

# Memo

To:	Short List Assessors
From:	s 9(2)(a)
CC:	s 9(2)(a)
Date:	13 <sup>th</sup> July 2021
Re:	<b>Option Assessment Information</b>

### 3.0 Assessment

The following sets out the criteria upon which to base your assessment and also the scoring scale to used.

ation Act 1982

#### 3.1 Assessment Criteria

The assessment criteria to be used for each criteria is outlined in **Appendix A**. This table also outlines who is undertaking the assessment. When there are multiple assessors for a single criteria, it is up to the lead assessor (identified in bold) to determine an overall score and ensure the documentation reflects input from all assessors.

#### 3.2 MCA Scoring system

Scoring allows for differentiation between options. The scoring system used needs to have sufficient range to sufficiently discern the benefits, disbenefits and/or effects of the various options. A 7-point scoring system, as detailed in the table below, will be used for this project. It will be used to rate quantitative and qualitative measures within the MCA template. The rating scale comprises a 7-point scale from -3 to +3. A summary of option performance can be obtained by adding these scores together. The total score or relative ranking of each option will be reported as part of the MCA table. The scoring should be done based on the scheme assessed. If the effects can be mitigated this mitigation should be identified and if the project team agree this is appropriate, a score with this mitigation in place should be provided (and included in costs).

Magnitude	Definition	Score
Major positive (+ve)	Major positive impacts resulting in substantial and long-	3
	term improvements or enhancements of the existing	
	environment.	
Moderate positive	Moderate positive impact, possibly of short-, medium- or	2
(+ve)	long-term duration. Positive outcome may be in terms of	
	new opportunities and outcomes of enhancement or	
	improvement.	

Minor positive (+ve)	Minimal positive impact, possibly only lasting over the short term. May be confined to a limited area.	1	
Neutral	Neutral – no discernible or predicted positive or negative impact.	0	
Minor negative (-ve)	Minimal negative impact, possibly only lasting over the short term, and definitely able to be managed or mitigated. May be confined to a small area.	-1	z
Moderate negative (- ve)	Moderate negative impact. Impacts may be short, medium or long term and are highly likely to respond to management actions.	20	
Major negative (-ve)	Impacts with serious, long-term and possibly irreversible effect leading to serious damage, degradation or deterioration of the physical, economic, cultural or social environment. Required major rescope of concept, design, location and justification, or	-3	
Released inde	official monnat		
Relev			

## Appendix A – Assessment Criteria

Appendix A – Assessment	t Criteria	, 98°	2
Criteria	Measure	Short List Assessor (Lead scorer identified in Bold)	Better Business Case Critical Success Factor Alignment
Investment Objective 1 A rapid transit service that: - Is attractive, reliable, frequent, safe and equitable - Is integrated with the current and future active and public transport network Improves access to employment, education and other opportunities.	<ul> <li>Spare capacity in 2051</li> <li>Number of employment opportunities accessible within 45mins public transport travel time of communities within the corridor (especially Mangere, Onehunga and Mt Roskill)</li> <li>Number of households within 45mins public transport travel time of the city centre and Airport</li> <li>Number of education opportunities (including schools, kura kaupapa and tertiary education) within 45mins public transport travel time of communities within the corridor (especially Mangere, Onehunga and Mt Roskill) and regionally</li> <li>Public transport travel times between key centres along the route (including the city centre, Airport, Mt Roskill, Onehunga and Mangere)</li> <li>Number of social / recreational / cultural / health opportunities within 45mins public transport travel time of communities within the corridor (especially Mangere, Onehunga and Mangere)</li> <li>Number of social / recreational / cultural / health opportunities within 45mins public transport travel time of communities within the corridor (especially Mangere, Onehunga and Mt Roskill)</li> <li>Daily boardings of the service</li> <li>Percentage of corridor separated from general traffic</li> <li>Level of integration with wider PT network (number of regional RTN trips)</li> <li>Percentage of 45mins of employment and education trips that is for areas with a high deprivation index</li> </ul>	s 9(2)(a)	Strategic fit and business needs
Investment Objective 2 A transport intervention that embeds sustainable practice and that reduces Auckland's carbon footprint	<ul> <li>Enabled Carbon footprint criteria</li> <li>Operational (Enabled) Carbon emissions</li> <li>Transport System (Enabled) Carbon emissions ***         <ul> <li>Ability to effect mode shift and travel patterns (i.e attract patronage, reduced peaks) *                 <ul> <li>Interconnectivity to other transit and/or active modes*</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Strategic fit and business needs</li> </ul>

