

## Evaluation Framework

The evaluation framework used to assess 21 scenarios that passed through an initial filter is shown overleaf. The framework will be further developed and added to before it is used for the evaluation of short list options.

Other matters considered during the development of critical success factors within this framework included:

- **impact on businesses on Golden Mile** - while this is an important consideration for LGWM, at long-list stage, given the limited detail within the scenarios impact on business will generally be proportional to the amount of physical works that are undertaken. A more nuanced assessment against this criterion may be introduced when concept designs for each short list option are available.
- **opportunities for businesses on the Golden Mile** – is also an important consideration for LGWM but ultimately is a function of the objectives (4) and (5)
- **ability to accommodate an increased bus throughput** – this is a function of improving bus travel times and travel time reliability. Therefore, if investment objective 1 is achieved it will enable some increase in bus throughput. Nonetheless the additional capacity for bus throughput will be very dependent on the combination of interventions in the corridor. Therefore, at long list stage, the differences between scenarios will not be discernible. This criterion may be used when concept designs are developed for shortlist options.
- **compatibility with proposals to create parallel bus corridors** - unless the parallel bus corridor does not follow the Quays, this criterion is unlikely to differentiate between scenarios.

## INVESTMENT OBJECTIVES

1: Improve bus travel times and travel time reliability along the Golden Mile		High Improvement	Medium Improvement	Low Improvement	Negative
ASSESSMENT FACTORS	Bus Stop Delay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close spacing</li> <li>Dwell times</li> <li>Short length stops</li> </ul>	Bus stop delay is significantly reduced, addressing all key issues	Some reduction to bus stop delay expected, as only some issues addressed.	Minimal change	Increased bus stop delay
	Signal controlled intersections	Significantly reduced delay to buses expected as multiple conflicting movements removed.	Some reduced delay to buses expected, with slightly higher proportion of green time allocated to buses.	Minimal change	Increased intersection delay expected
	Interaction with general traffic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sides roads</li> <li>Along corridor</li> <li>Intersection approaches</li> </ul>	All interactions with general traffic along the corridor section removed.	Some reduction in interaction between buses and general traffic along the corridor.	Minimal change	Increased interaction between buses and general traffic.
2: Improve convenience and comfort of waiting for, boarding and alighting buses along the Golden Mile		High Improvement	Medium Improvement	Low Improvement	Negative
ASSESSMENT FACTORS	Waiting space available	Space available for large waiting area, free of pedestrian movements.	Some increase in waiting area at bus stops.	Minimal change	Decrease in waiting area at stops.
	Legibility of bus stops <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bus stopping pattern</li> <li>Ease of use</li> </ul>	Bus stops regularly spaced, with standard length & simple stopping patterns.	Some improvement to bus stop legibility.	Minimal change	Decreased bus stop legibility with complex stopping patterns and/or long stops.
3: Reduce the number of crashes within the Golden Mile that result in pedestrian injury		High Improvement	Medium Improvement	Low Improvement	Negative
ASSESSMENT FACTORS	Delay at signalised intersections, leading to increased pedestrian compliance.	Multiple conflicting traffic movements removed.	Some reduced delay to buses expected, with slightly higher proportion of green time allocated to pedestrians.	Minimal change	Increase in pedestrian delay.
	Conflict between pedestrians and vehicles turning into or out of side roads at priority-controlled intersections with side streets	All vehicle movements in and out of side streets closed.	Some vehicle movements in and out of side streets closed.	Minimal change	Increased vehicle movements in and out of side streets.
	Conflict between vehicles and pedestrians when crossing at uncontrolled locations	General traffic removed from full section of the corridor	General traffic volume reduced along the corridor	Minimal change	Increased general traffic along the corridor
4: Increase the capacity for pedestrians to move within the corridor by improving walking LOS along and across Golden Mile		High Improvement	Medium Improvement	Low Improvement	Negative
ASSESSMENT FACTORS	Footway Congestion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>width of path</li> <li>obstructions in path</li> </ul>	Path width enables higher pedestrian flow without congestion. Suits users of all needs.	Path width is sufficient to handle current volume without congestion.	Minimal change	Reduced width or more obstructions.
	Connectivity (Both along and across the GM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>frequency of signal-controlled crossing</li> <li>ease / ability to cross at uncontrolled locations</li> <li>permeability of the corridor</li> </ul>	High level of priority for pedestrian movements along the Golden Mile (e.g. where side streets are closed). Safe to cross the Golden Mile at any location (with caution). Closely spaced formal crossings (no more than 75m apart).	Pedestrians need to pause and give way along the mile. Safe informal crossing points (e.g. median and low enough volume) Moderately spaced formal crossings (75m-125m)	Minimal change	Frequent need to give way to vehicles. Unsafe informal crossing, pedestrians likely to take risks. Widely spaced formal crossings (more than 125m)

5: Improve the place quality of the Golden Mile		High Improvement	Medium Improvement	Low Improvement	Negative
ASSESSMENT FACTORS	Environmental comfort (considers noise, pollution, vehicle traffic volume, space for vegetation/LID)	Improvement to all	Improvement to some	Minimal change	Reduction from current
	Opportunity for public realm enhancements (feels safe, relaxed, provides for dwelling, seating, events, identity contributors (like art works or celebrating heritage places), space for hospitality)	Improvement to all	Improvement to some	Minimal change	Reduction from current

### CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

	Greatly Achieved	Somewhat Achieved	Minimally Achieved	Negative
1. Improved level of service for cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>scenario or option creates additional 1.5m-2.5m road width for people who cycle / use micro-mobility;</li> <li>scenario or option reduces the number of traffic conflicts for cyclists / micro-mobility users;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>scenario or option reduces the number of traffic conflicts for cyclists / micro-mobility users;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cycling LOS similar existing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>less space available for cyclists;</li> <li>additional restrictions on use of Golden Mile for cycling;</li> </ul>
2. Resilience to network operational disruptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>carriageway layout increases ability for buses to pass lane closures or broken-down vehicles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>existing diversion routes are unaffected (remain available);</li> <li>ability for buses to pass lane closures is unchanged</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the number of available bus diversion routes are reduced;</li> <li>the ability for buses to pass lane closures is reduced</li> </ul>
3. Increase flexibility and ability to adapt as the city's transport networks evolve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>scenario or option is equally compatible with a Taranaki Street or Kent/Cambridge bus / MRT interchange</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>scenario or option is compatible <u>either</u> with a Taranaki Street or Kent/Cambridge bus / MRT interchange</li> </ul>
4. Ability to Demonstrate Tangible Improvements within the 2018-21 / 2021-24 NLTP periods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is possible to complete delivery in or before 2022</li> <li>Supports increased volumes of pedestrians and is an environment that people want to spend time in and therefore \$</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is possible to complete delivery in or before 2024</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is possible to start, but not complete, delivery before 2024</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is not possible to start delivery before 2024</li> </ul>

Released under the Official Information Act 1982