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# Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>- The Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan (PAMP) program was developed and is administered by the Roads and Traffic Authority of NSW (RTA). The aim of this program is to ensure the most important pedestrian facilities are built to an appropriate standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation team</strong></td>
<td>- Tracey Parnell and Rod Pope, Charles Sturt University (CSU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim of evaluation</strong></td>
<td>- To evaluate the processes, impacts and outcomes of the development of PAMPs by local councils of the South West Region of NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td>- Approval for this evaluation was obtained from the Charles Sturt University, School of Community Health Ethics in Human Research Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>- Included council staff of local councils, Road Safety Officers (RSOs), community representatives and senior RTA staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>- This evaluation involved predominantly qualitative methodology and included a call for submissions from all councils in the target region and semi-structured interviews with participants from purposefully sampled councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response rates</strong></td>
<td>- Approximately 60% of councils in the target region responded to the initial call for submissions; 15 councils were purposefully sampled for the semi-structured interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key findings</strong></td>
<td>- Councils trialled a range of strategies to involve communities in the PAMP planning process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Varying responses by communities regarding involvement in PAMP development were reported;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Varying levels of knowledge about PAMPs amongst community members was noted;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There appeared to be a lack of formal community feedback regarding PAMPs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Generally, positive informal community feedback to work completed was reported;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resistance of some communities to initial plans was noted during discussions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There was a variation in the amount of funding received by councils including funding from RTA;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some councils reported difficulties matching RTA funding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Few other funding opportunities had been explored by councils to support PAMP funding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The timing of notification of funding from RTA impacted on some councils’ development and actioning of plans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A few participants were concerned that PAMP funding will cease;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A number of councils reported difficulties related to the availability of staff to develop and action the PAMP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There were differences in the experiences of councils who used external consultants to develop the PAMP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variations in the role of the RSO in PAMP development were noted;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There was recognition of the importance of council support in PAMP development and follow up;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There were variations in participants’ knowledge of PAMP guidelines; issues related to usability of guidelines were outlined by some participants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plans were generally responsive to RTA objectives although variations between plans were noted;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The importance of effective communication with RTA and the perceived impact on PAMP development and actioning was discussed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There were issues related to the integration of various plans within councils (including the PAMP) and the effect this can have on a coordinated approach to service delivery to the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The importance of reviewing plans was outlined by a number of respondents including RTA Staff;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggestions to improve the format and process of submissions to make the process less labour intensive were made by some participants;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No funding of footpaths or the maintenance of footpaths within the RTA PAMP program was raised as an issue by some councils;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For some councils, the current footpath infrastructure impacted on the perceived relevance of PAMPs funding;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There were indications from some participants that PAMP guidelines were not specifically relevant to rural/remote areas and were perhaps better suited to more metropolitan areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benefits of PAMP program

- Anticipated benefits include improved pedestrian facilities, better access for people with impaired mobility, reduced injuries to pedestrians, consistent and appropriate pedestrian facilities.
- A range of other benefits were noted during the evaluation including: increased numbers of people walking within communities, better access to community facilities, slowing of traffic, passive community surveillance, improved health of community members, potential environmental impact, ability to connect with the community, and increased equity of access.

### Concluding comments

- The PAMP program has been of great benefit to a number of local government areas included in this study; the benefits of the outcomes of PAMPs have been shown to be broad and far reaching.
- There is evidence to suggest that the PAMP program is less accessible and useful to some of the communities in the target area for a range of reasons.
- Consideration regarding how to improve the equity of this program is required in order to ensure the intended benefits can be achieved by all communities.

### Recommendations

- More succinct guidelines and proformas for plan development and submissions;
- Improve equity of access to the PAMP program;
- Provision of more education to councils by the RTA regarding the PAMP program;
- Consider ways to increase community involvement;
- Explore the possibility of combining the PAMPs program with the Bike plan program;
- Lighting is an important part of planning footpath infrastructure and thus consideration should be given to including this as part of the PAMP program;
- Improve promotion of the PAMP program and the completed works within communities;
- Councils need to consider other funding options to support RTA funding;
- Consider electronic submissions to RTA;
- RTA to spend more time in the “field” working with councils to develop and action PAMPs;
- RTA, councils and RSOs to work together to provide opportunities to share information and experiences relating to PAMP program;
- Councils to obtain further empirical data to support claims regarding the benefits of the PAMP program.
1. Introduction

In its broadest context, the environment encompasses physical, social, cultural, and institutional factors, and has the potential to impact, both positively and negatively, on the engagement of individuals in a community (Townsend & Polatajko, 2007). The physical environment includes both natural and built factors. Well planned, thoughtful design of the built environment creates opportunities for people to engage in community life through the provision of safe and equitable access to, and participation in, a broad range of occupations. (Occupation is defined here as “…everything people do to occupy themselves including looking after themselves,…enjoying life,…and contributing to the social and economic fabric of their communities…,” Townsend & Polatajko, 2007, pg 369). The importance of planning and developing community environments that facilitate access, safety, health, environmental awareness, and a sense of belonging within the community is recognised by many researchers and practitioners (Imrie & Hall, 2001; Letts, Rigby & Stewart, 2003).

The Roads and Traffic Authority of NSW (RTA), Australia has responsibility for a range of issues, including the promotion of safety and access for pedestrians in community contexts. To this end, the RTA has developed guidelines for use by local councils in developing Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans (PAMPs).

