



SF2014/0068979

Warrumbungle Shire Council,
The General Manager
PO Box 191
Coonabarabran NSW 2357

RECEIVED
03 NOV 2014

BY:

Dear Sir/Madam

Invitation to Nominate Walking and Cycling Projects for NSW State Government Active Transport funding

Roads and Maritime Services is seeking nominations from councils for eligible cycleway and pedestrian projects to be considered for NSW State Government Active Transport funding for the 2015/16 financial year.

Transport for NSW, in collaboration with Roads and Maritime, has recently developed new Walking and Cycling Funding Guidelines, with some key changes to the way the funding is allocated. Roads and Maritime is administering and managing this program in partnership with the councils that will be delivering these facilities for local communities. Council is encouraged to review the attached guidelines (Attachment 1) and develop a strategy to best position them to successfully bid for funding.

There are a total of six funding streams, three walking and three cycling:

1. Walking Communities Council partnership funding
2. Walking Communities NSW Government priority funding
3. Pedestrian Bridges
4. Connecting Centres Cycleways Council partnership funding
5. Priority Cycleways NSW Government priority funding
6. Cycling Towns

Please refer to page 3 of the guidelines for an overview of the funding streams, including examples of the types of projects that may be applied for, the relevant eligibility requirements, as well as the percentage contribution of State funding available.

Council is invited to nominate cycling and walking projects to Roads and Maritime by **28 November 2014**. Roads and Maritime has created a new online process for the submission of proposals to facilitate the upload and tracking of supporting documents. The online nomination form and project scoring spreadsheet can be accessed from our website at <http://www.rms.nsw.gov.au/business-industry/partners-suppliers/lgr/active-transport/index.html>

Please include with your nominations supporting documents such as designs, strategic and delivery plans, and project descriptions detailing the proposal and the value of the proposal in terms of encouraging a shift to active transport in the community.

Roads and Maritime Services

Council can now apply for a rolling program of funding up to three years for a project to allow for early planning then design and construction or implementation. Council can also submit proposals for a forward program of projects over multiple years. However, confirmation of funding will be provided on a project by project, year by year basis.

Once all proposals have been received, they will be assessed and prioritised according to the criteria in the Walking and Cycling Funding Guidelines and then submitted to Transport for NSW for funding approval. Council will be advised early in 2015 if their project has been given a priority that is likely to be funded, allowing councils to budget for these proposals in 2015/16. Following the State Budget announcement, Roads and Maritime will also formally advise councils for acceptance of funding for successful proposals.

A copy of this letter and the project scoring spreadsheet will be emailed to your nominated contact in the coming week. Please contact Joshua Parkin on 02 6861 1480 or email ActiveTransport@rms.nsw.gov.au if you need any information or more time beyond the closing date to prepare your nomination.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'P. Standen', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Phil Standen
Regional Manager
Western Region

30.10.14

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS FUNDING GUIDELINES

1. Introduction

The NSW Government is committed to working with councils to make walking and cycling safer, more convenient and enjoyable transport options that benefit everyone. By better targeting investment to improve walking and cycling in the areas where most short trips occur, the NSW Government aims to support more accessible, liveable and productive towns, cities and centres and free up capacity on our roads and public transport system for those customers that need to travel further.

These guidelines outline a new priority weighting system that will be applied to assess pedestrian and cycling proposals submitted to the NSW Government for funding. The aims of the guidelines, based on *Sydney's Walking Future* and *Sydney's Cycling Future* are to:

- assess the eligibility of projects for NSW Government State funding
- prioritise eligible projects for delivery
- provide guidance to councils and other stakeholders on planning cycles and funding arrangements
- provide accountability and transparency.

In line with the NSW Long Term Transport Master Plan (LTTMP), *Sydney's Walking Future*, *Sydney's Cycling Future* and the Regional Transport Plans, there is a focus on improving walking and cycling connections within major centres. The purpose of this is to increase opportunities for people to walk and ride their bikes more often in order to help reduce congestion and free up capacity on public transport, particularly around schools, workplaces and universities.

Principles

The principles guiding the prioritisation process are:

- Ensure initiatives are based on sound evidence
- Prioritise cost effective solutions
- Deliver in collaboration with partners
- Support a culture of walking and cycling for transport.

