

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

SECTION	Bicycle Lanes	Signage	Local Bike Plan Development	New Shared Paths	Path Upgrades	Generic Minor Works	End of Trip Facilities
Applicant Details	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Local Bike Plan Status	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Grant Funding History	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Project Location	5	20	10	5	5	5	5
Current Road or Path Environment	20		-	20	20	20	20
Dimensions / Scope	20		22	20	20	20	30
Project Justification	20	15	15	20	20	20	17
Connectivity	10	12	-	10	10	10	10
Continuity	7		-	7	7	7	-
Cost Breakdown	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Funding Proportion	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Compliance with Austroads, Part 14	5	-	-	5	5	5	5
TOTAL	120	80	80	120	120	120	120

1) These numbers represent the maximum score a submission can receive in each section

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

BICYCLE LANES

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).
No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM

Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						Yes Council Endorsed		Being Endorsed	Yes Not Endorsed		No	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:								2007-08 Or In Preparation	2004-05 to 2006-07	2003-04 Or Prior	-	3
Is Bike plan used for Works Program:									Yes (Significantly)	Yes (to some degree)	No	2
Section Score												10
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score												5
TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE												20

APPLICATION FORM

1. Project Location	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Valid Answer	Varies				Invalid / Blank	5
2. Current Road Environment	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Road Speed, Volume & Type of Motor Vehicles:	High	Varies								Low		10
Road Width:						Narrow	Varies				Wide	5
Car Parking Demand:						High	Varies				Low	5
Section Score												20
3. Project Dimensions and Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Adequacy of lane width:						More than Adequate		Just Adequate			Not Adequate	5
Road Widening to accommodate lanes:						Yes		Resurfacing Only			Line Marking Only	5
Path surface:						Red Asphalt		Black Asphalt		Concrete	Other	5
PBN Route Markers:						Yes					No	5
Section Score												20
4. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
PBN Local Bicycle Route:						Yes					No	5
Works Item Number / Bike Plan Reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	1
Item Priority:										Essential	Enhancement	1
Local Bike Plan:									Yes		No	2
Bike Plan Reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	2
Benefit to cyclists:								Large Benefit	Varies		Small Benefit	3
Community support for this project:								Significant Support	Varies		No Support	3
Types of cyclists:								Wide Variety	Varies		None	3
Section Score												20

5. Connectivity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Connection to a school(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a commercial area(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a community facility(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a train / bus station?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to local bicycle route:										Yes	No	1
Other connections from this project:										Beneficial	None	1
Section Score												10
6. Continuity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Project Continuity							Missing Link		Extension		Stand Alone	4
Connection to bicycle lane:										Yes	No	1
Connection to shared path:										Yes	No	1
Connection to bicycle parking:										Yes	No	1
Section Score												7
7. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
8. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
9. Compliance with Austroads	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Austroads Compliant		No (Almost Compliant)	Not Compliant - Varying Score Depending on Justification		Non Acceptable	5
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE												100

Total Project Score												120
----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	------------

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

SIGNAGE MARKINGS

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).

No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM												
Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						Yes Council Endorsed		Being Endorsed	Yes Not Endorsed		No	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:								2007-08 Or In Preparation	2004-05 to 2006-07	2003-04 Or Prior	-	3
Is Bike plan used for Works Program:									Yes (Significantly)	Yes (to some degree)	No	2
Section Score												10
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score												5
TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE												20

APPLICATION FORM												
1. Project Location & Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Type of signage:						Yes					No	5
On road / path:						Yes					No	5
Extent of works:							Yes				No	4
New / replacing existing:							Yes				No	4
Correct colour:									Yes		No	2
Section Score												20
2. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Benefit to cyclists:						Large Benefit	Varies				Small Benefit	5
Community support for this project:						Significant Support	Varies				No Support	5
Types of cyclists:						Wide Variety	Varies				None	5
Section Score												15
3. Connectivity and Continuity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Connection to a school(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a commercial area(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a community facility(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a train / bus station?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to local bicycle route:										Yes	No	1
Other connections from this project:										Beneficial	None	1
Project Continuity									Missing Link	Extension	Stand Alone	2
Section Score												12
4. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
5. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE												60

Total Project Score 80

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

LOCAL BIKE PLANS

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).