PAMPs are “…partnerships between State and Local Governments to co-ordinate investments in safe, convenient and coherent pedestrian infrastructure on key pedestrian routes,” (RTA, 2002, pg 7). It is an expectation that local councils in NSW will provide pedestrian routes that encourage people to walk and that are safe, convenient and connected. The PAMP process involves identifying priority pedestrian routes and developing a coordinated plan to ensure these routes provide safe and convenient access to community facilities and services; it is also anticipated that the PAMP program will ensure that the needs of pedestrians with mobility issues are addressed. PAMP funding is directed at “on-road” works and councils are encouraged to integrate their PAMP with other relevant council plans.

The PAMPs program, which was initiated by the RTA in 1998, was developed to ensure better planning of facilities for pedestrians. The development of a PAMP within a council has the potential to provide a structured and co-ordinated framework for the planning and development of pedestrian policies and facilities for that community. It is anticipated that the developed plans will “…enhance safety, convenience and mobility…” (RTA, 2007) for pedestrians. The benefits of developing a PAMP are outlined in Appendix 16.1. The RTA Annual Report 2007 outlines that 77 councils in NSW now have a PAMP including five that were fully completed during 2006-2007. Twenty-eight of the thirty-two councils in the RTA South West Region have completed PAMPs.

In line with its commitment to contributing to the health, welfare and safety of Australian communities, Charles Sturt University (CSU) and its Centre for Inland Health and School of Community Health agreed to complete an evaluation of the PAMP program, as applied by local councils in the South-West region of NSW, for the RTA. This evaluation was conducted concurrently with an evaluation of the RTA’s Bike Plan program. Information was collected from respondents...
about both programs during the call for submissions and the evaluation interviews. A number of issues were raised during the course of these evaluations which impact on the linkages between these programs and, where relevant, these are noted.

2. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team was comprised of researchers from Charles Sturt University. The project was led by Tracey Parnell, Occupational Therapist within School of Community Health, with support from Rod Pope, Senior Research Fellow and Director of the Centre for Inland Health. The program was further supported by research assistants who assisted with interviews, data collection, and transcription.

3. Aims and objectives of evaluation

3.1. **Aim:**
To evaluate the processes, impacts, and outcomes of the development of PAMPs by local councils of the South West Region of NSW.

3.2. **Objectives:**
1. To document the experiences of councils and other stakeholders in the various phases of the PAMP development process, the issues and costs they faced in the processes, and how they addressed those issues or funded those costs, or why they did not;
2. To assess the extent to which the developed PAMPs meet the RTA PAMP objectives;
3. To determine the level of satisfaction of key stakeholders with the developed PAMPs, and points of difference;
4. To determine the actions that have been taken by any party in response to the PAMPs, actions that have not yet been taken, and reasons for which actions have and have not been taken;
5. To determine the level of satisfaction of key stakeholders with the actions resulting from the PAMPs, and points of difference;
6. To determine the extent to which the PAMPs remain current and are being used, reviewed and updated as required;
7. To determine the amount of funding for new works that has been secured by councils based on the PAMP, its source(s) and its application.
4. Ethics

The activities in this evaluation were deemed to be associated with minimal risk under current National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) guidelines. Ethics approval was obtained for the project from the Charles Sturt University, School of Community Health Ethics in Human Research Committee.

5. Participants

The participants approached for this evaluation included:

- Council staff of local councils in the designated region, particularly engineering or other staff who had been intimately involved in PAMP processes;
- Road Safety Officers (RSOs) in the target region;
- Consumer group representatives involved in the PAMP processes as identified by PAMPS, councils or RSOs;
- Senior RTA staff

6. Method

This project principally involved qualitative evaluation methods. Participant information sheets, consent forms, interview schedules, and key criteria for document analyses were designed by the evaluation team in consultation with the RTA Project Manager and in order to meet the evaluation objectives.

Information was initially generated from a call for submissions forwarded to all councils and Road Safety Officers (RSOs) in the identified region (that is, the South West Region of NSW). This call for submissions included details about the project and provided a number of guiding points for respondents to address; a copy of the guiding points is included in the appendices. All information (written and verbal) obtained from the calls for submissions was thematically analysed by the evaluation team and key themes identified.

Semi-structured interviews, using the key themes identified in the responses to the calls for submissions, were conducted with council staff, RSOs and/or consumer representatives from a purposeful sample of 15 of the 32 councils in the target region. The evaluation team endeavoured to sample a mix of councils in terms of geographical size, population and stage of development of PAMPS; a number of councils declined involvement in this evaluation, potentially impacting on the
range of views obtained. In four of the councils, interviews were conducted face-to-face and were accompanied by observation of the pedestrian infrastructure and facilities within the community. Due to time constraints, all other interviews were conducted by telephone. Detailed document analysis of a purposeful sample of six PAMPS developed by some of the participating councils was also conducted.

To further enhance the depth of data collected, telephone interviews were also conducted with two purposefully sampled senior RTA staff members, with responsibilities for and involvement in the PAMP program. The perspectives reflected in interview responses, submissions, observations within communities and PAMP documents were triangulated in the analysis phase, during thematic analysis, to identify, clarify, and validate key themes and issues.

