Step 2: Calculate the project's overall effectiveness rating

The second step is to calculate an overall effectiveness rating (Low, Medium or High) for each project based on its performance against the RLTS outcome areas. The RLTS outcome areas are:

The overall effectiveness rating for each project is based on its outcome score as set out in Table 3. The outcome score is calculated by adding up the number of Low, Medium and High ratings against each RLTS outcome area and multiplying these by 1, 3 or 5 respectively. For example, a project scoring HMMHLMLL would be scored 5+3+3+5+1+3+1+1=22).

The outcome score bands in Table 3 are based on an even distribution of scores, with the highest possible scoring being 40 and the lowest 8. If there are a number of projects scoring near the outcome score boundaries then an adjustment may be required to ensure projects with similar scores are rated the same.

> **Note:** The TWG agreed the 1,3,5 scoring scale to provide a greater spread of scores than would be achieved by a narrower scale of 1,2,3 for Low, Medium and High ratings. The scoring scale will be reviewed by the TWG and may be adjusted once all projects have been assessed to ensure outputs are logical.
>
> **Note:** There is no explicit weighting between the various outcome areas. Weightings are implicit in the defined requirements for low, medium and high ratings. Essentially, the more outcome areas a project contributes to the higher its overall effectiveness rating. Safety considerations are discussed in section 1.

Table 3: Effectiveness rating based on outcome scores

Outcome scores	Effectiveness rating
Less than or equal to 18	Low
Between 19 and 29 inclusive	Medium
Greater than or equal to 30	High

4.1.2 Assessing economic efficiency

"The economic efficiency assessment considers how well the proposed solution maximises the value of what is produced from the resources used" (NZTA Knowledge Base).

The assessment of economic efficiency will be undertaken in accordance with NZTA requirements which uses Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) to rate the economic efficiency of activities and projects. The possible assessment ratings for economic efficiency are based on the calculated BCR as set out in Table 4.

If there are a number of projects scoring near the assessment rating boundaries then an adjustment may be required to ensure projects with similar BCRs are rated the same. For example, if Project A has a BCR of 1.9 and Project B has a BCR of 2.1 it would make more sense for both projects to be rated the same (i.e. both Low or both Medium) rather than one project rated Low and one Medium, as the economic efficiency of both projects is essentially the same.

Table 4: Assessment ratings for economic efficiency

Calculated BCR	Efficiency assessment rating
Less than 2	Low
Greater than or equal to 2 and less than 4	Medium
Greater than or equal to 4	High

4.1.3   Assessing strategic fit

"A strategic fit assessment considers how an identified problem, issue or opportunity aligns with NZTA's strategic investment direction, which derives from the GPS. Strategic fit … demonstrates the potential contribution to issues that are significant from a national perspective" (NZTA Knowledge Base).

The assessment of economic efficiency will be undertaken in accordance with NZTA requirements and depends on the activity class of a particular activity or project. The NZTA strategic fit assessment criteria are outlined in Appendix C.

4.2   **Prioritising activities based on assessment profiles**

The prioritisation of activities is primarily based on the priority order of assessment profiles as defined by NZTA although the regional process further considers effectiveness and efficiency to rank projects within each assessment profile.

4.2.1   Priority order of assessment profiles

The NZTA has identified a priority order for assessment profiles as set out in Table 5 (refer NZPA Knowledge Base). These priorities are based on NZTA's approach which first assesses strategic fit, then economic efficiency and finally effectiveness. This reflects the priority NZTA must give to delivery on the government expectations as set out in the GPS.

Table 5: NZTA assessment profile rankings

NZTA Profile (Strategic fit, effectiveness, efficiency)	Priority order
HHH	1
HHM,HMH, MHH	2
HMM, HLH, MMH	3

HLM,HHL,MLH	4
HML, MHM, MMM	5
HLL, MLM, LHH, LMH	6
MHL, LHM	7
MML, LLH, LMM	8
LHL, MLL	9
LML, LLM	10
LLL	11

4.2.2 Prioritisation process

The following prioritisation process will be undertaken based on the above assessment profiles:

1. Project assessment profiles will be reviewed and moderated by the TWG

2. Projects will be ranked based on the profile priority order in Table 5

3. Where projects have the same priority order they will be ranked by their effectiveness score (scores may range from 24 down to 8)

4. Where projects have the same priority order and effectiveness score they will be ranked by their BCR value

Note: Consideration of regional priorities or "flavour" comes through the assessment of effectiveness against RLTS outcomes. It also comes through with projects within the same priority band being further prioritised based on effectiveness score and then efficiency.

5. Conclusion

The prioritisation process will result in a prioritised list of projects for consideration by the Regional Transport Committee. The projects included in the final RLTP will depend on available funding, as identified by NZTA, and any changes made by the Regional Transport Committee.