No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM												
Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						No			Yes Endorsed		Yes Not Endorsed	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:						2002-03 Or Prior	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08 Or Since	5
Section Score											10	
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score											5	
TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE											20	

APPLICATION FORM												
1. Project Location	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Extent of Works:	Entire Municipality					Parital Area	Varies				Invalid / Blank	10
2. Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Review existing network:							Yes				No	4
Community consultation:							Yes				No	4
Works plan:							Yes				No	4
Develop report:							Yes				No	4
Council policy on cycling:									Yes		No	2
Path surface:									Yes		No	2
PBN Route Markers:									Yes		No	2
Section Score											22	
3. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Benefit to cyclists:						Large Benefit	Varies				Small Benefit	5
Community support for this project:						Significant Support	Varies				No Support	5
Types of cyclists:						Wide Variety	Varies				None	5
Section Score											15	
4. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
5. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE											60	

Total Project Score 80

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

NEW SHARED PATHS

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).

No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM												
Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						Yes Council Endorsed		Being Endorsed	Yes Not Endorsed		No	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:								2007-08 Or In Preparation	2004-05 to 2006-07	2003-04 Or Prior	-	3
Is Bike plan used for Works Program:									Yes (Significantly)	Yes (to some degree)	No	2
Section Score											10	
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score											5	

TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE 20

APPLICATION FORM													
1. Project Location	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score	
Location Details:						Valid Answer	Varies				Invalid / Blank	5	
2. Current Road Environment	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score	
Road Speed, Volume & Type of Motor Vehicles:	High	Varies									Low	10	
Road Width:						Narrow	Varies			Wide	5		
Car Parking Demand:						High	Varies			Low	5		
Section Score											20		
3. Project Dimensions and Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score	
Adequacy of path width:						More than Adequate		Just Adequate			Not Adequate	5	
Adequacy distance from kerb (0.5m):										Adequate	Not Adequate	1	
Adequacy distance from obstacles (0.5m):										Adequate	Not Adequate	1	
Suitable gradient (3%)										Adequate	Not Adequate	1	
Type of Shared Path:						Principal Shared Path		Recreational Shared Path			Other	5	
Path surface:						Red Asphalt		Black Asphalt		Concrete	Other	5	
Path separation:									Completely Separated	Separated But Adjacent	Shared	2	
Section Score											20		
4. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score	
PBN Local Bicycle Route:						Yes					No	5	
Works Item Number / Bike Plan Reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	1	
Item Priority:										Essential	Enhancement	1	
Local Bike Plan:									Yes			No	2
Bike Plan Reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	2	
Benefit to cyclists:								Large Benefit	Varies		Small Benefit	3	
Community support for this project:								Significant Support	Varies		No Support	3	
Types of cyclists:								Wide Variety	Varies		None	3	
Section Score											20		

5. Connectivity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Connection to a school(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a commercial area(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a community facility(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a train / bus station?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to local bicycle route:										Yes	No	1
Other connections from this project:										Beneficial	None	1
Section Score												10
6. Continuity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Project Continuity							Missing Link		Extension		Stand Alone	4
Connection to bicycle lane:										Yes	No	1
Connection to shared path:										Yes	No	1
Connection to bicycle parking:										Yes	No	1
Section Score												7
7. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
8. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
9. Compliance with Austroads	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Austroads Compliant		No (Almost Compliant)	Not Compliant - Varying Score Depending on Justification		Non Acceptable	5
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE												100

Total Project Score	120
----------------------------	------------

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

PATHS UPGRADES

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).

