

PAMP Scoring Criteria - 2002

8.2.4 Prioritisation of Measures

Footpaths have been prioritised based on Council's current formula for ranking requests for new footpaths. Each footpath proposed is assessed and given a ranking under five topics. The topics are:

- 1) Use by the Elderly (3 = high, 1 = low);
- 2) Combined Use, i.e. total number of pedestrians (3 = high, 1 = low);
- 3) Traffic Density (3 = high, 1 = low);
- 4) Safety Issues, (3 = safety risk eg cannot walk on grass path & blind corner; 1 = low risk; adequate off road); and
- 5) Special Factors = score high if along side school, hall, etc (3 = high, 1 = low, 0 = irrelevant)

The formula gives different topics different weightings in calculating a final score. The formula is:

Score = 2*(Elderly)+4*(Combined Use)+3*(Traffic Density)+5*(Safety Issues)+1*(Special Factors)

This formula and weighting system has been used to score each of the recommended locations for footpaths in Appendix D.

The concept of assigning rankings based on several criteria is considered to be an appropriate means of prioritising footpath projects. However, when using this formula for this project it was found that some projects which were seen as important for providing for children or increasing the connectivity for the entire network did not score as highly as those which were seen to moderately help some of the other factors such as road safety. It was therefore recommended that two additional criteria be added to the formula, namely:

- 6) Use by the Young (3 = high, 1 = low); and
- 7) Network Connectivity (3 = great improvement, 1 = little improvement).

The revised formula proposed is:

Score = 2*(Elderly) + 4*(Combined Use) + 3*(Traffic Density) + 5*(Safety Issues) + 1*(Special Factors) + 2*(Young) + 3*(Connectivity)

This revised formula was considered by Council. Council has decided to retain the original formula. The original formula and weighting system have been used to score each of the recommended locations for footpaths in Appendix D.

For this study a second ranking has been given based on an overall judgement of the merits of each location. The schedule of infrastructure works set out in Appendix D, allocates a priority (High, Medium and Low) to the proposed improvements. These priority allocations have been made based on the several factors including:

- Increasing pedestrian network connectivity;
- Proximity to major pedestrian attractor or generator; and
- Use by special group in the community such as children (e.g. near schools) or senior citizens.

Amendments to the Original 2002 PAMP Scoring Criteria

With the PAMP needing to be managed as a living document going forward (as completed paths were continually added, and new project nominations needing to be considered and ranked), the 2002 criteria needed to be expanded as the number of projects increased. Amendments to the criteria were flagged to be addressed as part of the subsequent 2005 PAMP update. Primarily, the main issues with the original criteria were; the simplified scoring process was subjective, limited criteria resulted in numerous projects returning the same score, and concerns were being raised regarding a perceived unfair distribution of projects across the city. An attempt was made to improve on these outcomes as part of the 2005 PAMP update process.