Note: Affordability is considered in terms of where the funding line falls and taking account of NZTA work category funding limits.

Appendix A – Assessment profile template

ASSESSMENT FORM A-1: Assessment profile

Project Name   _____

Project Description   _____

Estimated cost   _____

Project assessment

Effectiveness rating

Complete Assessment Form A-2: Project Outcomes prior to completing the following table.

Outcome area	Rating (tick one)			Notes
	Low	Med.	High	
1.1 Increased peak period public transport mode share	☐	☐	☐	
2.1 Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists	☐	☐	☐	
3.1 Reduced greenhouse gas emissions	☐	☐	☐	
4.1 Reduced severe road congestion	☐	☐	☐	
5.1 Improved regional road safety	☐	☐	☐	
6.1 Improved land use and transport integration	☐	☐	☐	
7.1 Improved regional freight efficiency	☐	☐	☐	
8.1 Improved safety, efficiency and reliability of strategic road, public transport and freight links to the north of the region	☐	☐	☐	
Count of each rating:				
Rating score	1	3	5	
Count of each rating multiplied by rating score				
Overall efficiency score (Sum of count of each rating multiplied by rating score):				

	Rating (tick one)			Notes
	Low (Score<=19)	Medium (19<Score<30)	High (Score>=30)	
Effectiveness rating	☐	☐	☐	

Efficiency rating

Calculated BCR: _____

	Rating (tick one)			Notes
	Low (BCR<=2)	Medium (2<BCR<4)	High (BCR>=4)	
Efficiency rating	☐	☐	☐	

Strategic fit rating

	Rating (tick one)			Notes
	Low	Medium	High	
Strategic fit rating	☐	☐	☐	

Project profile

Project Name   _____

Profile (recorded as strategic fit, effectiveness, efficiency – e.g. HML):

                    _____

ASSESSMENT FORM A-2: Project Outcomes

Project Name _____

Outcome area	Contribution to project outcomes[1]		Rating requirements			Rating (tick one)				Notes
Key and related outcomes	Project outcome (add any others in notes field)	Tick	Requirements for Low rating	Requirements for Medium rating	Requirements for High rating	N/a	Low	Med.	High	
1.1 Increased peak period public transport mode share 1.2 Increased off-peak public transport use and community connectedness 1.3 Improved public transport accessibility for all, including the transport disadvantaged 1.4 Reduced public transport journey times compared to travel by private car 1.5 Increased public transport reliability	Making best use of existing infrastructure Increased network coverage Better information, Integrated ticketing, Longer hours of operation Improved affordability, Improved reliability, Improved journey times/service frequencies, Improved personal safety, Improved vehicle quality, Improved infrastructure quality	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	Improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of public transport, safety and/or use of existing infrastructure.	Moderate improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of public transport, safety and/or use of existing infrastructure.	Significant improvement in the competiveness of public transport during peak periods, safety and/or use of existing infrastructure.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

[1] The contribution to project outcomes column is to be used as a guideline only when considering rating requirements and rating for each outcome area. The assessment will need to take into account whether a project is providing a small contribution to a large number of project outcomes or a significant contribution to a limited number of project outcomes; as either case may justify a higher rating.

			Improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of walking and cycling, safety and/or utilisation of existing infrastructure	Moderate improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of walking and cycling, safety and/or utilisation of existing infrastructure	Significant improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of walking and cycling, safety, and/or utilisation of existing infrastructure					
2.1 Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists 2.2 Improved level of service for pedestrians and cyclists 2.3 Increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists	Increased network coverage ☐ Better information ☐ Enables future improvements ☐ Improved safety ☐ Improved journey times/route directness ☐ Improved infrastructure quality ☐ Improved modal integration ☐					☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1 Reduced greenhouse gas emissions 3.2 Reduced private car mode share 3.3 Reduced fuel consumption 3.4 Increased private vehicle occupancy	Reduced need to travel demand ☐ Encourages more use of efficiency vehicles ☐ Reduced travel distance ☐ Increased vehicle occupancy ☐		Reduction in private car mode share, fuel consumption or increased vehicle occupancy	Moderate reduction in private car mode share, fuel consumption or increased vehicle occupancy	Significant reduction in private car mode share, fuel consumption or increased vehicle occupancy	☐	☐	☐	☐	

