

Option 1: Do Minimum - Minor Safety, Low Promotion and No Network Roll Out

This option includes the following activities and outcomes:

- No Urban Cycleway Programme funding over the first three years of the programme.
- Delivers minor safety improvements across the existing road network at cycle safety blackspots – between \$1M and \$3M
- Does not access any National Land Transport cycling funding for the rest of the network.

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	E&P 0.2	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	28.8	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	No route improvements to the network, only localised treatments	x
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	No route improvements to the network, only localised treatments	x
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	City's growth trend may continue	√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Safety - minor safety works	√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	No route improvements to the network, only localised treatments	x
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Does not address problems or achieve benefits identified.	L
Effectiveness	Has minimal impact on effectively addressing issues or improving the transport network.	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	Low investment, high return on investment (BCR)	H
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High Political risk - not using available funding sources from NLTP and UCP Low delivery risk, time, and cost impacts.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	Yes, requirement of the Business Case process to shortlist the do minimum option	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Does not meet Investment Objectives, low strategic fit and effectiveness.	
Workshop Comments	This is a complete failure, Not an option	

Scenario 2: Minor Capital Improvements

WCC LTP only funding (Limited UCP and NLTP funding)

This option includes the following activities and outcomes:

- No Urban Cycleway Programme funding over the first three years of the programme.
- Minor cycleway infrastructure delivered by WCC only - either Hutt and/or Island Bay cycleways.
- Delivers minor safety improvements across the existing cycle way network.
- Does not access any National Land Transport funding for the rest of the network.

I = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C															I	D	C	
	0.5	2	6.5															0.2	0.3	2.5	
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes							I	D	C												
							0.2	0.3	2.5												
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes										I	D	C									
										0.2	0.3	2.5									
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes												I	D	C							
												0.2	0.3	2.5							
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	C			I	D	C															
	1			0.2	0.3	2.5															
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes															I	D	C				
															0.2	0.3	2.5				
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P		
	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	56.8	2.7	3.2	7.7	1.6	1.7	3.9	1.6	1.7	3.9	1.6	1.7	3.9	1.6	1.7	3.9	1.6	1.7	3.9		

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	\$49M of ~\$100M network, say 50% of the network implemented	√
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Minor Improvements in the efficiency of the network	√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	City's growth trend is expected to continue with increased infrastructure	√√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Minor works plus limited new network	√√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City		Improved but not completed network, 50%
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Begins to address problems and opportunities	M
Effectiveness	Incomplete network - is affordable	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (~1-3)	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High political risk, low time risk, medium implementation risk	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	

Option 3A: Equitable access for all package areas (WCC, UCP then NLTP funding)

This option includes the following activities and outcomes:

- Utilising Urban Cycleway Programme funding over the next three years to plans, designs and constructs the cycle ways: 1.Ngauranga to Bunny Street (Wellington CBD), 2. CBD network and 3. some of the Eastern area network
- Delivers minor safety improvements across the existing cycle way network
- Prioritises cycle network for the three other package areas before reinvesting through the network with secondary and tertiary routes

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
	0.5	2	6.5																		
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C												C	C	C				
	1	4	13												2	2	2				
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C										C	C	C						
	0.5	1	4.5										2	2	2						
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C	C			C								C			
				0.5	1	3	2			2								2			
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C		C			C								C		
				0.5	1	3		2			2								2		
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C			C			C								C	
				0.5	1	3			2			2								2	
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	101.1	3	8	25	2.7	4.2	10.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Achieves the whole network within 21 years	√ √
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Equitable and not efficiency based	√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Equity based programme, investment priorities equitable access over the most efficient	√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Improvement but due to equitable approach does not resolve on a safety (risk) based approach.	√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Overall area is covered and improves amenity across Wellington.	√ √
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Most investments align with NZTA prioritised routes.	M
Effectiveness	Affordable	M
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (~1-3)	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	Medium political risk, medium time risk, medium implementation risk	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Medium efficiency and effectiveness, Pptentially does not maximise NLTP funding opportunities	
Workshop Comments	Has some appeal. Quite logical, maximises partnership funding and allows for Wellington City priorities to be achieved. Very good, just speed up delivery. Needs to be more ambitious.	

