

## PAMP Scoring Criteria - 2005

Type of Facility (choose a,b or c, then consider additional points for d)	Scores
a. Missing Link	4
b. Extension of, or link to, existing facility	2
c. New facility	1
d. Additional Points for shared facility	2

  

Landuse (indicator of demand/ vulnerable users - add points together)	Scores
Schools	4
Major CBD	4
Aged Self-care	4
Other education facility	3
Local commercial/retail area	3
Neighbourhood shopping centre	2
Recreation facility	2
Community facility	1
Corner store	1
Caravan Park	1
Bus Stop	1
Commuter Route	1
Tourist Route	1

  

Safety	Scores
<b>Traffic Speed</b> (85 <sup>th</sup> %ile if known, otherwise speed limit)	<b>Scores</b>
a. 80-99 km/hr	3
b. 50-79 km/hr	2
c. <50 km/hr	1
b. no traffic	0

  

Traffic Volume	Scores
a. 12,000 vpd and above	4
b. 8,000 - 11,999 vpd	3
c. 3,000 - 7,999 vpd	2
b. up to 2,999 vpd	1

  

Safety - Conflict with Vehicles (what most users do; one only)	Scores
a. Always shares road space with traffic	4
b. Sometimes shares road space with traffic	2
c. Always use road shoulder adjacent traffic	1
d. Never mix with traffic	0

  

Accident History (pedestrian and cyclist accidents only)	Scores
a. 2 or more accidents	4
b. 1 accident	1

  

Population	Scores
a. Major Urban Centre - Nowra/Bomaderry	5
b. Secondary Area (Sanctuary Point, Ulladulla, Mollymook, Mollymook Beach)	4
c. Town (more than 2,000 persons; Vincentia, Culburra/Orient Point, Sussex Inlet, Shoalhaven Heads)	3
d. Village (1,000-2,000 persons; Basin View, St Georges Basin, Callala Bay, Berry, Cambewarra, Greenwell Point, Burrill Lake, Milton, Narrawallee, Huskisson, West Nowra, Worrigea)	2
e. Small Village (less than 1,000 persons; Old Erowal Bay, Erowal Bay, Cudmirrah, Berrara, Callala Beach, etc)	1

### Amendments to the 2005 PAMP Scoring Criteria

As part of PAMP Stage 2 (in 2005) amendments were made to the original 2002 criteria to separate projects that were on the same score, provide a fairer distribution of projects throughout the City, and greater justification for projects returning higher relative PAMP scores. At the time of testing and adoption, the 2005 criteria was generating more acceptable city-wide outcomes based on the number of projects included in the PAMP at the time. Going forward however, as the number of projects being requested by the community continued to increase, and more and more concerns raised regarding some towns and villages that felt they weren't being fairly prioritised compared to the larger populated centres, further amendments were flagged to try and improve on these outcomes. Post 2005, the main focus areas were to expand on the criteria to ensure projects were less likely to return the same score (with some future proofing & assuming that significantly more projects were likely to be added to the program over time), address distribution concerns by moving away from a part-criteria of population, to more of a criteria that recognised accessibility, connectedness, and walkability, regardless of location, in a way that ensured that projects being favoured by the PAMP criteria were also reflecting the broader needs of the City, fairly, across all towns and villages. Post 2005, rather than go back through an extensive PAMP review process, staff were given direction through a number of Councillor briefings to broaden the PAMP criteria considerably, and ensure the criteria was fit for purpose going forward, to cater for the considerable growth anticipated across the city, as well as addressing current and emerging issues, with a focus on connectedness, equity, inclusion and accessibility. Several attempts were made to improve on these outcomes as part of the evolving PAMP process, by 2010 the dust had settled on a more extensive criteria set, and that criteria still remains in operation in 2023. The current criteria is open to review as part of the 2023 PAMP-Bike Review process.