Key changes to old funding regime

There are a number of changes to the funding arrangements between the NSW Government and Councils. The key changes are:

- Prioritise projects that will have the greatest impact on levels of walking and cycling, e.g.
 - Projects within 2km walking and 5km cycling catchments of major centres
 - Improve access to public transport interchanges
 - Focusing investment on projects that have the greatest potential to support customers to walk or ride for transport..
- A milestone based funding arrangement for joint funding streams in order to incentivise early planning, design and pipeline development and to deliver a and robust program of works in accordance with agreed delivery timeframes. Joint funding will now be apportioned to *planning and design* and *construction and implementation*.
- A rolling program of funding over up to 3 years for a project can be applied for to allow for early planning prior to design and construction/ implementation. Funding will be subject to budget availability and confirmed on an annual basis in line with NSW Government budget processes.

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS FUNDING GUIDELINES

- Planning, design and construction/ implementation will represent “stop-go” points for further funding. This will include:
 - initial funding to support planning and design
 - subsequent funding for delivery, contingent on satisfactory completion of planning and design and community consultation (where relevant)
 - if planning and design has already been completed, councils can apply for construction/implementation funding in the first instance.

The new funding guidelines will be reviewed after 12 months. Council feedback on the guidelines is welcomed. Feedback can be submitted by email to RMS at the following address:
Activetransport@rms.nsw.gov.au

2. Funding streams

There are a total of six funding streams – three walking and three cycling. Table 1 is a breakdown of different types of funding streams including examples of the types of projects that can be applied for, the relevant eligibility requirements as well as level of State funding provided. Funding may be applied for over a number of years (with a yearly delineation). However, confirmation of funding will be provided on a year by year basis.

Program Categories

Councils may apply for project funding under one or more of the following program categories:

- Infrastructure projects
- Non-infrastructure projects
- Metropolitan
- Non-metropolitan (regional)
- “Planning and design” projects
- “Implementation” projects

The budget apportioned for each program category may vary each year. Projects will be assessed and prioritised within each program category. Councils can refer to eligibility criteria for each program funding stream to determine whether projects would be eligible for consideration.

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS

FUNDING GUIDELINES

Table 1 Funding Streams

Funding Stream			Eligible projects	Eligibility			State Funding		
				Local & Regional Roads	State Roads	Centres and interchange catchment	Early planning	Design	Construction/ implementation
Walking	Walking Communities	Council partnership funding	<p>Infrastructure projects: One or more projects to improve pedestrian amenity. Eligible projects include: scramble crossings, raised crossings, marked zebra crossings, installation/realignment of kerb ramps, kerb blisters, walking network planning. Footpaths are not eligible under this program.</p> <p>Non-infrastructure projects: Campaigns, social media, advertising, community engagement – break down barriers to walking.</p>	✓		2km	Up to 75%	50-75%	Up to 50%
		NSW Government priority funding	One or more projects to improve pedestrian amenity. Eligible projects include: scramble crossings, raised crossings, marked zebra crossings, installation/realignment of kerb ramps, kerb blisters, signal timing changes, signalised crossings and removal of slip lanes.		✓	2km	100%	100%	100%
	Pedestrian Bridges		Connect walking paths across busy roads, rail corridors or other major barriers.	✓	✓	2km	100%	100%	100%
Cycling	Connecting Centres	Council partnership funding	<p>Infrastructure projects Local bicycle infrastructure connecting local bicycle networks to key destinations. Projects include on road and off road bicycle infrastructure as defined in the Austroads Guides. Projects must be part of an identified transport network. Closed recreational circuits will not be considered. Projects must comply with the relevant Austroads Guides, Australian Standards and NSW Bicycle Guidelines.</p> <p>Non-infrastructure projects Eligible projects include: bike network maps, bike plans, campaigns, social media, advertising, community engagement, bicycle rider confidence courses and travel behaviour change programs that break down barriers to bike riding. Projects must be consistent with relevant Austroads Guides and NSW Government guidance.</p>	✓		5km	Up to 75%	50-75%	Up to 50%
		Priority Cycleways	NSW Government priority funding	Projects that are identified in a NSW Government plan as a <i>Priority Cycleway</i> or meet criteria for priority cycleway funding. These routes connect major generators of bicycle traffic within each region eg. universities, commercial centres and public transport interchanges. Projects must comply with the relevant Austroads Guides, Australian Standards and NSW Bicycle Guidelines. Priority cycleways will generally be under the care and control of councils when completed.	✓	✓	n/a	100%	100%
	Cycling Towns		NSW Government priority funding	Bicycle infrastructure proposals that complete a primary safe network of cycleways to a range of destinations within a 5km catchment of the town centre. Project examples could include: connected bicycle network construction; bicycle parking facilities; construction of a bicycle end of trip facility or centre. Councils must demonstrate supporting complementary cycling promotion initiatives to encourage use of the infrastructure. Projects must comply with the relevant Austroads Guides, Australian Standards and NSW Bicycle Guidelines.	✓	✓	5km	100%	100%