Option 3B: Package Area focus (intensive approach) - One package area at a time based on efficiency (WCC, UCP then NLTP funding)

This option includes the following activities and outcomes:

- Utilising Urban Cycleway Programme funding over the next three years to plans, designs and constructs the cycle ways: 1.Ngauranga to Bunny Street (Wellington CBD), 2. CBD network and 3. some of the Eastern area network
- Delivers minor safety improvements across the existing cycle way network
- Provide all routes by highest efficiency/effectiveness package (geographical area) sequentially

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000	Short			Medium						Long												
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37	
Strategic Interventions																						
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	Investments to be determined by evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness. Example Yr 4-6: eastern Yr 7-9: western Yr 10-12: southern Yr 13-15: northern Yr 16 onwards: CBD and remaining																		
	0.5	2	6.5																			
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																			
	1	4	13																			
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																			
	0.5	1	4.5																			
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																						
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																						
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																						
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C		
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C		
				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P			
	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2			
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																						
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																						
Other																						
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	100.5	3	8	25	4	4	4	2	2.5	6	2	2.5	6	2	2.5	6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Achieves the whole network within 21 years	√
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Slightly less efficient than a prioritised route approach (i.e. LoS Gap analysis)	√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Coverage (equitable access) approach not efficiency or effectiveness focused	√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Coverage (equitable access) approach not efficiency or effectiveness focused	√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Coverage (equitable access) approach not efficiency or effectiveness focused	√
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Addresses problems across area and will utilise some priority routes	M
Effectiveness	Affordable	M
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (1-3), is higher than 3A and may be at the higher level depending on specifics of the programme	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	Medium political risk, medium time risk, medium implementation risk	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	NO	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Medium to high efficiency and effectiveness, potentially does not maximise NLTP funding opportunities	
Workshop Comments	Suspect the secondary and tertiary routes would rank lower than primary routes elsewhere. Not sure going into one neighbourhood and delivering several routes at once will be well received by the community. There is a delivery risk in constructing all the cycleways at once. Include high level education and promotion to maximise outcomes of this option.	

Option 3C: UCP then highest priority based on Level of Service Gap (WCC, UCP then NLTP funding)

- Routes prioritised by Level of Service deficiencies after UCP - addresses safety issues and deficiencies
- Provide routes for all catchment areas
- Yrs 1-3: Hutt, CBD and Eastern – primary and some secondary routes
- Yrs 4 onwards: Based on WCC prioritisation of Level of Service deficiencies

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Strategic Interventions Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	Investments to be determined by evaluation of level of service gaps and deficiencies. Example Yr 4-6: eastern Yr 7-9: western Yr 10-12: southern Yr 13-15: northern Yr 16 onwards: CBD and remaining																	
	0.5	2	6.5																		
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
	1	4	13																		
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
	0.5	1	4.5																		
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	101.4	3.2	8.2	25.2	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Achieves the whole network within 21 years	√ √
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Level of Service (Gap analysis) and evidence based approach	√ √
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Higher Level of Service encouraging new cyclists	√ √
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Safer and higher Level of Service than current	√ √
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Coverage and efficiency and effectiveness focused	√ √
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Strategic Priority routes addressed	H
Effectiveness	Outcome focused	M
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (1-3), is higher than 3A and may be at the higher level depending on specifics of the programme. Early realisation of benefits.	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	Medium political risk, medium time risk, medium implementation risk, funding risk for NLTP.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	Yes	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Meets Investment Objectives and NZTA Assessment Criteria requirements.	
Workshop Comments	Q1 - would addressing LoS still provide for connected journeys as per strategic fit criteria or would it be more sporadic? Q2 - LoS - is this safety or efficiency or both? Liked how after the first three years we can focus on some routes with good gains in getting people on bikes, or fixing safety issues, e.g. Karori hill, Brooklyn, Berhampore. UCP funding is critical and should take advantage of funding stream. Could combine with option 7, create a hybrid option with education and awareness.	

Option 3D: Centres and Neighbourhoods

- Centres and neighbourhoods approach (local uptake prioritised over commuter)
- Provide routes based on servicing centres, schools, amenities and increasing demographic uptake
- Yrs 1-3: Hutt, CBD and Eastern
- Yrs 4-6: Western, Southern and Northern
- Yrs 7 onwards: Remaining routes

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Strategic Interventions Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	Investments to be determined by level of service gaps and deficiencies around centres and schools, and then connections between centres, and then remaining routes.																	
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C																		C
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children	Focus Area																				
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	101.4	3.2	13.2	20.2	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Focus on centres, local areas, not all connected until the end of the investment period	√
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Focus on centres, local areas, not all connected until the end of the investment period	√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Local community, schools and non-commuter cycling is increased. Likely continued rate of improvement for the remaining network.	√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Safety issues addressed around centres and schools only, safety issues for commuters still existing.	√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Improves the environment, safety and efficiency around these centres and schools only in the short to medium term.	√
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Not commuter routes or primary routes.	L
Effectiveness	Not affordable as it is not likely to rate highly under NZTA investment criteria.	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	Likely to be less than 1.	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	Medium political risk, medium time risk, medium implementation risk, funding risk for NLTP.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Meets Investment Objectives at low levels and does not meet assessment criteria.	
Workshop Comments	Will not get NZTA support (funding). Will not get NZTA support so not a good overall programme.	