Relea

		<ul> <li>Station proximity and accessibility to users (residential, town centres, employment, medical, education) *</li> <li>Supports high density low carbon urban uplift, avoiding need for travel</li> </ul>	)
Investment Objective 3 Unlocking significant urban development potential, supporting a quality compact urban form and enabling integrated and healthy communities.		<ul> <li>Amount of Residential Gross Floor Area (GFA) within walking distance of stations</li> <li>Amount of commercial GFA within walking distance of stations</li> <li>Qualitative assessment of the safety and attractiveness of station and corridor environments (community connections)</li> <li>Ability for the urban uplift to be delivered (Crown and Private)</li> </ul>	Strategic fit and busines     needs
	-	Opportunities and Impacts	
Deliverability	Technical	<ul> <li>Level of disruption (transport)</li> <li>What are risks of delivery of the project?</li> <li>What impact would each option have on utilities; consider location/relocation and tie in with existing services.</li> <li>Markets ability to deliver (capability and capacity perspective)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Potential Achievability</li> <li>Supplier capacity and capability</li> </ul>
	Safety	<ul> <li>Will safe transport outcomes be delivered for users of the entire transport system (excluding CPTEED)?</li> <li>How aligned is option to safe systems outcomes?</li> <li>What is the predicted level of safety performance?</li> <li>What is the level of compliance to the safe systems requirements?</li> </ul>	Potential Achievability
	Consentability	<ul> <li>What is the level of consenting complexity and risk?</li> <li>Is there a fatal flaw?</li> </ul>	Potential Achievability
Environmental Effects	Landscape	ONFs ONLs     Level of impact on areas identified	Potential Achievability
	Visual	Impacts on view shafts     Level of impact on areas identified	Potential Achievability
	Water Quality and wetlands	Impacts on wetlands mpacts on ground water Level of impact across the area	Potential Achievability
	Relea		

	Ecology	<ul> <li>Impacts on SEAs</li> <li>Level of impact across the project area-</li> </ul>	s 9(2)(a)	Potential Achievability
	Natural Hazards	Liquefaction and earthquake risk	<b>N</b>	Potential Achievability
	Climate Change	<ul> <li>1.Sustainable Practice criteria (Measures – align with Toitu te Taiao, Broader Outcomes and ISCA IS rating system) <ul> <li>Improving Public health</li> <li>Reduce air, noise and light pollution</li> <li>Promoting connected transit journeys and active modes</li> </ul> </li> <li>Reducing environmental harm and promoting regenerative land use practices <ul> <li>Reducing adverse effects on biodiversity and water quality*</li> <li>Improving resource efficiency and waste management, and promoting material circularity/re-use</li> </ul> </li> <li>2.Implementation Carbon footprint criteria (measure – carbon calculator to measure regional net embodied and enabled carbon reduction)</li> <li>Construction (Embodied) Carbon emissions</li> <li>3. Climate Change Resilience <ul> <li>Construction and operational exposure to direct risks - natural hazards (SLR)*</li> <li>Construction and operational exposure to indirect risks - storm events causing overland flow, tunnel flooding</li> <li>Ability to incorporate adaptation measures to treat all high and extreme risks (eg buffer zones adjacent corridor)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Potential Achievability
ocial and community	Urban design	<ul> <li>Ability to rapidly reinstate operations post significant disruption/ hazard event*</li> <li>The degree to which the option encourages greater productivity and economic</li> </ul>	-	Strategic fit and busine
	Orban design	<ul> <li>growth e.g good proximity between businesses, workers and consumers</li> <li>The degree to which the option leverages off existing amenity including existing centres and the inherent character of the area</li> </ul>		needs
	Social cohesion (during construction)	<ul> <li>Impacts on communities and businesses during construction</li> <li>Impact on, local connectivity / accessibility for and to the existing and future communities</li> <li>Severance of the existing community (including consented)</li> <li>Scale of effect on existing community facilities community and open space</li> </ul>	-	<ul> <li>Strategic fit and busines needs</li> </ul>

		382
Social cohesion (operation)	<ul> <li>Impacts on communities and businesses during operation</li> <li>Impact on, local connectivity / accessibility for and to the existing and future communities</li> <li>Severance of the existing community (including consented)</li> <li>Scale of effect on existing community facilities community and open space</li> </ul>	• Strategic fit and business needs
Human Health and Wellbeing (construc n)	Will the option affect any sensitive receivers within 100m(adjacent residential, childcare centres, hospitals, rest homes, places of worship, marge and schools)?	Strategic fit and business     needs
Human Health and Wellbeing (operatio	<ul> <li>Will the option affect any sensitive receivers nearby or consented (adjacent residential, childcare centres, hospitals, rest homes, places of worship, marae and schools)? particularly relating to:         <ul> <li>Air Quality</li> <li>Noise and vibration</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Strategic fit and business     needs
Impacts on Te Ao Maori	<ul> <li>Is there any Maori land impacts?</li> <li>Are there areas of significance to Maori identified to be impacted?</li> <li>What are wider Kaitiakitanga considerations?</li> <li>Opportunities to improve Cultural outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strategic fit and business needs</li> <li>Potential Achievability</li> </ul>
Property Impacts	<ul> <li>Scale of public / private land (m<sup>2</sup> / number of properties / special status of impacted property (Maori, reserve etc)) required to deliver the option.</li> <li>Number of business impacted.</li> <li>Potential for business relocation</li> <li>Likelihood, extent and complexity of additional property acquisition.</li> <li>Opportunity for around station development</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strategic fit and business needs</li> <li>Potential Achievability</li> </ul>
	Value for Money	
Economic Benefits	Economic benefits	Value for money
Cost	• What is the CAPEX cost of the project • What is the OPEX cost of the project	<ul><li>Value for money</li><li>Potential affordability</li></ul>
Value for money	What is the BCR of the project?	Value for money
e.		

Released under the Official Information Act 1982