7. Response rates

Following the call for submissions, seventeen responses, representing nineteen councils were received (Note: some RSOs cover more than one council and responded to the call for submissions for the different councils they work within, thus the discrepancy in figures). The South West region of NSW is comprised of thirty-two councils and thus the response rate was just under 60%. Approximately one third of the responses received were completed by RSOs and the remainder by council staff involved in the PAMPS. As previously noted, 15 of the 32 councils in South West NSW were involved in the second stage of data collection.

8. Key findings from the Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan data

8.1. Summary of key findings from PAMPS data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation and feedback</td>
<td>• A range of strategies were tried by councils to involve communities in the PAMP planning process; these efforts resulted in varying responses from communities regarding involvement in development of the PAMP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community representatives interviewed appeared to have limited knowledge of the PAMP program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There was a lack of formal community feedback regarding PAMPS however there was positive, informal community feedback to the work funded and completed under the PAMP program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Resistance of some communities to the initial PAMP was reported by some participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key themes</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Funding**                     | - There was a variation in the amount of funding received by councils from RTA with some councils outlining their difficulty in matching RTA funding;  
- Although other funding opportunities had been explored, there was no evidence of other funding being used to complement PAMPs funding;  
- Concerns were raised in relation to the timing of notification of funding from RTA and the impact this had on planning and completion of works;  
- There was some concern expressed that RTA PAMP funding will cease;  
- There is a need to ensure that new community development incorporates needs of the plan. |
| **Resources**                   | - A number of councils reported difficulties related to the availability of staff to develop and action the PAMP;  
- There were differences in the experiences of councils who used external consultants to develop the PAMP, with some reported positive experiences and others, less successful outcomes;  
- Variations in the role of the RSO in PAMP development were noted;  
- There was recognition of the importance of council support in PAMP development and follow up. |
| **RTA guidelines, support and feedback** | - There were variations in participants’ knowledge of PAMP guidelines; issues related to usability of guidelines were outlined by some participants;  
- Plans generally responsive to RTA objectives although variations between plans noted  
- The importance of effective communication with RTA and perceived impact on PAMP development and actioning was discussed. |
| **Processes and planning**      | - Participants raised concerns regarding the integration of various plans within councils (including the PAMP) and the effect this can have on a coordinated approach to service delivery;  
- The importance of reviewing plans was outlined by a number of respondents including RTA staff;  
- Suggestions to improve the format and process of submissions to make the process less labour intensive were made by some participants. |
| **Footpaths**                   | - No funding of footpaths or funding for the maintenance of footpaths within RTA PAMP program.                                                                 |

### Resources

A number of councils reported difficulties related to the availability of staff to develop and action the PAMP; there were differences in the experiences of councils who used external consultants to develop the PAMP, with some reported positive experiences and others, less successful outcomes; variations in the role of the RSO in PAMP development were noted; there was recognition of the importance of council support in PAMP development and follow up.
### Key Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rurality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There were indications from some participants that PAMP guidelines were not specifically relevant to rural/remote areas and were perhaps better suited to more metropolitan areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The constraint of smaller budgets on the ability to fully utilise PAMP program funding was raised by some councils as a barrier to the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.2. Community Consultation and Feedback

Most of the councils and RSOs who responded to the calls for submission or who were interviewed indicated that attempts at community consultation had been made prior to development of the PAMP. Various strategies were used by councils or their representatives to include local communities in the planning phase; these strategies included newspaper advertisements, public meetings and focus groups, observations within the community, surveys, direct approaches to relevant persons and groups, and making draft plans available for public comment. Some councils also used their Access Committees as a forum to discuss the PAMP and to achieve a level of community consultation (a number of councils have an Access Committee that is compromised of a group of residents and other interested parties with an interest in access and safety issues within the community).

The attempts at involving the community had varying degrees of success; some councils indicated that they felt they had adequate community involvement and others indicated that the response was limited and was at times frustrating: “...if you get a bill of three percent turn up at a meeting you’re doing very well.” At least two of the councils interviewed indicated that there had been very little involvement of the community in the planning and development phases of the PAMP: “...I probably really doubt that we would have had much community involvement in it....it would have been fairly minimal.”

Interviews with community representatives revealed varying levels of knowledge about the development phase of the PAMP with much of the feedback from this group relating to satisfaction with the work completed as a result of the PAMP. Very few community representatives were familiar with the PAMP terminology or the goals of the program; many were unaware that their local council had an active PAMP. One participant indicated that the process of plan development and community involvement “...needs to be more transparent and obvious.” Another community representative reflected that “…community involvement needs to be ongoing and meaningful...” and should be extended beyond just the initial planning stages.
With regard to community feedback about the PAMP and actions taken as a result of the PAMP, most councils and RSOs were able to outline feedback, both positive and negative, that had been received. Most of this feedback was in response to works completed or future works that community members felt needed to be given a higher priority. Very few, if any, of the councils had sought any formal feedback from the community in response to the PAMP or the works completed as a result of the plan: “...a lot of it is just verbal run around and talking to people.”

Although much of the community feedback about the work completed as a result of the PAMPs was positive, for example, “…they certainly appreciate the work we’ve done,” there was also some evidence of resistance and negativity within communities in response to the plans and resultant works. Some councils and RSOs indicated that until works were actually completed and being utilised, the communities seemed to be reluctant to embrace the proposed changes. Other community members reported to councils that the changes made (for example, pedestrian refuges) interfered with the flow of traffic by “…slowing it down and...making it difficult to turn.” One rural council outlined having received complaints from a farmer who was no longer able to bring his farming machinery through the centre of town on a bi-annual basis due to the construction of a pedestrian refuge.