Option 3E: UCP then highest priority based on a hybrid of Strategic Routes, LoS deficiency, and Equity

- Provide routes for all catchment areas as early as practicably possible
- Yrs 1-3: Hutt, CBD and Eastern – all routes
- Yrs 4 onwards: Based on WCC hybrid prioritisation

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	Investments to be determined by evaluation of strategic routes, level of service gaps and deficiencies, and equity. Example Yr 4-6: eastern Yr 7-9: western Yr 10-12: southern Yr 13-15: northern Yr 16 onwards: CBD and remaining																	
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C																		
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	101.4	3.2	8.2	25.2	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Achieves the whole network within 21 years	√ √
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Level of Service (Gap analysis) and evidence based approach	√ √
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Higher Level of Service encouraging new cyclists	√ √
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Safer and higher Level of Service than current	√ √
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Coverage and efficiency and effectiveness focused	√ √
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Strategic Priority routes addressed	H
Effectiveness	Outcome focused	H
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (1-3), is higher than 3A and may be at the higher level depending on specifics of the programme. Early realisation of benefits.	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	Medium political risk, medium time risk, medium implementation risk, funding risk for NLTP.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	Yes	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Meets Investment Objectives and NZTA Assessment Criteria requirements.	
Workshop Comments	Possibility that this will be virtually the same as 3A, but gives less upfront certainty. Q1 - would addressing LoS still provide for connected journeys as per strategic fit criteria or would it be more sporadic? Q2 - LoS - is this safety or efficiency? Liked how after the first three years we can focus on some routes with good gains in getting people on bikes, or fixing safety issues, e.g. Karori hill, Brooklyn, Berhampore. UCP funding is critical and should take advantage of funding stream. Could combine with option 7, create a hybrid option with education and awareness.	

Option 4: Accelerated Programme - Complete within 9 years (WCC, UCP and NLTP funding for Yrs 1-3, Yr 4-9)

- Programme is accelerated and prioritised by ability to construct the whole network in 9 years
- Yrs 1-3: Hutt, CBD and Eastern – primary and some secondary routes
- Yrs 4-6: Western, Southern and Northern – primary and secondary routes
- Yrs 7-9: Remaining routes

* Programme to be reviewed based on available funding.

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C				C	C	C												
	0.5	2	6.5				1	1	1												
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C				C	C	C												
	1	4	13				1	1	1												
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C				C	C	C												
	0.5	1	4.5				1	1	1												
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C	C	C	C												
				0.5	2	5	1	1	1												
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C	C	C	C												
				0.5	2	5	1	1	1												
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C	C	C	C												
				0.5	2	4	1	1	1												
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	101.3	3.2	8.2	25.2	2.9	7.4	15.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Meets objective, however investment may exceed demand or need for infrastructure	√ √
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Meets objective, however investment may exceed demand or need for infrastructure	√ √
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Meets objective, however investment may exceed demand or need for infrastructure	√ √
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Meets objective, however investment may exceed demand or need for infrastructure	√ √
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Meets objective, however investment may exceed demand or need for infrastructure	√ √
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Resolves identified problems and achieves benefits within a short time period.	H
Effectiveness	Unlikely to attract all funds required from NLTP or reallocation of funds from other WCC investments within required timeframe	H
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (1-3) Early realisation of benefits and costs.	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High political risk, time risk, implementation risk, funding risk for NLTP.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	Yes *	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Major constraint due to ability to access additional funding sources.	
Workshop Comments	Option 4A favourable if NLTP and UCP funding carries on beyond year three. Prioritisation exercise should focus on understanding and identifying which programme option best delivers benefits and investment objectives, then adjust LTP if required and rate affordability.	