No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM												
Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						Yes Council Endorsed		Being Endorsed	Yes Not Endorsed		No	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:								2007-08 Or In Preparation	2004-05 to 2006-07	2003-04 Or Prior	-	3
Is Bike plan used for Works Program:									Yes (Significantly)	Yes (to some degree)	No	2
Section Score												10
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score												5
TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE												20

APPLICATION FORM												
1. Project Location	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Valid Answer	Varies				Invalid / Blank	5
2. Current Path / Road Environment	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Path Width:						Poor	Varies				Satisfactory	5
Path Condition						Poor	Varies				Satisfactory	5
Road Speed, Volume & Type of Motor Vehicles:						High	Varies				Low	5
Road Width & Car Parking Demand:						High	Varies				Low	5
Section Score												20
3. Project Dimensions and Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Adequacy of path width:						More than Adequate		Just Adequate			Not Adequate	5
Adequacy distance from kerb (0.5m):										Adequate	Not Adequate	1
Adequacy distance from obstacles (0.5m):										Adequate	Not Adequate	1
Suitable gradient (3%)										Adequate	Not Adequate	1
Type of Shared Path:						Principal Shared Path		Recreational Shared Path			Other	5
Path surface:						Red Asphalt		Black Asphalt		Concrete	Other	5
Path separation:									Completely Separated	Separated But Adjacent	Shared	2
Section Score												20
4. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
PBN Local Bicycle Route:						Yes					No	5
Local Bike Plan:										Yes	No	1
Shared Path Safety Hotspot:						Priority 1		Yes		Yes	Small Benefit	5
Benefit to cyclists:								Large Benefit	Varies		Small Benefit	3
Community support for this project:								Significant Support	Varies		No Support	3
Types of cyclists:								Wide Variety	Varies		None	3
Section Score												20

5. Connectivity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Connection to a school(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a commercial area(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a community facility(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a train / bus station?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to local bicycle route:										Yes	No	1
Other connections from this project:										Beneficial	None	1
Section Score												10
6. Continuity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Project Continuity							Missing Link		Extension		Stand Alone	4
Connection to bicycle lane:										Yes	No	1
Connection to shared path:										Yes	No	1
Connection to bicycle parking:										Yes	No	1
Section Score												7
7. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
8. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
9. Compliance with Austroads	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Austroads Compliant		No (Almost Compliant)	Not Compliant - Varying Score Depending on Justification		Non Acceptable	5
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE												100

Total Project Score	120
----------------------------	------------

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

GENERIC MINOR WORKS

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).

No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM												
Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						Yes Council Endorsed		Being Endorsed	Yes Not Endorsed		No	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:								2007-08 Or In Preparation	2004-05 to 2006-07	2003-04 Or Prior	-	3
Is Bike plan used for Works Program:									Yes (Significantly)	Yes (to some degree)	No	2
Section Score											10	
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score											5	
TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE											20	

APPLICATION FORM												
1. Project Location	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location details:						Valid Answer	Varies				Invalid / Blank	5
2. Current Path / Road Environment	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Safety of current situation:	Poor	Varies								Satisfactory		10
Road speed, volume & type of motor vehicles:						High	Varies				Low	5
Other reasons for modifications:						Necessary	Varies				Unnessary	5
Section Score											20	
3. Project Dimensions and Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Rectifying gully grates	Yes (more than 5)					Yes (less than 5)					No	10
Replace kerb ramps:								Yes			No	3
Replace grab rails / bollards									Yes		No	2
Small path links:									Yes		No	2
Median Islands:									Yes		No	2
Other:										Beneficial	No	1
Section Score											20	
4. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
PBN Local Bicycle Route:						Yes					No	5
Works Item Number / Bike Plan Reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	1
Item Priority:										Essential	Enhancement	1
Local Bike Plan:									Yes		No	2
Bike Plan Reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	2
Benefit to cyclists:								Large Benefit	Varies		Small Benefit	3
Community support for this project:								Significant Support	Varies		No Support	3
Types of cyclists:								Wide Variety	Varies		None	3
Section Score											20	