8.3. Funding

There was much discussion, both favourable and unfavourable, on the issue of funding in relation to PAMPs. In general, councils were appreciative of the funding received through the RTA in order to improve the safety and accessibility of pedestrian facilities and considered that the 50/50 funding of the development and implementation of PAMPs was of great benefit to the council and community.

The amount of funding received from the RTA to complement council funding allocated to develop and action PAMPs, varied significantly between councils. The amount of detail provided by council staff and RSOs in response to this line of enquiry also varied greatly with some giving broad responses such as “...all funding requested has been approved...” and others providing detailed accounts of the money spent during the development and construction phases of the PAMP. In the responses to the call for submissions, one council outlined that they had not applied for any funding through the PAMP program. The detailed responses, indicated that the amount of funding secured by councils to date through the RTA for the PAMP program varied from around $20,000 – $130,000; it is expected that some councils will have received less than this, and others considerably more. There was no indication in either the responses to the call for submissions or in the interviews, that funding from other sources had been accessed to complement PAMP funding.

Some of the councils, particularly the smaller and more rural/remote councils, stated they had difficulty in matching the funding from the RTA: “It’s not like we get it for nothing.....some councils don’t have the money to budget for the other half, so things still won’t get done.” The amount of funding available within a council for the PAMP seemed to depend to some extent on the priority that was placed on this program by the council executive. Some councils had not pursued PAMP funding or had only done so in a restricted capacity due to limited funds available within the council to match RTA funding to develop and/or action a plan. A number of councils had attempted to
access PAMP funding in order to replace old, or build new, footpaths; funding for footpaths is not available through the PAMP program and thus these requests were declined. This issue is discussed in more detail in the following section on “Footpaths.”

As previously noted, a number of councils and RSOs discussed other funding opportunities they accessed in order to supplement both the council and RTA funding. These included funding available through other RTA programs, Department of Sport and Recreation, and the Department of Health. Some council staff and RSOs indicated that although they were aware of the availability of other funding opportunities, they did not have the time and resources to research and access these opportunities: “...with a group our size, we don’t have time to sit down and research them.” RTA staff demonstrated an awareness of the funding difficulties faced by councils and during the evaluation interviews actively promoted the use of other funding opportunities to supplement the RTA and council funding in order to achieve the goals of the council in relation to pedestrian access and mobility.

A number of council staff and RSOs criticised the timing of notification of funding from the RTA. They reported that often notification from the RTA was received after council budgets have been established, meaning that “...we don’t always know what funding we’re going to get until after our budgets have actually been put through council.” Obviously this has the potential to have a major impact on the work that a council is, or is not, able to undertake within a financial year but also reinforces the importance of having a detailed and accurately costed PAMP.

There was some concern expressed by a number of council staff and RSOs that the RTA funding for PAMPs might cease with some believing that the current evaluation project was oriented to that end. Councils who have successfully accessed PAMP funding and who have a current working PAMP overwhelmingly indicated that they would like the program and associated funding to continue and if possible, to increase: “...if you’ve got any more money today, let us know. We’ll spend it next week!”

8.4. Resources

A range of resource issues were identified as having impacted on the development and/or implementation of the PAMPs. These issues included staffing, the use of external consultants, the availability of an RSO, funding (as previously discussed), and levels of general council support.

The availability of staff to develop, review, and monitor the PAMP appeared to be problematic for a number of councils; this appeared to be more apparent in councils who did not have an RSO. Some of the councils highlighted the impact of staff turnover and ongoing difficulties with recruitment and retention of appropriate staff on the PAMP process. Some of the more remote councils indicated that they are continually under staffed and thus work has to be prioritised accordingly. Staffing difficulties were also raised in relation to the completion of PAMP action work (that is construction work) with some councils not having the manual labour workforce required to complete the work and in some instances, being unable to secure suitable contract staff to complete the work for them.

A number of councils employed external consultants to undertake the initial stages of the PAMP process (including community analysis and consultation, observation, and initial plan development);
in these instances the funding for the consultant was split between the council and the RTA. Most indicated the reasons for using an external consultant as being related to staffing and time: “...because basically we were just under resourced so we just had to bite the bullet and get outside consultants to do it.” There was mixed feedback regarding the success of using external consultants. Some of the councils and RSOs reported that this was an effective and efficient way of getting the PAMP process started and a detailed plan completed. Other councils and RSOs indicated that if they were to use an external consultant again, they would approach it differently and work more closely with the consultant: “…councils have got to...have a good look at the draft recommendations that the consultants come up with.....rather than just accept what the consultant puts in front of your nose.”

The views on using an external consultant from outside the council area also varied with some saying it was good to have a “...fresh set of eyes...” assessing the situation; however others indicated that the consultants lacked an awareness of the local issues and thus the recommendations were not always realistic and achievable. The issue of “ownership” of the completed plan was also raised in relation to the use of external consultants. Most councils who had secured an external consultant did not believe ownership of the plan was an issue although one council reflected that engaging an external consultant had probably impacted on the uptake and follow through of the PAMP by council staff.

