|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Fit** | **Supporting definitions** |
| **Road maintenance**  By default, the strategic fit rating for road maintenance is low.  A road maintenance programme may be given a medium rating for strategic fit if the problem, issue or opportunity is that the appropriate customer levels of service are being delivered for:   * safety, and * journey time reliability, and * resilience   on journeys for:   * employment, and * access to economic opportunities, and * access to social opportunities, and * tourism, and * freight   A high rating for strategic fit must only be given to a road maintenance programme if the issue or opportunity is that there is a significant gap to the appropriate customer levels of service for:   * safety, and * journey time reliability, and * resilience   on journeys for:   * employment, and * access to economic opportunities, and * tourism, and * freight |  |
| **Public transport – programmes**  By default, and without evidence to the contrary, the strategic fit rating for an existing public transport services programme is low.  A public transport programme may be given a medium rating for strategic fit if, in the short to medium term, there is a positive contribution to:   * providing access to social and economic opportunities   A high rating for strategic fit must only be given to a public transport programme if, in addition to meeting the criteria for “medium”, the problem, issue or opportunity is:   * severe congestion in major urban areas (evidenced in travel time and journey reliability on main corridors and arterials across the network). | **Journey time reliability** - Journey time reliability is the reliability of trips on the network, as defined in section 3.5 of the NZTA's Economic evaluation manual, volume 1. Improvements in journey time reliability will reduce the level of unpredictable variations in journey times, which are experienced for a journey undertaken at broadly the same time every day.  **Severe congestion:** where the volume to capacity ratio exceeds 100% for 5 days per week over at least 1 hour in a time period on at least 3 km of a route and the average annual daily traffic (AADT) is greater than 20,000 vehicles per day.  For information on the volume to capacity ratio, refer to the Economic Evaluation Manual (http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/economic-evaluation-manual/economic-evaluation-manual/index.html).  **Major urban:** Major urban areas have the highest concentration of economic activity in employment and firms within the main urban areas. These are currently represented by the major business and employment areas within the main urban areas of Auckland, Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin.  **Safer Journeys area of high concern:** The high priority areas identified in Safer Journeys strategy where the greatest improvements could be made over the period covered by the Safer Journeys strategy.  These include: Reducing alcohol/drug impaired driving, Increasing the safety of young drivers, Safe roads and roadsides, Safe speeds, Increasing safety of motorcycling  **Safer Journeys area of medium concern:** The medium priorities that need to be addressed by relative to the high priorities require less change in policy or practice to improve safety in Safer Journeys action plan.  These include: Improving the safety of the light vehicle fleet, Safe walking and cycling, Improving the safety of heavy vehicles, Reducing the impact of fatigue, Addressing distraction, Reducing the impact of high risk drivers  **Community at high risk:** High risk is assigned to those approved organisations with risk profiles above one standard deviation from the mean, and above in the [Communities at Risk Register](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/communities-at-risk-register/index.html).  **Community at medium risk**: Medium risk is assigned to those approved organisations with risk profiles above half a standard deviation from the mean, and below one standard deviation in the [Communities at Risk Register](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/communities-at-risk-register/index.html).  **Walking and/or Cycling Strategic network:** The network of strategic cycle corridors, feeders, connectors and collectors that comprises an agreed walking and/or cycling network dedicated to facilitating economic growth, productivity and easing congestion by providing safe and convenient cycling  journeys to work, education or shops.  **Primary corridor:** A primary corridor is the highest classification level in a walking and/or cycling strategic network that carries the largest volume of pedestrians and/or cyclists and has the greatest potential to attract new pedestrians and cyclists. Primary corridors provide for trips across town and between suburbs. For example in Auckland the strategic corridor would be the ‘metros’, Christchurch the ‘majors’, etc  **Secondary corridor:** A secondary corridor is an identified component of a walking and/or cycling strategic network that connects potential users to the primary corridors. Secondary corridors provide for trips across suburbs or between destinations (ie schools, workplaces). For example in Auckland the secondary corridor would be the ‘feeders’ or ‘collectors’, Christchurch the ‘locals’ etc  **Utility cycling:** cycling done mainly to get to an activity at the journey’s end, such as commuting trips to work, education, or shops. Utility cycling is used as a proxy for walking and cycling’s contribution to economic growth outcomes.  **Associated facilities:** Associated facilities include the supporting measures required to optimise an implemented route, for example - connections to the local road network or other cycle facility, parking and signage, short term promotion of the new facility.  **Cycle facility:** Infrastructure that is cycling specific, such as cycle lanes, paths and parking.  **High walking and cycling crash risk**: The predicted (estimated using exposure models, latent demand, crash history or other accepted modelling or audit) fatal and serious crash rate for pedestrians and/or cyclists is greater than 3 fatal and serious crashes over a 5 year period or 5 fatal and serious crashes over a 10 year period.  **Medium walking and cycling crash risk:** The predicted (estimated using exposure models, density prediction, crash history or other accepted modelling or audit) fatal and serious crash rate for pedestrians and/or cyclists is greater than 1 fatal and serious crash over a 5 year period or 3 fatal and serious crashes over a 10 year period.  **Main Urban Areas:** Main urban areas represent the most urbanised areas with respect to the concentration of employment, firms and population. Main urban areas are centred on a city or main urban centre. They have a minimum population of 30,000 and an above-average concentration of businesses (typically greater than 90 businesses per 1,000 population).  Main urban areas are as defined by Statistics NZ in the link below. Under these criteria the main urban areas are represented by Whangarei, Auckland, Hamilton, Tauranga, Rotorua, Gisborne, Napier-Hastings, New Plymouth, Wanganui, Palmerston North, Kapiti, Wellington, Nelson, Christchurch, Dunedin and Invercargill.  <http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/Geographic-areas/urban-rural-profile/defining-urban-rural-nz.aspx>  **Medium crash risk:** Risk of deaths and serious injuries is the likelihood of future deaths and serious injuries. This risk may be assessed by an analysis of crash history or using a suitable crash risk prediction model. This includes medium risk rural roads, intersections or motorcycle routes, or where the risk on other areas of the system exceeds that on the medium risk areas above. This will typically be medium collective risk.  **High crash risk:** Risk of deaths and serious injuries is the likelihood of future deaths and serious injuries. This risk may be assessed by an analysis of crash history or using a suitable crash risk prediction model. This includes high risk rural roads, intersections or motorcycle routes, or where the risk on other areas of the system exceeds that on the high risk areas above. This will typically be high, or medium high collective risk.  **Capacity constraints:** When demand, in terms of volume or load, routinely exceeds operating capacity  **Journey time reliability**: Consistency of travel times that road users can expect. Travel time is predictable for the importance of the road.  **Resilience:** The ability of the network or road to withstand, or recover quickly after a disruption. The availability and restoration of each facility when there is a weather or emergency event, whether there is an alternative route available and the road user information provided. This can be measured through the number of journeys impacted by unplanned events, or acceptable risk where there is no viable alternative access should it be closed by an unplanned event.  **Travel quality and aesthetics:** The level of travel comfort experienced by the road user and aspects of the road environment (e.g. cleanliness, comfort/convenience and security) that impact on the travel experience of road users in the road corridor, in accordance with the road classification.  **Accessibility:** The ease with which people are able to reach key destinations and the transport networks available to them - includes land use access and network connectivity. This includes level of access to properties, new development without unduly impacting existing users, bus service appropriate to the environment, freight access, capacity sufficient for the number of vehicles and type using them.  **Congestion**: congestion is where the volume to capacity ratio exceeds 80% for 5 days per week over at least a 1 hour time period that affects at least 1.5 km of a route. For information on the volume to capacity ratio, see the NZTA's Economic Evaluation Manual.  **Significant change:** A significant change in strategic context is:   * a change in planning assumptions in relation to demographic (i.e. population or age profile changes) projections as a result of the next official census, or * a change in planning assumptions relating to the nature and shape of dominant industries in the region, or * a need to alter a region's RLTS or RPS to address impacts of projected sea level rises, coastal erosion or significantly increased flood risk in areas where key networks are at risk, or * a legislative requirement to renew a region's RLTS or RPS. * Significant change pressures within the context of regional growth are: * a change in planning assumptions relating to the nature and shape of dominant industries in the region, or * impacts from sea level rise, coastal erosion or significant flood risk from climate change that threatens or is projected to threaten local and or key state highway networks.   **Making better use:** Making better use of existing services and infrastructure means fully considering and analysing existing services and use of infrastructure and identifying opportunities for change without significant additional expenditure.  **Value for money:** Selecting the right things to do, implementing them in the right way, at the right time and for the right price. |