3. Overview of process

Figure 1 presents an overview of the assessment process and timeframes. Potential projects put forward for funding through one of the six funding streams are assessed using the prioritisation assessment criteria described below.

Funding will be notionally allocated to each region. Projects will be assessed and ranked in order of funding priority. The final funding recommendation will be made by a joint executive committee of Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) for NSW Government approval. Councils will be kept informed as to the status of their application throughout this process and receive formal notification after the NSW State Budget.

4. Overview of criteria

Projects are assessed using the prioritisation assessment criteria. These criteria are divided into three key themes:

- Strategic alignment
- Council support
- Ability to deliver

Each of the six funding streams has common criteria within these themes, (although the way they are measured varies), as well as program-specific criteria.

Figure 1 Assessment process and timeframes

Roads and Maritime Services / Transport for NSW	Council
July	July 2 July - final advice of work completed up to 30 June for accruals in previous financial year. Councils to notify RMS of their acceptance of projects for the current financial year.
August	31 August 31 Aug - Final date for Councils to forward invoices to RMS for completed works in the prior financial year.
September	September
October Council project submissions assessed for the following financial year program by RMS regions.	October 1 Oct - Final date for Councils to notify RMS of their acceptance of projects for the current financial year. Mid Oct - Applications close for the following financial year. Projects submitted after this date will be assessed for the program 2 years ahead.
November	November
December List of recommended projects from RMS regions reviewed by senior management.	December Target date to complete 50% of projects for which funding has been approved.
January	January
February Notify councils of nominal status of the assessment project applications for the following financial year.	February
March	March
April	April
May	May
June Ensure all projects funded within the current financial year are complete. Formal advice to Councils of project allocations for the next financial year after state budget.	June NSW Government payments will only be made to the value of work physically completed by 30 June.

Walking Communities (both joint funding and 100% state funding)

Is the project an infrastructure project or a non-infrastructure project?

Infrastructure	Continue below
Non-infrastructure	Go to next heading

Infrastructure Projects - Walking Communities

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)	
	Local / regional roads	State roads
Planning	(up to 75%)	(up to 100%)
Design	(50% - 75%)	(up to 100%)
Construction	(up to 50%)	(up to 100%)

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Project is within 2km walking catchment of centre - See catchment map	
Yes	8
No	0
Identified in Council Plans (can receive multiple scores)	
Walking explicitly identified in Council Community Strategic Plan	1
Walking is identified in council Delivery Program	2
Project is identified in council Operational Plan	3
Identified in Council Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan	3
Links to major trip attractors (can receive multiple scores – maximum of 14)	
Directly connects to major public transport interchange	6
Within 400m of major public transport interchange	4
Within 800m of major public transport interchange	2
Within 400m of other pedestrian generating land uses, e.g. university, TAFE, school, hospital, commercial/retail area, aged care facility, park, stadium, community centre, pool. 2 Points for each, e.g. 2 schools + 1 hospital = 6 points	2 for each
Within 400m of local public transport stop	1
Otherwise	0
Projects that will improve pedestrian amenity	
Improves priority for pedestrians at intersections (e.g. additional green time, left hand red hold arrow)	3
Improves pedestrians amenity through the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pedestrian refuges • scramble crossings • raised crossings • marked zebra crossings • removal of slip lanes • installation / realignment of kerb ramps • kerb blisters • signalised crossings • signalised crossing modifications 	3
None of the above	0
A suite of inter-related pedestrian facility projects designed to improve amenity and connectivity for pedestrians	
A combination of inter-related pedestrian infrastructure projects (≥5 projects)	5
A combination of inter-related pedestrian infrastructure projects (2-4 projects)	3
Is a stand-alone project	2
Project does not improve amenity or connectivity for pedestrians	0
Theme - Council support	
Project maximises leverage from Council funds (joint Council / State funded projects only)	
Planning and/or design stage:	
State Gov funding required ≤ 50%	5
State Gov funding required 50% - 75%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 75%	1
Construction stage:	
State Gov funding required ≤ 25%	5
State Gov funding required 25% - 50%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 50%	1