As previously noted, a number of the councils who responded to the call for submissions or who were involved in interviews had an RSO. The roles played by the RSO in the development, monitoring, reviewing, and actioning of the PAMP seemed to vary between councils. In one council, the responsibility of the PAMP rested largely with the RSO, “...I’ve always looked after PAMP...and now I’ve moved [departments] they’ve moved the dollars with me...” and another, “…I did all the work...to formulate our plan.” This is in stark contrast to an RSO in another council who stated “…but I really haven’t had any involvement in it.” Councils that had an RSO either on a full time or part time basis commented on the benefits of this and most of the councils without an RSO indicated they would find such a position valuable but were unable to afford it and had difficulty negotiating a shared position with other nearby councils.

Some of the interviewees, including community representatives, felt that the support of the PAMP program by council had an impact on its success. A number of RSOs and council staff talked about needing to continually justify the plan and associated expenditure despite receiving equal funding from the RTA: “…the problem with our contribution is I need to convince our council to pour money into it.” The competing priorities for some councils also seemed to be an issue in terms of allocating time and resources to PAMPs: “…roads are a very high priority for councils like ours, we have a large rural area.” There were a number of councils that appeared to place a relatively high priority on the PAMP program and could see the benefits to the community as a result of undertaking the work: “…the council has tipped in its contribution...for PAMPs and also put money on there for construction of a new footpath and will bear full cost.”
8.5. **RTA guidelines, support and feedback**

Given that the PAMP program was initiated and is jointly funded by the RTA, there was discussion both in the responses to the call for submissions and the interviews regarding the RTA. This included comments about the RTA in relation to the PAMP guidelines, support, communication, and processes in general.

Although many of the council staff and RSOs recalled having read the RTA PAMP guidelines, very few were able to recall details of what these guidelines included. Most respondents had an idea of the spirit of the PAMP program and felt that the plans developed in their councils addressed this, “I can’t recall what they [the guidelines] are now but I know the aim of developing a PAMP.” None of the community representatives interviewed were aware of the PAMP guidelines but had a general sense that the aim of the program was to improve safety and access for pedestrians. Some council staff and RSOs felt that the guidelines were “…very city centred…” and “…not geared for rural and remote areas at all.” Other respondents indicated that the guidelines were difficult to follow and needed to be clearer in terms of what is and is not funded under the PAMP program. Two council staff stated that perhaps they had not read the guidelines thoroughly, potentially missing important details.

Detailed review of the PAMPs developed by six councils revealed that, in general, they addressed the guiding objectives outlined in the RTA PAMP guidelines. However, consistent with the opinions expressed by some councils and RSOs regarding the clarity of the RTA guidelines and the application of the objectives to rural/remote areas, it was evident that not all objectives were fully addressed by all of the PAMPs reviewed during the course of this evaluation. An example of this is in relation to the RTA objective regarding the identification and resolution of pedestrian crash clusters; for a number of the PAMPs reviewed, the issue of pedestrian crashes was not seen to be problematic within that community and thus this was not a focus in terms of identifying priorities for the PAMP schedule of works. In one of the other PAMPs reviewed, a lack of existing footpaths was identified as an issue and this was addressed in the associated schedule of works as a high priority. As is discussed in further detail later in this report, footpaths per se are not funded under the PAMP program.

In councils where a Bike Plan was available, there appeared to be little consideration of this plan within the PAMP.

Most council staff and RSOs were positive about their interactions with the RTA in relation to the PAMP program: “...the RTA weren’t too bad most of the time in terms of being on the ball.” A few respondents commented on the importance of having a good relationship with the RTA including open communication channels and an awareness of the requirements in terms of documentation and timelines. There was also a sense that changes in staff at the RTA impacted on the effectiveness of a council’s interaction with the RTA and their ability to action their PAMPs, “…communication breakdown because of changes in personnel.” A few participants reported dealing with RTA staff who did not seem to have a strong grasp of the PAMP program.

The time between submitting requests and receiving feedback regarding the allocation of funding from the RTA was felt by some respondents to be too lengthy and impacted on their ability to include works in councils’ annual budgets, “...the RTA does take a long time to get back...I still don’t have a clue whether I’ve got the money or not.” Some indicated that the amount of work required to
obtain the funding was sometimes disproportionate to the funding received, “...we do have to jump through hoops quite a bit.” One council staff member felt that the amount of paperwork (including submissions, accounts and reports) required for each submission was not worth the effort for the amount of funding applied for, “...by the time you cut through the red tape...it’s just as easy to include it in your budget and do it yourself.”

However, as previously mentioned in the “Funding” section, respondents were generally appreciative of the funding provided by the RTA to plan and implement PAMPs.

8.6. Processes and Planning

The processes and planning involved in the PAMP program was addressed to some degree by all respondents including community representatives and particularly by RTA staff. Feedback from community representatives in relation to planning and processes related largely to community consultation and how this was sought and whether or not it was ongoing. Some community representatives also commented on how the PAMP integrated with the plans of some of the community based groups (for example Community Access Groups) and the importance of ensuring council plans, PAMPs, and other community plans complemented each other. There was also some discussion about the need to coordinate community priorities with council plans and funding available. The RTA staff interviewed, frequently emphasised the importance of thorough and detailed PAMPs and the need for these to be reviewed regularly in terms of priorities and costings.