5. Connectivity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Connection to a school(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a commercial area(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a community facility(s)?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to a train / bus station?									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Connection to local bicycle route:										Yes	No	1
Other connections from this project:										Beneficial	None	1
Section Score												10
6. Continuity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Project Continuity							Missing Link		Extension		Stand Alone	4
Connection to bicycle lane:										Yes	No	1
Connection to shared path:										Yes	No	1
Connection to bicycle parking:										Yes	No	1
Section Score												7
7. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
8. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
9. Compliance with Austroads	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Austroads Compliant		No (Almost Compliant)	Not Compliant - Varying Score Depending on Justification		Non Acceptable	5
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE												100

Total Project Score 120

SCORING SYSTEM & WEIGHTED CRITERIA

PBN Local Government Grants 2010-11

END OF TRIP FACILITIES

* This spreadsheet will be used to assess each project submission.

* Each scorable question has specific responses that correlate to a specific score (shown in the table).

* Some questions have a variable score - open to the interpretation of the assessment team.

* Some scorable questions are worth more than others (have a higher weighting).
No question can score more than 10 points

Yes	Response that Correlates to the Maximum Score Available
Concrete	Response that Correlates to an Intermediate Score
Varies	Response that Correlates to a Varied Score (at the discretion of the assessment team)
No	Response that Correlates to a Score of Zero

COUNCIL INFORMATION FORM

Applicant Details	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Address Details:								Valid Answer	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
Contact Person	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details:									Valid Answer	Varies	Invalid / Blank	2
Local Bike Plan Status	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Current Local Bike Plan:						Yes Council Endorsed		Being Endorsed	Yes Not Endorsed		No	5
Year the Local Bike Plan was prepared:								2007-08 Or In Preparation	2004-05 to 2006-07	2003-04 Or Prior	-	3
Is Bike plan used for Works Program:									Yes (Significantly)	Yes (to some degree)	No	2
Section Score												10
Recent Funding	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Year of most recent PBN LG Grant:								2006-07 (or prior)	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	3
Outstanding works completed and acquitted:										Yes	No	1
Expenditure on cycling in 2008-09:										Valid Answer	Invalid / Blank	1
Section Score												5
TOTAL COUNCIL INFORMATION SCORE												20

APPLICATION FORM

1. Project Location	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location details:						Valid Answer	Varies				Invalid / Blank	5
2. Current Site Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Existing bike parking facilities:	Poor	Varies								Satisfactory		10
Other existing facilities:	Poor	Varies								Satisfactory		10
Section Score												20
3. Scope	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Type of proposed facility						Urails		Cora Racks		Bike Lockers	No	5
Number of additional spaces						20 (or more)		Oct-20		6-10	5 or less	5
Secure compound:							Yes				No	4
Shelter:							Yes				No	4
Showers:							Yes				No	4
Water Fountain:							Yes				No	4
Seating:							Yes				No	4
Section Score												30
4. Project Justification	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Local bike plan:						Yes					No	5
Bike plan reference:										Correctly Specified	Not Specified	1
Further details:									Beneficial		None	2
Benefit to cyclists:								Large Benefit	Varies		Small Benefit	3
Community support for this project:								Significant Support	Varies		No Support	3
Types of cyclists:								Wide Variety	Varies		None	3
Section Score												17

5. Connectivity	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Type of location:						Community Facility		Commercial Facility	Bus / Train Station		No	5
Name of location specified:									Yes Im'dt Connection	Yes Within 500m	No	2
Local bicycle route connections:									Yes		No	2
Other connections from this project:										Beneficial	None	1
Section Score												10
7. Cost Breakdown	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Details of Cost Estimate								Well Detailed	Varies		Invalid / Blank	3
8. Funding Proportion	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Grant as Percentage of total project cost:	30% (or less)					30-40%			40-45%	45-50%	More than 50%	10
9. Compliance with Austroads	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	Max Score
Location Details:						Austroads Compliant		No (Almost Compliant)	Not Compliant - Varying Score Depending on Justification		Non Acceptable	5
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE												100

Total Project Score	120
----------------------------	------------