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS
FUNDING GUIDELINES

Theme / criteria	Score
Project offers good value for money	
Cost of projects (refer Appendix A)	
Below average rates (<10% of average)	3
Within average range (+/- 10% of average)	2
Above average rates (>10% of average)	1
If costs not provided in Appendix A	
≥ 3 quotes received (if >\$25,000) or ≥ 2 quotes received (if <\$25,000)	3
Otherwise	0
Ability to deliver	
Projects considered feasible	
Very straight forward, feasible project with no major obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, no heritage issues and strong community support	5
Moderately straight forward and feasible project with minor obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, few or no heritage issues or good community support	4
Complex project with some difficult obstacles, e.g. requires some land acquisition, some heritage issues or has little community support	2
Very complex project with significant obstacles, e.g. requires significant land acquisition, heritage issues and has little community support	1
TOTAL SCORE	

Non-Infrastructure Projects - Walking Communities

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)
Planning	(up to 75%)
Implementation	(up to 50%)
Evaluation	(up to 75%)

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Within centre (regional) / major centre (metropolitan) - See catchment map	
Focus on residents and/or workers within 2km walking catchment of centre	8
Otherwise	0
Addresses Walking for Transport*	
Yes	3
No	0
Identified in Council Plans (can receive multiple scores)	
Walking explicitly identified in Council Community Strategic Plan	1
Walking identified in Council Delivery program	2
Project identified in Council Operational Plan	3
Identified in council Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan	3
Purpose of project	
Behaviour change	3
Education	2
Information	1
None of the above	0
Council support	
Project maximises leverage from Council funds	
<i>Planning and evaluation stages:</i>	
State Gov funding required ≤ 50%	5
State Gov funding required 50% - 75%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 75%	0
<i>Implementation stage:</i>	
State Gov funding required ≤ 25%	5
State Gov funding required 25% - 50%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 50%	0
Project reach	
Project covers multiple local government areas	5
Project covers all of one local government area	3
Project covers part of one local government area	1
TOTAL SCORE	

*The project must promote, educate or inform customers about walking for a purpose other than for recreation alone. For example walking to schools, workplaces, the shops or other local trip generators.

Pedestrian Bridges

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)
Planning	(up to 100%)
Design	(up to 100%)
Construction	(up to 100%)

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Project is within 2km walking catchment of centre - See catchment map	
Yes	8
No	0
Links to major trip attractors (can receive multiple scores – maximum of 14)	
Directly connects to major public transport interchange	6
Within 50m-400m of major public transport interchange	4
Within 400m-800m of major public transport interchange	2
Within 400m of other pedestrian generating land uses, e.g. university, TAFE, school, hospital, commercial/retail area, aged care facility, passive or active recreational facility. 2 Points for each, e.g. 2 schools + 1 hospital = 6 points	2 for each
Within 400m of local public transport stop	1
Otherwise	0
Bridge connects active transport links	
Yes – on both sides	5
Yes – one side only	3
No	0
Locations where pedestrian provision is poor	
Locations where there is currently no provision for pedestrians to cross road	5
Locations where there is currently provided at an intersection – one side only	3
Locations where there is currently provided at an intersection – both sides of intersection	2
Locations where there is currently a mid-block crossing	1
Crossing significant physical barrier	
Rail corridor or river	4
Locations with 8 or more lanes (including slip and turning lanes)	3
Locations with 6 to 7 lanes (including slip and turning lanes)	2
Locations with 4 to 5 lanes (including slip and turning lanes)	1
Locations with less than four (4) lanes (including slip and turning lanes)	0
Ability to deliver	
Projects considered feasible	
Very straight forward, feasible project with no major obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, no heritage issues and strong community support	5
Moderately straight forward and feasible project with minor obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, few or no heritage issues or good community support	4
Complex project with some difficult obstacles, e.g. requires some land acquisition, some heritage issues or has little community support	2
Very complex project with significant obstacles, e.g. requires significant land acquisition, heritage issues and has little community support	1
TOTAL SCORE	

Connecting Centres (Cycling)

Is the project an infrastructure project or non-infrastructure project?