As discussed in the “Funding” section the timing of the allocation of funding from the RTA seemed to impact on the planning process for some of the councils. Some councils did not feel this was a significant issue as they were able to plan their budget based on the schedule of works and costings they had developed in relation to the PAMPS, “…we basically just run to the plans.” Despite being able to do this, there were still some issues with this strategy as the funding from the RTA was not confirmed until some time after the submission of applications, “…we’ve got all this money sitting in the reserve waiting to do the work but we won’t know...that we’ve actually got the...funding. Very often the plans have to be changed or councils dip into their own account and do some of the work.” One RSO felt that the council he worked for did not fully understand the PAMP guidelines and funding process; he further outlined that he felt this lack of understanding would impact negatively on how the council planned to go about accessing funding in the future and probably on their success with acquiring funding.

In councils where both council staff and RSOs were interviewed, it was evident that the integration of the various council department plans was not always completed in a seamless manner. Some respondents considered that the PAMP was not always taken into consideration when other works and developments within the council were being planned; however this was not the case in all councils. A number of respondents perceived the planning and development of the PAMP as an
opportunity to review the council’s footpath infrastructure, to record this in a formal way, and to begin to develop a vision for the future of it. It appeared to enable councils an opportunity to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their current footpath network and to improve the access to and safety of it for all users. At least two councils reflected that the PAMP program had encouraged them to think more carefully about development policies for new subdivisions, “...we’ve seriously got to look at our development policy...for new subdivisions and...consider incorporating developers to pay for the new footpaths.” Consideration of the make up of the Local Government Area population, both now and in the future, was a factor raised by some council staff and RSOs as being important in relation to developing and reviewing PAMPs.

Some of the council staff and RSOs felt that the success of their PAMP had been due to effective planning at the outset and regular reviews of the plan, “...the main thing is that we do regular reviews...” and “...we re-prioritise every few years.” Having adequate staff to undertake thorough reviews of the council’s PAMP was an issue for some of the councils, “...because of staffing issues...there isn’t anybody in place that could...take that on board at the present time.” Allocating funding to a review of the PAMP was also a concern for some councils, “...they [the council] can’t afford to spend fifteen thousand dollars on...getting a consultant in to do it again...” and for still others, the review of the PAMP was not seen as a priority in terms of resource allocation. Despite this, most council staff and RSOs were aware of the importance of reviewing plans.

A final issue in relation to planning and processes was to do with the format and process of submitting plans and applying for funding. A number of respondents felt that provision of a standard format in which to submit the plan and associated schedule of works would simplify the process of plan development for councils. Review of a number of the PAMP documents revealed that although many were similar in their format and structure, there were notable differences in the level of detail included both in the planning document and the schedule of works perhaps indicating that staff had spent time developing a suitable format for the plan and deciding the amount of detail to include. Some council staff indicated that the amount of paperwork required was too labour intensive and that the RTA should consider electronic submission of documentation to further expedite the process.

8.7. Footpaths

Discussion was generated about footpaths in response to questions about the PAMP program. As previously noted, the PAMP program has been initiated to improve the access and mobility of pedestrians but does not include funding for the construction of new, or the upgrade of existing footpaths; this is currently a council responsibility. Some of the councils reported being aware of this guideline from the outset of PAMP development and thus had ensured that their council continued to budget for footpaths, “...here at council we’ve got a budget for footpaths.”

Two councils in particular talked at length about the lack of funding for footpaths and the fact that their original PAMP had included estimates for footpaths. They both outlined their disappointment when advised that footpaths would not be funded and felt that this was not clear enough in the RTA guidelines or during discussions with RTA staff. A large number of the respondents indicated that
the non-funding of footpaths had impacted to some degree on the actioning of their PAMP and/or on their plans to access further funding under this program, “...so unless we can get the PAMP program funding footpaths, that program is of no use to us any longer.”

Some of the smaller councils outlined the current status of their footpath network and how this impacted on their ability to effectively use PAMP funding. One respondent indicated that although they could put in numerous pedestrian refuges and kerb ramps it seemed pointless without “…a footpath to get to and from those...” and ‘...putting in blisters and pram crossings and pedestrian refuges is pointless if there’s nothing to connect them together.” Respondents were generally aware of the need for the community to have an effective footpath network that linked relevant community resources and enabled people to “...experience the community...” in a useful and meaningful way. Community representatives echoed this view.

Council technical staff, in particular, highlighted a number of problems with ongoing maintenance and construction of footpaths. As noted, most councils budget for footpaths on an annual basis and are able to include construction of new footpaths in this planning. Some councils, again it seemed to be smaller and more rural councils, talked about the difficulty of allocating money to the upkeep and maintenance of existing footpaths without even considering new footpath developments. Many identified the resistance of property owners to contribute to the cost of new footpaths, particularly given the current financial climate, and the impact this has on developing a realistic PAMP. One council reported that they have decided to fully fund one section of an upcoming footpath extension to ensure that the program continues to develop, “...we won’t require any funding from the landowners."