| **Road Safety Promotion**  By default, the strategic fit rating for activities within a road safety promotion programme is low.  A road safety promotion programme may be given a medium strategic fit rating if each road user behaviour change activity for reducing the crash risk involving deaths and serious injuries is:   * a national or local programmes in a Safer Journeys area of medium concern; OR * a local programmes for a community at medium risk; OR * a national programmes that support delivery of a local programmes for a community at medium risk   A high strategic fit rating must only be given to road safety promotion programmes if each road user behaviour change activity for reducing the crash risk involving deaths and serious injuries is:   * a national or local programmes in a Safer Journeys area of high concern; OR * a local programmes for a community at high risk; OR * a national programmes that support delivery of a local programmes for a community at high risk. |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | **Walking and Cycling Improvements**  By default, the strategic fit rating for walking and cycling improvements is low.  A walking and cycling activity may be given a medium strategic fit rating if the problem, issue or opportunity is:   * part of a secondary corridor within a walking and/or cycling strategic network in a main urban area, for the purposes of utility cycling, including associated facilities to put the corridor into service; OR * a link to complete or complement an existing walking and/or cycling strategic network in a main urban areas; OR * on a corridor, or site, with medium walking and cycling crash risk; OR * a link to a substantial employment centre, outside of main urban areas, which may be considered as an exception where high demand is demonstrated; OR * a link to complete connections to the NZ Cycle Trails.   A walking and cycling activity must only be given a high strategic fit rating if the problem, issue or opportunity is:   * part of a primary corridor within a walking and/or cycling strategic network in a main urban area, for the purposes of utility cycling, including associated facilities to put the corridor into service; OR * on a corridor, or site, with high walking and cycling crash risk. | |
| **Public transport – improvements**  By default, the strategic fit rating for public transport improvements is low.  A medium strategic fit rating may be given if, in the short to medium term, the problem, issue or opportunity is:   * a service provision does not meet forecast demand, including in and to main urban areas, within a region; OR * access to social and economic opportunities, particularly for those with limited access to a private vehicle; OR * a deficiency in reliability, or resilience in the transport system.   A public transport improvements activity must only be given a high strategic fit rating if, in addition to meeting the criteria for a medium rating, in the short to medium term the problem, issue or opportunity is:   * a service provision does not meet forecast demand on networks or corridors in major urban areas, OR * a deficiency in journey time reliability in major urban areas. |
| **Road improvements**  By default, the strategic fit rating for road improvements is low.  A medium strategic fit rating may be given if the problem, issue or opportunity involves:   * journeys for: * employment, * access to economic opportunities, * access to social opportunities, * tourism, and/or * freight;   where a demonstrated gap in the customer levels of service has been identified for:   * journey time reliability, * resilience, * mismatched capacity and demand that results in congestion, and/or * mismatched capacity and demand that results in capacity constraints   AND/OR   * a medium crash risk   A road improvement activity must only be given a high strategic fit rating if the problem, issue or opportunity involves:   * journeys for: * employment, * access to economic opportunities, * tourism, and/or * freight; AND   has a significant gap in the customer levels of service for:   * journey time reliability, * resilience, * mismatched capacity and demand that results in severe congestion, and/or * mismatched capacity and demand that results in capacity constraints   AND/OR   * a high crash risk |
| **Transport Planning**  By default, the strategic fit rating for transport planning activities are:   * for Work category 001: Regional land transport planning management, the default is high and there is no requirement for further assessment * for all other transport planning work categories, the default is low.   