Option 5: Highest priority based on Level of Service Gap (No UCP funding)

- Based on WCC prioritisation of Level of Service deficiencies and project prioritisation
- Increased level of Wellington City Council funding from Yr 1
- No Limited UCP funding
- Negotiate potential for NLTP funding

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000	Year																				
	Short			Medium						Long											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Strategic Interventions	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	<p style="text-align: center;">Priority Routes across the Network, not based on areas, prioritised by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Level of Service deficiency 2. Safety 3. Efficiency and effectiveness 4. Usage 5. Potential uptake 																				
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	101.25	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	4.85	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Achieves the cycling network through a Level of Service (safety, amenity, functionality) prioritised approach across Wellington City.	√ √
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Improves efficiency and effectiveness across the cycling network through a Level of Service (safety, amenity, functionality) prioritised approach across Wellington City.	√ √
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Increases the level of cycling across the cycling network through a Level of Service (safety, amenity, functionality) prioritised approach across Wellington City.	√ √
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Improves the rate, number and severity of crashes across the cycling network through a Level of Service (safety, amenity, functionality) prioritised approach across Wellington City.	√ √
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Improves sustainability, liveability and attractiveness of the city by improving the cycling network through a Level of Service (safety, amenity, functionality) prioritised approach across Wellington City.	√ √
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Meets the Strategic fit, targeted investment based on need.	H
Effectiveness	Not affordable due to inability to access UCP and NLTP funding in the first 3 years.	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (1-3), is higher than 3A and may be at the higher level depending on specifics of the programme. Early realisation of benefits.	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High Political risk - not using available funding sources from NLTP and UCP Low delivery risk, time, and cost impacts.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Major constraint due to ability to access additional funding sources.	
Workshop Comments	Good - But going alone without UCP funding is not smart. Not a favoured option	

Scenario 6: Network wide minimum standard then upgrade over time (Limited UCP funding)

- High coverage and low Level of Service infrastructure
- Provide routes for all catchment areas as early as practicably possible
- Yrs 1-3: Hutt, CBD and Eastern – all routes
- Yrs 4-6: Western, Southern and Northern
- Yr 7 onwards: gradual improvement in the quality of infrastructure

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long												
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	C	C	C																
	0.5	1	2	1.4	1.4	1.4																
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	C	C	C										C	C	C				
	0.5	1	2	1.4	1.4	1.4										2	2	2				
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	C	C	C							C	C	C							
	0.5	1	2	1.4	1.4	1.4							2	2	2							
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	C	C	C	C			C									C			
	0.5	1	2	1.4	1.4	1.4	2			2									2			
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	C	C	C		C			C									C		
	0.5	1	2	1.4	1.4	1.4		2			2									2		
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	C	C	C			C			C									C	
	0.5	1	2	1.4	1.4	1.4			2			2									2	
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	
				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	E&P	
	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																						
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																						
Other																						
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	100.8	4	7	13	9.6	9.6	9.6	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Not comprehensive	√
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Not comprehensive	√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Not comprehensive	√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Not comprehensive	√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Not comprehensive	√
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Low quality infrastructure along primary routes	M
Effectiveness	Not affordable as it is not compliant with NZTA funding.	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	Likely to be less than 1.	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High political risk, low time risk, low implementation risk, funding risk for NLTP.	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	Does not meet Investment Objectives well and has a low strategic fit.	
Workshop Comments	Ambitious but risky. Not very strategic. You would be doing it twice and probably miss target market too Blanket coverage is not smart.	

Option 7: Non infrastructure, education and promotion only

- No Urban Cycleway Programme funding over the first three years of the programme.
- Minor cycleway infrastructure delivered by WCC only - Island Bay cycleways.
- Does not access any National Land Transport funding for the rest of the network.

T = Indicative Business Case D = Detailed Business Case C = Construction M = Monitoring E&P = Education and Promotion \$ = ,000,000 Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long											
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes																					
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure				C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	C 0.2	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P 5	E&P 5	E&P 5	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	E&P 2	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children																					
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																					
Other																					
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	75.6	6	6	6	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	No network completed	x
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Limited uptake and mode shift	√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	City growth rate continues. Limited uptake and mode shift	√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Education increases safety	√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Some improvements from mode shift	√
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Begins to address problems and opportunities	M
Effectiveness	Incomplete network, is affordable	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (~1-3)	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High political risk due to lack of infrastructure improvements, low time risk, medium implementation risk	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	low efficiency and effectiveness, does not meet investment objectives well.	
Workshop Comments	This should be implicit in options 2 to 8. - Becomes a Master Plan Principle.	

Option 8: Very high quality LoS cycling infrastructure (prioritised within the network) (WCC, UCP then NLTP funding)

This option includes the following activities and outcomes:

- Urban Cycleway Programme funding over the first three years of the programme.
- Very high standard cycleway infrastructure on all routes.
- Delivers minor safety improvements across the existing cycle way network.
- Limited National Land Transport funding for the rest of the network.
- Includes wrap around, education and schools programmes.

