

## PAMP Scoring Criteria - Current (2010-2023)

To ensure projects are not unfairly penalised because of high cost or budget constraints, where appropriate to do so, some high cost or longer route projects need to consider appropriate and affordable stages (priorities/scores may differ between stages).

Type of Facility (choose a,b or c, then consider additional points adjustment for d-g)	Scores				
a1. Missing Link, relatively short, has high demand, relatively inexpensive (can be funded by Council)	80				
a2. Missing Link, relatively short, has less demand, relatively inexpensive (can be funded by Council)	60				
a3. Missing Link, medium length, no existing (but latent demand), expensive (requires 50/50 grant funding application)	40				
a4. Missing Link, long length, no existing (but latent demand), expensive (requires 100% grant funding application)	20				
b1. Extension of, or link to existing facility, high demand	60				
b2. Extension of, or link to existing facility, lower demand	30				
c1. New facility (no adjoining network)	10				
c2. New facility (connects a remote and/or disconnected location to an existing network)	80				
d. Additional Points for shared facility	20				
e. Additional Points to address an accessibility priority, DIA need, or missing link to Public Transport node	80				
f. Additional Points to address a Bike Plan priority	Add Bike Plan Score (out of 10)				
g. Deduct Points for widening proposal (where a path exists), in fairness, to compare with locations where there is no path	-50				
<b>Landuse</b> (indicator of demand/ vulnerable users - add points together)					
* Measured from centre pt of each project stage to point of access from public rd					
	0-500m	500-1000m	1000-1500m	1500-2000m	>2000m
	a	b	c	d	e
Schools	80	40	20	10	0
Major CBD, Civic and entertainment precincts	80	40	20	10	0
Retirement, Seniors Living, Aged Self-care, hospitals, medical centres, etc	80	40	20	10	0
Other education facility	60	30	15	7.5	0
Local commercial/retail area	60	30	15	7.5	0
Neighbourhood shopping centre	40	20	10	5	0
Recreation facility	40	20	10	5	0
Community facility eg. Pre-school, long day care, church, library, can include Clubs & other locations used as evac centres, etc	20	10	5	2.5	0
Corner store	20	10	5	2.5	0
Caravan Park	20	10	5	2.5	0
Bus zones, Bus shelters, train stations, other multi-modal facilities, etc	20	10	5	2.5	0
<b>Safety-Traffic Speed</b> (85 <sup>th</sup> %ile if known, otherwise speed limit)					
Scores					
a1. enter actual value of speed in km/hr x .50 - K&G present	(km/hr x 0.5)				
a2. enter actual value of speed in km/hr x 2 - no K&G present	(km/hr x 2)				
b. no traffic	0				
<b>Safety- Traffic Volume</b> (Average Daily Traffic Volume) - road adjoining proposal/or proposal diverts users away from the road					
Scores					
a1. enter actual value of Average Daily Traffic / 100 / # lanes in road (left side of road only) - K&G present	(vpd) / 100 / lane factor				
a2. enter actual value of Average Daily Traffic / 100 / # lanes in road (left side of road only) - no K&G present	(vpd) / 50 / lane factor				
b. no traffic	0				
<b>Safety - Conflict with Vehicles</b> (what most users do, one only)					
Scores					
a. Always shares road space with traffic	80				
b. Sometimes shares road space with traffic	40				
c. Always use road shoulder adjacent traffic	30				
d. Never mix with traffic	0				
<b>Accident History</b> (pedestrian and cyclist accidents only)					
Scores					
a. enter actual number of accidents x 50	No. accidents x 50				
b. no accidents	0				
<b>Users</b> (add points together)					
Scores					
Commuter route	20				
Tourist route	20				
<b>ESD</b> (Would the project encourage more people to walk or cycle for either recreation or commuter use? Add points together)					
Scores					
a. Yes > overcomes safety concerns	40				
b. Yes > Is significant improvement to local accessibility	30				
c. Yes > Is scenic or desirable route	20				
d. No > Not likely, or only to minor degree	0				
<b>Walk Score.Com</b> (measure of walkability based on proximity to nearby services and facilities)					
Scores					
a. enter actual value from Walk Score.Com website x 1	Value x 1				
<b>How Walk Score Works</b>					
Walk Score is a number between 0 and 100 that measures the walkability of any address based on the proximity to a range of commonly used community facilities, as determined by Walk Score.Com					
<a href="http://Walk Score.Com">Walk Score.Com</a>					
90-100 (Walker's Paradise — Daily errands do not require a car)					
70-89 (Very Walkable — Most errands can be accomplished on foot)					
50-69 (Somewhat Walkable — Some amenities within walking distance)					
25-49 (Car-Dependent — A few amenities within walking distance)					
0-24 (Car-Dependent — Almost all errands require a car)					
<b>Adopted Community Project</b>					
Scores					
Proposed path has community support with a Community Group organised to manage and construct the path & Council agrees to allocate funds to the project	500-1000 (depending on proportion of Community funding allocated)				

### PAMP Scoring Criteria - Current (2023)

The above (current) PAMP criteria has been in operation from 2010-2023, but is open to review as part of the 2023 PAMP-Bike Plan Review process. The current criteria is considerably more detailed than the original 2002 and 2005 PAMP criteria, deliberately so, with a focus on connectedness, equity, inclusion and accessibility, and not overly influenced by population and location. From 2010-2023 the current criteria has been considered fit for purpose, still caters for considerable growth anticipated, and ensures an equitable spread of projects across the broader City. Whilst funding limitations remains the key constraint to Council being able to significantly expand the active transport network to suit everyone's immediate needs (which is why criteria needs to be in place), it is considered that the current criteria is still providing acceptable city-wide outcomes based on the number and spread of projects currently included in the PAMP. As part of the PAMP 2023 update, the current criteria (subject to review) has been tentatively populated within a spreadsheet model, with convenient drop down function, and open transparency, to ensure that all project scores are readily viewable, and easier to amend, on a needs basis. When reviewing the PAMP criteria, keep in mind that project scores, whilst an important guide for Council, are not the only factor when Council considers which projects to support in the budget. Communities will still be able to seek the support of Council for individual projects that are of importance to them, as part of the annual budget process. It is also important to keep in mind that some projects (regardless of score) may not be able to be supported in a given year due to the likely project costs or funding limitations that year. Grant programs (a significant factor in determining the extent of a delivery program each year), have their own program criteria, which can be highly variable and also subject to change each year. We look forward to your feedback on the current criteria.