Infrastructure	Continue below
Non-infrastructure	Go to next heading

Infrastructure Projects - Connecting Centres (Cycling)

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)
Planning	(up to 75%)
Design	(50% - 75%)
Construction	(up to 50%)

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Project is within 5km cycling catchment of centre - See catchment map	
Yes	8
Between 5 and 10km from centre	1
> 10km from centre	0
Identified in Council Plan (can receive multiple scores)	
Cycling explicitly identified in council Community Strategic Plan	1
Cycling is identified in council Delivery Program	2
Project is identified in council Operational Plan	3
Project Identified in council bike plan	3
Connects to state priority routes	
Part of a local bicycle route that connects to a State Priority Cycleway Route	5
Part of a local bicycle route with no connection to a State Priority Cycleway Route	0
Links to major trip attractors (can receive multiple scores – maximum of 14)	
Directly connects to major public transport interchange	6
Completes a missing link along route that connects to major public transport interchange	4
Connects to other trip attractors, e.g. university, TAFE, school, hospital, commercial/retail area, aged care facility, park, stadium, community centre, pool. 2 Points for each, e.g. 2 schools + 1 hospital = 6 points	2 for each
Otherwise	0
Project utilises existing infrastructure	
Project connects to existing route	3
Otherwise	0
Project addresses major missing links or identified barriers (can receive multiple scores)	
Connects multiple routes in bike network or completes a major missing link in network	3
Provides new access beyond an existing major barrier	3
Upgrades/widens an existing section of the bike network	2
None of the above	0
Direct route	
Most direct route	4
Slight detour compared to road network (<500m)	3
Moderate detour compared to road network (500m-1km)	2
Large detour compared to road network (>1km)	1
Project connects Aboriginal communities to centre – regional only	
Project connects Aboriginal community to centre	8
Project partially connects Aboriginal community to centre	5
Otherwise	0
Council support	

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS
FUNDING GUIDELINES

Theme / criteria		Score	
Project maximises leverage from Council funds			
<i>Planning and/or design stage:</i>		<i>Construction stage:</i>	
State Gov funding required ≤ 50%	5	State Gov funding required ≤ 25%	5
State Gov funding required 50% - 75%	3	State Gov funding required 25% - 50%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 75%	0	State Gov funding required ≥ 50%	0
Project offers good value for money			
Cost of projects (refer Appendix B)			
Below average rates (<10% of average)		3	
Within average range (+/- 10% of average)		2	
Above average rates (>10% of average)		1	
If costs not provided in Appendix B			
≥ 3 quotes received (if >\$25,000) or ≥ 2 quotes received (if <\$25,000)		3	
Otherwise		0	
Ability to deliver			
Projects considered feasible			
Very straight forward, feasible project with no major obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, no heritage issues and strong community support	5		
Moderately straight forward and feasible project with minor obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, few or no heritage issues or good community support	4		
Complex project with some difficult obstacles, e.g. requires some land acquisition, some heritage issues or has little community support	2		
Very complex project with significant obstacles, e.g. requires significant land acquisition, heritage issues and has little community support	1		
TOTAL SCORE			

Non-Infrastructure Projects - Connecting Centres for Cycling

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)
Planning	(up to 75%)
Implementation	(up to 50%)
Evaluation	(up to 75%)

