



**Report** 04.152  
**Date** 17 March 2004  
**File** TP/01/05/01

**Committee** Regional Land Transport  
**Author** Joe Hewitt Manager Access Planning

## **Regional Prioritisation of Transit's Proposed Projects 2004/05**

### **1. Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to:

- set out the background which defines the context for today's meeting; and
- to advise the Committee of the technical evaluation process that has been developed to enable project priorities to be recommended.

### **2. Background**

In accordance with Section 99 (3) (a) of the Land Transport Management Act 2003, Transit is seeking submissions on its Draft Land Transport Programme 2004/05 for State Highways. Submissions are requested by 31 March 2004.

Transit is seeking the following:

1. Suggested priorities for major regional state highway projects (non-block programme, costs greater than \$3 million);
2. Suggested priorities for investigation projects (potential projects development);
3. Suggested priorities for minor regional state highway projects (block programme, costs less than \$3 million);
4. Comment on the proposed maintenance programme; and
5. Comment on a proposed national Toll Administration Project.

Item 1 is the subject of the second report on this order paper titled "Major Project Construction Priorities". Item 2 is the subject of the third report titled "Major Project Investigation Priorities". Item 3 is covered by the fourth report

titled “Minor Project Construction Priorities” and items 4 and 5 are the subject of the final report titled “Matters For Submission To Transit”.

### **3. Evaluation Process**

Assessing of the merit of each proposed project for their contribution to achieving the outcomes sought by the RLTS is a critical part of the prioritisation process. The method used this year is similar that that refined last year and is fully documented in **Attachment 1**. Briefly, there is a three-stage technical assessment carried out by the officers that produces project priorities that are then recommended for the RLTC’s consideration. The fourth and final stage is for the RLTC to determine priorities taking account of political factors.

The technical assessment is undertaken by the Technical Working Group (TWG). This group is made up of officers from Crown Agents (Transit, Transfund and LTSA), GWRC and territorial authorities. The assessment uses a weighted attribute method to value a projects’ contribution to ‘progress’. Scoring is based on the best (latest) available data – quantitative where possible, peer reviewed by the TWG if not. The four stage process is outlined below.

#### **Stage 1 - Consistency check**

- a pass/fail test checking consistency with the RLTS and affordability, failures being deleted from further consideration

#### **Stage 2 - Scoring**

- scoring each project on each line of a weighted attribute matrix. Scoring is to an 8 point scale on each line, with ‘greatly, significantly, moderately, slightly’ plus and minus gradations, and pre-set definitions of each gradation for each line

#### **Stage 3 - Ranking**

- ranking of projects ordered by descending scores
- scores are reviewed by TWG and any adjustments documented
- recommended ranking is then referred to the RLTC

#### **Stage 4 - Political review**

- RLTC considers other criteria (i.e. not already in the attributes and these may include readiness, urgency, sequencing, feedback from public participation, and ‘other perceived costs/benefits’
- each adjustment by the RLTC is documented
- the final lists are formally adopted.

## **The weighted attribute matrix**

Each objective in the RLTS is taken into account and their weighting is equalised, i.e. 4 objectives means each scores 25% of the total, 5 objectives means each scores 20%.

RLTS policies are reflected in the attributes (line-items). For example, reducing congestion, economic efficiency, enhancing safety, and reducing fuel use are RLTS policies that become scored attributes for each project (currently there are 12 such attributes – the RLTS review can review these).

Wherever possible scoring is quantitatively based, information based where not and always peer reviewed. The 8-point scale is predefined for every attribute.

Attributes are weighted to reflect received policy priorities but no attribute can be neglected. Weightings are pre-set and transparent. Economic efficiency, enhancing safety, promoting accessibility and reducing congestion are attributes which achieve higher weighting in the received Wellington matrix with the rest being treated equally. The RLTS review can review weightings.

Flawed projects are deleted, i.e. any project that scores less than –3 on the 9-point scale on any line is disqualified from further consideration (thus projects that significantly increase congestion or have significant adverse environmental impact cannot be ranked or recommended).

## **4. Communications**

There is nothing to communicate as a result of this report. Much of the above explanation has already featured in the March issue of Transport Futures.

## **5. Recommendation**

*That the report be received.*

Report prepared by:

Report approved by:

**Joe Hewitt**

Manager Access Planning

**Dave Watson**

Divisional Manager Transport

## **Attachment**

1. Transport Package and Project Prioritisation Methodology
2. Letter from Transit dated 16 January 2004, seeking submissions on its draft Land Transport Programme 2004/05