8.8. Rurality

As noted in some of the previous sections, issues of rurality were raised in a number of the submissions and interviews. These issues related to a range of factors including the RTA guidelines for PAMPs, the integration of the program into council plans and infrastructure, funding, and factors specific to rural/remote areas that needed to be considered in PAMPs. Issues regarding the PAMPs guidelines in relation to rural/remote areas have been discussed in the preceding section and will not be repeated here. Funding issues have also previously been addressed but may be most cogently captured by a comment from one of the smaller, rural councils: “...smaller towns haven’t got the luxury of putting that much aside in a budget to do the work.”
A number of the more rural councils discussed the historical development of the towns within the council and how this had impacted on the existing footpath network. A few respondents felt that increased use of cars during the 1950-1980s had impacted on councils’ need to build and maintain footpaths and as a result, in some towns few new footpaths had been constructed for 20-30 years. Some also reported that limited housing development over the years had resulted in councils being willing to approve housing developments without attention to the need for pedestrian facilities, “…we’re very grateful for the development going in so…we’ll let people build and think about all the other things afterwards.” In some instances, this has resulted in communities having access to a limited footpath infrastructure and in relation to the PAMP program, it has meant that some councils find it difficult to see the immediate relevance of the program.

Some of the issues raised in regard to rurality related to the usage of roads and footpaths and awareness of safety issues. Many of the respondents who had one or a number of smaller towns within the council talked about the issue of traffic speed and the impact this has on pedestrian safety, “…there’s not a lot of traffic…so traffic tends to… speed. Speed’s a big issue out here.” One RSO reflected that the speed factor, coupled with driving and pedestrian habits, had the potential to result in pedestrian accidents and thus the works carried out through the PAMP program needed to be combined with community education programs. Another issue raised that was relevant to a number of the rural towns related to lighting of footpaths versus roads, “…they tend to walk where they can see which unfortunately happens to be in the middle of the road,” this obviously impacts on the safety of pedestrians and highlights the need for footpath networks to be accompanied by effective lighting.

9. Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected benefits</td>
<td>• Improved pedestrian facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better access for people with impaired mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fewer injuries to pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistent and appropriate pedestrian facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide access along route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected benefits</td>
<td>• Increased numbers of people walking within communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better access to community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slowing of traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Passive community surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved health of community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential positive impact on environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to connect with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased equity of access for all community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All respondents outlined benefits in relation to the PAMP program. As with the problems encountered, some of these benefits were anticipated however others have been a pleasant surprise to those involved. The RTA PAMP guidelines indicated that the expected benefits of developing and actioning a PAMP; these benefits included, “…more appropriate pedestrian facilities…improved access for mobility-impaired groups…safe and convenient crossing opportunities...reduced injuries to pedestrians...meeting the special event needs of pedestrians...and pedestrian facilities which are consistent and appropriate throughout NSW,” (RTA, 2002, pg 10). Interviews with RTA staff further supported the proposed benefits as outlined in the official guidelines.

A number of council staff and RSOs reported they have noticed more people walking and using the footpath network since improvements funded by the PAMP program had been implemented. None were able to provide empirical evidence to support this. This anecdotal information was also supported by some of the community representatives, “…you can really see the need for having...good crossings...and good footpaths...and you notice more and more people now moving around town.” Some also reflected that they felt that the number of elderly people using the footpath network had also increased as the network was more accessible, better maintained and safer; again this evidence was anecdotal. It was reported by a number of respondents that the people who had benefited most from the PAMP program were the elderly, people with disabilities and parents with prams, “…upgrading of the ramps definitely makes sure that people with wheelchairs can access certain areas of town which is great!” It would be beneficial for councils to seek out more empirical data to support their claims regarding the benefits of the PAMP program.

There was a sense that the works carried out through the PAMP program had contributed to increased safety for pedestrians and better access to community facilities and services. As previously noted, the installation of some pedestrian refuges had resulted in a slowing of traffic which was seen to be a gain for pedestrians in terms of safety. Some respondents felt that in addition to improving the safety of pedestrians when crossing roads, the refuges also contributed to improving the confidence of some pedestrians as it enabled them to cross the road in stages, “…they can now cross a street by getting to the middle and there’s a refuge there and then do it in two stages.”

Another benefit of the PAMP program occurred due to the increased number of people using the footpath network and the “passive community surveillance” that happened as a result of this. One council reported that in response to increased feedback from the community, the local Crime Prevention Committee had undertaken a review of the relevant lighting, thus further improving safety for pedestrians.

One of the benefits outlined by many respondents, including community representatives, related to health outcomes and the increased opportunities that a safe and accessible footpath network provides for people wishing to increase their physical activity. There was anecdotal feedback about people who wanted to undertake exercise for fitness, rehabilitation, pleasure, and/or weight loss/maintenance, and those people who now used the footpath network as a safe means of transport within the community (for example, walking to work). It appears that provision of a safe and accessible footpath network has increased the opportunities for more people within communities to be able to make choices regrading engagement in these activities.
A few respondents alluded to the potential environmental impact of safe and accessible footpath networks. Some felt that, over time, some members of the community may choose to walk more frequently thus reducing the use of cars within the towns. One respondent indicated that although many footpath users at present appeared to be undertaking leisure activities, this may change in the future and “...who knows petrol prices might help us get more people out there!”

The general consensus of most respondents who had successfully developed and implemented a PAMP was that well planned footpath networks that were complemented by improvements through the PAMP program had the potential to offer a range of benefits to communities, including safety, equitable access, health, and the ability to experience and connect with the community.