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Within centre (regional) / major centre (metropolitan) - See catchment map	
Focus on residents and/or workers within 5km cycling catchment of centre	8
Otherwise	0
Addresses Cycling for Transport*	
Yes	3
No	0
Identified in Council Plans (Can receive multiple scores)	
Cycling explicitly identified in council Community Strategic Plan	1
Cycling identified in council Delivery program	1
Project identified in council Operational Plan	3
Project Identified in council bike plan	3
Project promotes the health, wellbeing, low cost and convenience benefits of bike riding (can receive multiple scores)	
Project is aimed at educating public about bike riding opportunities including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> planning a safe riding route to their destination how to connect to public transport on a bicycle end-of-trip facilities available at employment centres and other major destinations packs to new residents 	2
Project is aimed at educating public about cycling benefits (e.g. to health)	2
Project aimed at encouraging existing bike riders to ride more often	
Project includes a bicycle confidence course as part of a larger suit of improvements	5
Project is a bicycle confidence course as a lone project	3
Project provides bicycle parking at destinations	3
Council support	
Project maximises leverage from Council funds	
Planning and evaluation stages:	
State Gov funding required ≤ 50%	5
State Gov funding required 50% - 75%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 75%	0
Implementation stage:	
State Gov funding required ≤ 25%	5
State Gov funding required 25% - 50%	3
State Gov funding required ≥ 50%	0
Project reach	
Project reaches multiple local government areas	5
Project covers all of one local government area	3
Project covers part of one local government area	1
TOTAL SCORE	

*The project must promote, educate or inform customers about cycling for a purpose other than for recreation alone. For example cycling to schools, workplaces, the shops or other local trip generators.

Priority Cycleways

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)
Planning	(up to 100%)
Design	(up to 100%)
Construction	(up to 100%)

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Project is within 5km cycling catchment of centre - See catchment map	
Yes	8
Between 5 and 10km from centre	1
> 10km from centre	0
Identified in Council Plans (can receive multiple scores)	
Cycling explicitly identified in council Community Strategic Plan	1
Cycling identified in Council Delivery Program	2
Project identified in Council Operational Plan	3
Project identified in Council bike plan	3
None of the above	0
State Road projects	
Project is completely (100%) on a State Road	5
Project is predominately on a State Road	4
Project is predominately on local roads	2
Project is on local roads only	0
State Priority Cycleway projects	
Project is one of the Priority Cycleways identified in a NSW Government Plan	8
Project is a State Priority Cycleway (other than above)	4
Project is part of a Local Bicycle Route that connects to State Priority Cycleway Route	2
None of the above	0
Project connects to major public transport interchange	
Project provides connection to 2 or more major public transport interchanges	5
Project provides connection to a major public transport interchange	4
None of the above	0
Links to major destinations	
Cycleway connects to (within 400m radius of) trip attractors, e.g. a school, university, TAFE, hospital, commercial/retail area, aged care facility, park, stadium, community centre, pool (2 points for each). For example: 2 schools + 1 hospital = 3 points	2 for each
If does not connect to significant trip attractors	0
Project utilises existing infrastructure	
Project connects to existing route	3
Otherwise	0
Project addresses major missing links or identified barriers (can receive multiple scores)	
Connects multiple routes along State Priority links or closes major gap on State Priority network	3
Upgrades/widens an existing section of the State Priority bike network	3
Provides new access beyond an existing major barrier	3
Connects two existing local routes in the cycle network	2
Upgrades/widens an existing section of the local bike network	1
None of the above	0
Direct route	
Most direct route	4
Slight detour compared to road network (<500m)	3
Moderate detour compared to road network (500m-1km)	2
Large detour compared to road network (>1km)	1

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS
FUNDING GUIDELINES

Theme / criteria	Score
Project connects Aboriginal communities to centre – regional only	
Project connects Aboriginal community to centre	10
Project partially connects Aboriginal community to centre	8
Otherwise	0
Cycleway passes through high density residential area	
High density residential area (e.g., metropolitan: 4+ storeys; regional: 2+ storeys)	3
Medium density residential area (mix of dwelling types, e.g. townhouses, villas, terraces, detached houses on small lots)	2
Low density residential area (detached houses on large blocks of land)	1
Does not pass through residential area	0
Cycleway passes through high density employment area	
High density employment area (e.g. major retail development, multi-storey commercial/office buildings)	3
Medium density employment area, (single-storey retail, office buildings)	2
Low density employment area (e.g. single storey commercial warehouses, light industrial)	1
Does not pass through employment area	0
Council support	
Project offers good value for money (refer Appendix B)	
Below average rates (<10% of average)	3
Within average range (+/- 10% of average)	2
Above average rates (>10% of average)	1
Ability to deliver	
Projects considered feasible	
Very straight forward, feasible project with no major obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, no heritage issues and strong community support	5
Moderately straight forward and feasible project with minor obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, few or no heritage issues or good community support	4
Complex project with some difficult obstacles, e.g. requires some land acquisition, some heritage issues or has little community support	2
Very complex project with significant obstacles, e.g. requires significant land acquisition, heritage issues and has little community support	1
TOTAL SCORE	