A medium rating for strategic fit may be given where the activity applies best practice planning and processes including adopting a coordinated approach with relevant stakeholders and:   1. is focused on where there is significant change in actual or predicted transport demand or performance, and its drivers such as changes in industry, population, technology, energy and climate, and where these changes are not accounted for in existing strategies and plans; AND 2. ensures:  * integration of modes, transport and land use planning issues and other infrastructure planning * making better use of existing transport capacity, including services and infrastructure * managing adverse environmental effects from land transport; AND  1. considers:  * wider transport network performance & capability * safety * value for money * environmental and public health outcomes   A high rating for strategic fit must only be given where the activity meets the requirements for a medium rating AND,   1. makes improvements to whole-of-network, long-term local, regional and national planning in response to significant changes in actual or predicted transport demand or performance, and their drivers such as changes in industry, population, technology, energy and climate; AND 2. addresses one or more of the following:  * easing of severe congestion * optimised levels of service, operation and management of networks * journey time reliability * reduction in deaths and serious injuries in areas identified as being of high crash risk |
| **Road Policing**  By default, the strategic fit rating for components of a road policing programme is low  A road policing programme may be given a medium strategic fit rating if it comprises activities for reducing the crash risk involving deaths and serious injuries through:   * national or local programmes in a Safer Journeys area of medium concern * local programmes for a community at medium risk * national programmes that support delivery of a local programmes for a community at medium risk   A high strategic fit rating must only be given to a road policing programme if it comprises activities for:   * Reducing the crash risk involving deaths and serious injuries through:   + national or local programmes in a Safer Journeys area of high concern The high priority areas identified in   + local programmes for a community at high risk   + national programmes that support delivery of a local programmes for a community at high risk.   AND   * Protection of land transport revenue |

**Effectiveness**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IAF Specifics (PIKB level)** | **IAF definitions** |
| The effectiveness assessment components look at how well the proposed activity or programme:   * is outcomes focused:   + tangible change in addressing the problem, issue or opportunity identified in the Strategic Fit assessment   + consistency with levels of service in an appropriate classification system * is integrated:   + consistency with the current network and future transport plans   + consistency with other current and future activities   + consistency with current and future land use planning   + accommodates different needs across modes   + support as an agreed activity across partners * is correctly scoped:   + the degree of fit as part of an agreed strategy or business case   + has followed the intervention hierarchy to consider alternatives and options including low cost alternatives and options   + is of an appropriate scale in relation to the issue/opportunity   + covers and/or manages the spatial impact (upstream and downstream, network impacts)   + mitigates any adverse impacts on other results * is affordable:   + is affordable through the lifecycle for all parties   + has understood and traded off the best whole of life cost approach   + has understood the benefits and costs between transport users and other parties and sought contributions as possible   is timely:   * + delivers enduring benefits over the timeframe identified in the justified strategy or business case   + provides the benefits in a timely manner   provides confidence:   * + manages current and future risk for results/outcomes   + manages current and future risk for costs   Assessment based on minimum compliance against all components ( L / M / H) | All six criteria set out are to be assessed for any programme or activity proposed for NLTP. The following explanations are most appropriate when applied to road improvement activities. Variations of these are appropriate when assessing activities other than road improvements and further explanation is provided in the following section. The explanations are a guide to assessment, highlighting aspects that need to be considered. If any of these aspects is not applicable to the activity then it should not form part of the assessment.  Refer to the PIKB for variations dependent on activity class. |

**Benefit and cost appraisal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IAF Specifics (PIKB level)** | **IAF definitions** |
| All activities with BCR greater than or equal to 1 and below 3 are prioritised in a single band for improvements to local roads, state highways, public transport, and walking and cycling.  All activities with BCR greater than or equal to 3 and below 5 are prioritised in a single band for improvements to local roads, state highways, public transport, and walking and cycling.  All activities with BCR greater than or equal to 5are prioritised in a single band for improvements to local roads, state highways, public transport, and walking and cycling.  Activities which are unable to determine the benefit cost appraisal using a Benefit Cost Ratio, are given a rating using Low, Medium, or High based on their relative cost effectiveness or performance comparisons.  Existing programmes for road maintenance, public transport programmes, road policing, and road safety promotion will be given a rating, through comparative benchmarking, of:   * Low - when cost effectiveness shows below-average efficiency * Medium - when cost effectiveness shows average efficiency * High - when cost effectiveness shows above-average |  |