INVESTMENT PRIORITISATION METHOD WORKED EXAMPLES

1: WALKING AND CYCLING PROPOSAL

This is a fictional example, designed to be similar to the proposals we receive. To get the best understanding of how we might apply the Investment Prioritisation Method (IPM), you may also find it helpful to refer to the GPS alignment and Scheduling criteria in the IPM.

IPM for the 2021-24 National Land Transport Programme (NLTP)
Planning and Investment Knowledge Base

The proposal: shared path

A new shared path is proposed along the state highway to connect two nearby town centres. At present, an on-road shared path exists.

The high traffic volume on the state highway, combined with the shared path not being physically separated from motor vehicles, causes people to raise concerns about using it. There has been no fatal accident in the last five years, however there were two serious accidents involving cyclists or pedestrians. There is a perceived safety risk for walking and cycling, resulting in poor multi-modal network performance.

Existing shared path conditions are considered poor and unattractive. The surface is uneven. The path width is inconsistent (ranges from 1.5m to 2.5m) limiting two-way movement and overtaking, causing conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. The existing shared path is unlikely to attract new cyclists or pedestrians.

The poor multi-modal network performance further contributes to the high traffic volumes and insufficient network capacity. Vehicle kilometres travelled has been increasing. Peak delays and unreliable journey times have adversely affected regional productivity.

The anticipated transport outcomes of this proposal include:

- increased numbers of commuter cyclists using the corridor
- increased numbers of pedestrians and runners using the corridor
- maintaining or improving journey times and reliability.

The percentage of walking and cycling trips over all trips is expected to increase from current ~5% to 15%.

The shared path also completes the regional walking and cycling network. Improving the shared path will improve connections to social and economic opportunity. Although not included in any programmes or packages, this proposal plays an important role to attract new cyclists and pedestrians to enable future investments for the network.

A strategic case has been developed and the next phase (phase being considered for inclusion) is single stage business case.

Applying the IPM to this proposal

The first consideration we make is if this proposal aligns with our policy for NLTP investment. We find that the proposal meets the minimum information requirements, as outlined in the Planning and Investment Knowledge Base, and qualifies for consideration in the Walking and cycling improvements activity class.

Turning to the issues to be addressed by the proposal, we see it can be assessed under “**Better Travel Options** and **Climate Change**” or “**Safety**”.

GPS alignment

We first consider this issue under **Safety** GPS alignment criteria.

- This is not a medium high or high collective risk corridor or intersection, as there have been few serious accidents in the last five years. This issue relates to a **perceived risk**, not a **predicted risk** which would be supported by evidence. It could be assigned a **Medium** rating using the criterion "Investment to support behaviour change (e.g. changing perceptions of safety or road safety promotion) to improve road safety outcomes."

- This proposal does not involve speed limit reviews or speed limit changes.

- The levels of concerns ratings are drawn from the 'All deaths and serious casualties' table in the most recent version of the Communities at Risk Register. **High Concern** is assigned to communities with personal risk profiles greater than one standard deviation from the mean (1 STDEV). For this example, the area has a personal risk profile 0.5 STDEV to 1 STDEV greater from the mean for cyclists and pedestrians. A **Medium** Concern is assigned, and this only fits in Medium GPS alignment rating.

We would then consider this issue under **Better Travel Options** and **Climate Change** GPS alignment criteria.

- We can see that the investment objective relates to >7% shift from private passenger vehicle-based trips to other modes and fits a **VERY HIGH** GPS alignment rating**.**

We could also have considered this issue under the **Better Travel Options** criteria. In this case, the best fitting criterion is "Better Travel Options and Climate Change" because this proposal is an improvement to enable mode shift from private vehicle rather than a new facility to enable active mode use.

Scheduling

We then consider the **Scheduling**, where interdependency and criticality are assessed.

We first assess this proposal under **Interdependency** against the **HIGH** criteria. This proposal does not belong to a programme or a package i.e. the proposed activity is a **standalone activity**. There is no scheduled investment in nearby walking and cycling facilities. Non-delivery of the proposed activity in the 2021-24 NLTP does not have significant nor moderate impact on realising the estimated benefits of a programme, package or another investment. We can see that this fits a **LOW Interdependency** rating.

Next, we assess this proposal against **HIGH Criticality** criteria. This proposal is not necessary in order to deliver/prepare the remainder of a programme/package. If there is an unplanned loss of service, best alternative of using private passenger vehicle is very unlikely to take over one-hour extra travel time. We can see that this fits a **LOW Criticality** rating.

The overall **Scheduling** rating is **LOW** for this proposal.

Efficiency

Last, we consider the **Efficiency** factor. At this point in the proposal's business case development, we don't have the full cost and benefit information. By inputting parameters into the IER tool, we get a suggested efficiency rating of **Medium**. This will be used as the Efficiency rating until full cost-benefit analysis is done in the business case.

With VH for GPS alignment, L for Scheduling, M for Efficiency, this proposal gets a Priority Order of 3 according to the Investment Prioritisation three-factor Matrix.

We hope you found this information useful. Please remember to take a look at our other examples.

See more examples online of how to apply the IPM

If you have any questions about this information, or want to understand more about what Waka Kotahi can invest in and how we can support your work, please contact your investment advisor, or Director Regional Relationships. You can also contact the NLTP team directly at nltp@nzta.govt.nz.