Cycling Towns

Stage	Level of funding (provide %)
Planning	(up to 100%)
Design	(up to 100%)
Construction	(up to 100%)

Cycling towns funding is open to Major Regional Centres defined in the NSW Government Regional Transport Plans and listed below:

Regional Transport Plan	Eligible for cycling towns funding					
	Town	Page	Town	Page	Town	Page
Central Coast	Gosford	34	Wyong	36		
Central West	Orange	42	Lithgow	48	Mudgee	54
	Dubbo	44	Parkes	50	Forbes	56
	Bathurst	46	Cowra	52		
Hunter	Newcastle	50	Raymond Terrace	56	Singleton	62
	Maitland	52	Morisset	58	Muswellbrook	64
	Cessnock	54	Forster-Tuncurry	61		
Illawarra	Wollongong	36	Kiama	38	Nowra-Bomaderry	40
Mid North Coast	Coffs Harbour	36	Grafton	40	Kempsey	44
	Port Macquarie	38	Taree	42		
Murray-Murrumbidgee	Albury	36	Griffith	40		
	Wagga Wagga	38				
New England	Tamworth	34	Inverell	38	Narrabri	42
North West	Armidale	36	Moree	40	Gunnedah	44
Northern Rivers	Tweed Heads	34	Ballina	38	Murwillumbah	42
	Lismore	36	Casino	40	Byron Bay	44
Southern	Goulburn	40	Queanbeyan	42	Moss Vale-Bowral	44
Western	Broken Hill	28				

Theme / criteria	Score
Strategic alignment	
Project is within 5km cycling catchment of regional centre – See catchment maps	
Yes	8
Between 5 and 10km from centre	1
> 10km from centre	0
Project is identified in Council plans	
Project is identified in Council plans	5
Elements of, but not all of project is identified in Council plans	3
Project is not identified in Council plans	0
Projects that complete the cycle network and address major missing links (can receive multiple scores)	
Connects multiple routes along strategic network links	10
Completes major cycle link connecting to town centre	8
Provides new access beyond an existing major barrier or completes a major missing link	6
Upgrades/widens an existing section of the network	2
None of the above	1
Projects that increase accessibility to bicycle infrastructure (can receive multiple scores)	
Provision of “bike hub” (i.e. centrally located building with end-of-trip facilities such as showers, lockers, bike storage facilities, etc.)	4
Increases accessibility to bikes (e.g. bike hire schemes)	2
Increases bike parking opportunities (e.g. bike cage)	2

WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS
FUNDING GUIDELINES

Theme / criteria		Score
Links to major trip attractors		
Directly connects to major public transport interchange	6	
Completes a missing link along route that connects to major public transport interchange (within 400m of interchange)	4	
Within 400m of other trip attractors, e.g. university, TAFE, school, hospital, commercial/retail area, aged care facility, passive or active recreational facility. 2 Points for each, e.g. 2 schools + 1 hospital = 6 points	2 for each	
Otherwise	0	
Council support		
Project where Council has complementary / supportive program/s identified		
Council has an established complementary non-infrastructure project/s which has been demonstrated to increase bicycle mode share*	5	
Council has an established complementary non-infrastructure project/s BUT no evidence of success	2	
Council has identified and confirmed funding for other project/s with demonstrated linkages with this Project	4	
Council has identified other project/s with demonstrated linkages with this Project (although funding is not yet confirmed).	2	
None of the above	FAIL	
*Council should provide examples from elsewhere in Australia or overseas		
Value for money		
Compare cost of project against other submissions	Score out of 10	
Ability to deliver		
Projects considered feasible		
Very straight forward, feasible project with no major obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, no heritage issues and strong community support	5	
Moderately straight forward and feasible project with minor obstacles, e.g. no land acquisition, few or no heritage issues or good community support	4	
Complex project with some difficult obstacles, e.g. requires some land acquisition, some heritage issues or has little community support	2	
Very complex project with significant obstacles, e.g. requires significant land acquisition, heritage issues and has little community support	1	
TOTAL SCORE		

**WALKING AND CYCLING PROGRAMS
FUNDING GUIDELINES**