4.1 Reduced severe road congestion 4.2 Maintained vehicle travel times between communities and regional destinations 4.3 Improved reliability of the strategic roading network	Making best use of existing infrastructure ☐ Better information ☐ Enables future improvements ☐ Improved reliability, ☐ Improved journey times/route directness ☐ Improved resilience ☐ Improved modal integration ☐ Removal of heavy traffic from residential streets ☐	Improved efficiency and connectedness of the strategic road network and/or use of existing infrastructure	Moderate improvement in efficiency and connectedness of the strategic road network and/or use of existing infrastructure	Significant improvement in efficiency and connectedness of the strategic road network and/or use of existing infrastructure	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1 Improved regional road safety	Reduced severity and frequency of walking incidents ☐ Reduced severity and frequency of cycling incidents ☐ Reduced severity and frequency of road incidents ☐ Reduced severity and frequency of public transport incidents ☐ Enables future improvements ☐ Improved perceptions of safety ☐	Improvement in safety of transport networks (any mode)	Moderate improvement in safety of transport networks (any mode)	Significant improvement in safety of transport networks (any mode)	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Objectives	Criteria		Contribution	Moderate	Significant					
6.1 Improved land use and transport integration (in line with the WRS and local authority urban development strategies) 6.2 Improved integration between transport modes 6.3 Sustainable economic development supported (in line with the WRS)	Reduced community severance	☐	Contribution to improved land use outcomes including the WRS and Proposed Regional Policy Statement	Moderate contribution to improved land use outcomes including the WRS and Proposed Regional Policy Statement	Significant contribution to improved land use outcomes including the WRS and Proposed Regional Policy Statement					
	Overall positive social and environmental impacts	☐								
	Facilitates local employment	☐								
	Facilitates population and employment along strategic public transport network	☐								
	Facilitates modal choice	☐				☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Enables future improvements	☐								
	Improved connectivity	☐								
	Improved east/west connections for the strategy network	☐								
	Positive network contribution in linking land uses	☐								
7.1 Improved regional freight efficiency 7.2 Improved inter-regional freight efficiency	Making best use of existing infrastructure	☐	Improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of rail/sea freight	Moderate improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of rail/sea freight	Significant improvement in the accessibility, connectedness and competitiveness of rail/sea freight					
	Constraints removed	☐								
	Enables future improvements	☐								
	Improved reliability,	☐				☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Improved journey times/route directness	☐								
	Improved resilience	☐								
	Improved modal integration	☐								

| 8.1 Improved safety, efficiency and reliability of strategic road, public transport and freight links to the north of the region | Improved connections to the north ☐

Improved port connections ☐ | Improvement in transport links north of the region | Moderate improvement in transport links north of the region | Significant improvement in transport links north of the region | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | |

Appendix B – RLTS objectives and outcomes

Land transport outcomes (key outcomes in bold)	Assist economic and regional development	Assist safety and personal security	Improve access, mobility and reliability	Protect and promote public health	Ensure environmental sustainability	Ensure that the RLTP is affordable to the regional community
1.1 Increased peak period public transport mode share	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.2 Increased off-peak public transport use and community connectedness	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1.3 Improved public transport accessibility for all, including the transport disadvantaged	✓		✓	✓		✓
1.4 Reduced public transport journey times compared to travel by private car	✓		✓			✓
1.5 Increased public transport reliability	✓		✓			✓
2.1 Increased mode share for pedestrians and cyclists	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
2.2 Improved level of service for pedestrians and cyclists	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.3 Increased safety for pedestrians and cyclists		✓	✓	✓		✓
3.1 Reduced greenhouse gas emissions	✓				✓	✓
3.2 Reduced private car mode share	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
3.3 Reduced fuel consumption				✓	✓	✓
3.4 Increased private vehicle occupancy	✓				✓	✓
4.1 Reduced severe road congestion	✓		✓		✓	✓
4.2 Maintained vehicle travel times between communities and regional destinations	✓		✓			✓
4.3 Improved reliability of the strategic roading network	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
5.1 Improved regional road safety		✓	✓	✓		✓
6.1 Improved land use and transport integration (in line with the WRS and local authority urban development strategies)	✓		✓		✓	✓
6.2 Improved integration between transport modes	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
6.3 Sustainable economic development supported (in line with the WRS)	✓				✓	✓
7.1 Improved regional freight efficiency	✓		✓		✓	✓
7.2 Improved inter regional freight efficiency	✓		✓		✓	✓
8.1 Improved safety, efficiency and reliability of road, public transport and freight links to the north of the region	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓

Appendix C – NZTA strategic fit criteria

Detail on the NZTA strategic fit assessment criteria is provided in the NZTA Knowledge Base currently available online at:

> http://119.47.122.243/nzta/home/assessment-framework/strategic-fit-2/strategic-fit/

Appendix D – NZTA effectiveness methodology comparison

The effectiveness assessment set out in this prioritisation methodology considers the contribution the proposed solution makes towards achieving the objectives and outcomes of the RLTS.

This differs from the NZTA methodology in that for NZTA the effectiveness assessment considers the contribution the proposed solution makes to achieving the potential identified in the strategy assessment and to the purpose and objectives of the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

Further detail on the NZTA effectiveness assessment criteria is provided in the NZTA Knowledge Base currently available online at:

<div align="center">

http://119.47.122.243/nzta/home/assessment-framework/effectiveness/

</div>