Strategic Interventions	Short			Medium						Long												
	Year			4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	2036/37	
Hutt (Ngauranga to Wellington CBD) - improvements along the 5km of priority cycleway from Ngauranga to Wellington CBD (Bunny St) - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	I	D	C	I	D	C													I	D	C	
	0.5	2	6.5	0.5	2	6.5													0.2	0.3	2.5	
City Centre - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes							I	D	C													
							0.4	0.6	5													
Eastern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes										I	D	C										
										0.4	0.6	5										
Western - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes													I	D	C							
													0.4	0.6	5							
Southern - Island Bay cycleway, Xkm of priority lanes and Xkm of shared space - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes	C 1			I	D	C	I	D	C													
				0.4	0.6	5	0.8	1.2	8													
Northern - Xkm of high priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of medium priority strategic cycle route - Xkm of secondary (access) routes				I	D	C										I	D	C				
				0.8	1.2	8										0.4	0.6	5				
Minor Safety - Improvements to high risk, high crash sites across the city at current funding levels	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	
Wrap Around - End of trip facilities - Cycle parking infrastructure	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	
Promotion and Education - aimed at increasing level of cycling and safety (i.e. reduced crashes with vehicles)	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	E&P 1	
School Connections - cycleways delivered to connect schools with the cycleway network to support increased cycle usage by children	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	C 1	
Quick Wins - undertake early works and cycleway packages that are consistent with a range of route options to improve delivery (capex - spread)																						
Other																						
Cost Profile (\$ = ,000,000)	156	5.5	6	10.5	5.7	7.8	23.5	5.2	5.8	17	4.4	4.6	9	4.4	4.6	9	4.4	4.6	9	4.2	4.3	6.5

Investment Objectives KPIs are indicative and will be confirmed throughout the development of Indicative Business Cases	Comments	X - Does not meet criteria √ - Partially meets criteria √√ - Meets criteria √√√ - Exceeds criteria
1. Achieve a high level of service for cyclists within the transport network o KPI 1: Increased customer satisfaction with Level of Service o KPI 2: % of the network (catchment areas) that is completed	Network completed to very high standard	√√√
2. Greater transport network efficiency, effectiveness and resilience as a result of implementing cycling infrastructure o KPI 1: Increased contribution to network (journey time) reliability o KPI 2: Reduced Vehicle Operating Costs o KPI 3: Overall economic benefit	Provides a high level of transport efficiency. May have negative impact on other transport modes.	√√
3. The number of cyclists and cycle trips is increased over the next 10 years o KPI 1: Increased cycling as a transport mode (Mode Share from 4.3% in 2014 to X% in 2024) o KPI 2: Localised trip movements o KPI 3: School trips (school travel survey)	Will increase the level of cyclists	√√
4. The crash rate, number and severity of crashes involving cyclists is reduced o KPI 1: Reduced actual deaths, serious injury and crashes o KPI 2: Crash rate per km reduced from X to Y (regional statistic) o KPI 3: Improved perception of cycling safety (level of service perception survey)	Will decrease the number and severity of crashes and crash rate	√√
5. Wellington is a more sustainable, liveable and attractive city o KPI 1: Greater health (Health benefits) o KPI 2: Improved wellbeing (Quality of life) o KPI 3: Increased visitor satisfaction – can we really attribute cycling? o KPI 4: Reduced CO2 emissions o GPI index? – measures eco, enviro, general well being – Previous work by GWRC? o Measuring the success of E-bikes, could this be bike sales and rentals in Wellington City	Will make Wellington a more attractive and livable city	√√
NZTA Assessment Criteria	Comments	High / Medium / Low
Strategic Fit	Delivery exceeds needs	L
Effectiveness	Completed network, is not affordable	L
Benefit and Cost Appraisal	BCR (~1-3)	L
Significant Risks <i>How will the risk result in the project not proceeding or having a major political, environmental, timeframe or cost impact?</i>	High political risk, high time risk, high implementation risk	
Consider Further - Short List (Yes / No)	No	
Rationale & Assessment Overview	low efficiency and effectiveness, does not meet investment objectives well.	
Workshop Comments	Public and political backlash. Fantasy land. \$\$\$ Good to be aspirational but we need to actually deliver in the real political and budget realities. Not clear what else we would get / some grade separations e.g. over the port would be good as part of other projects.	