10. Concluding comments

The findings discussed above, in relation to the engagement with the PAMP program of local councils and RSOs, suggest that the program is valued by local communities of the South West region of NSW, and that in many cases it results in developments that are of great benefit to communities, across a range of domains. These include health, physical activity, rehabilitation, weight loss, walking as a mode of transport, pedestrian safety, access for older people and families and others with special needs, town planning, and community surveillance. However, it is also clear that the program is far less accessible and useful to those communities that are less wealthy, more resource-constrained, smaller, more remote and more dispersed. A key consideration for the RTA and NSW Government is how they might enhance the equity of this program and ensure that these disadvantaged communities have equal opportunity to receive and achieve the intended benefits and outcomes of the PAMP program.

11. Recommendations

A range of recommendations arising from the evaluation are presented below, for consideration by the RTA.

- A number of councils indicated that **clearer, more succinct guidelines** are required for the PAMP program. It was also suggested by one council that a **‘proforma’ for plans and schedules of works** would be useful for councils.

- The **RTA should consider electronic submissions of documentation** to further expedite the process.
The RTA should consider how it might **enhance the equity of the PAMP program** and ensure that small, dispersed and poorly-resourced communities have equal opportunity to access, receive and achieve the intended benefits and outcomes of the program.

Feedback from some councils indicated that they would benefit from **more education regarding development and management of PAMPs** – one council suggested that the RTA could conduct regular workshops specifically related to PAMPs, particularly for new staff taking over the coordination/management of the plans. This view was supported by a senior RTA representative, who felt that further education could also address issues of how to access the funding more effectively.

It may be useful for the **RTA and councils to specifically address the issue of community involvement** in the PAMP program in further developments and education initiatives related to PAMPs. Some of the community representatives interviewed felt that the process, as undertaken by councils, needs to be more “transparent and more obvious”. Although many knew about the pathways they did not know a lot about the plans that had preceded the building of the pathways and some were not sure about the level of community consultation leading up to the development of the plans.

One council suggested that the PAMP and Bike Plan programs and plans should be combined and the **funding from the RTA pooled to form the “Pedestrian and Bike Plans” program**. This would appear to be a useful consideration, given the tendency for Bike Paths to be used by pedestrians and people with special needs, in addition to cyclists. Multi-purpose facilities and infrastructure may be more cost-effective than two separate types, particularly in rural and remote communities, where populations are more dispersed and resources often more scarce.

Councils and the RTA indicated the **need for the PAMP and resulting completed works to be better promoted within the community**. In some instances it was felt that the works were not necessarily recognised by residents as a valuable contribution to pedestrian access and safety and thus were not fully utilised. It was anticipated that better promotion of the PAMP program might assist with harnessing community input during the planning and review phases, and in ensuring appropriate utilisation of works completed.

To address shortfalls in funding, it was felt by a number of councils and the RTA that councils should consider **other funding options**. Some councils reported that seeking and applying for extra funding is often a time consuming task that does not always reap rewards. On this basis, the RTA and other key funding sources should consider ways in which the paperwork burden can be reduced or made appropriate for the levels and chances of funding sought, or ways in which councils can be better supported in applying for funds related to PAMPs.

At least two of the councils represented in the interview phase of the evaluation discussed the importance of lighting in ensuring that footpath networks are safe for users. It was felt that **lighting should be included by councils in the planning phase of footpath networks** and that perhaps it might also be included as part of the PAMP program and thus funded as part of this program.
• **RTA staff should spend more time in the field** consulting with councils and RSOs to assist in plan development and review.

• It would be beneficial for the **RTA, councils and, RSOs to plan opportunities and forums to share their experience of PAMP development and actioning** and so inspire others to benefit from the ideas and applied solutions of others.

• It would be beneficial for councils who have successfully developed and implemented a PAMP to **obtain further empirical data** to support their claims regarding the benefits of this program.

### 12. Limitations of evaluation

There were a number of limitations on the current evaluation, and these may have impacted upon the findings of the evaluation:

• It was difficult to identify community representatives who were knowledgeable about the plans and who were willing to participate – this is consistent with some council suggestions that community consultation in relation to PAMPs was limited.

• Some councils did not have an RSO, and so the RSO perspective could not be sought.

• Changes in staff meant that sometimes the researchers were speaking with a person who had just picked up the program and had varying levels of familiarity with it.

• Staff involved in the development of PAMPs were sometimes on extended leave and so inaccessible.

• A number of councils declined involvement in this project, potentially impacting on the range of views obtained – in particular, views of those for whom the PAMP program was considered to be of limited benefit are likely to be missing, and so the findings are likely to be biased towards those communities who had positive interactions with the program.

• At the time of the evaluation, the end of the financial year was looming and some participants had limited time to engage in the evaluation.
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A. Benefits of PAMPS

“Properly implemented PAMPS can provide wide transportation, environmental and social benefits to the community, such as:

- More appropriate pedestrian facilities, especially in busy areas
- Improved access for mobility-impaired groups in the community, including older persons
- Safe and convenient crossing opportunities on major roads
- Reduced injuries to pedestrians
- Links with other transport services to achieve an integrated land use and transport facilities network
- Integration with planning instruments (e.g. Council’s planning documents, including Section 94 and Section 79 (c) under the EP&A Act, provisions within Local Environment Plans (LEPs) and Development Control Plans (DCPs)
- Links with existing vulnerable road user plans such as bike plans, maintenance programs and accessible public transport
- Meeting the special event needs of pedestrians
- Pedestrian facilities which are consistent and appropriate throughout NSW.”

(RTA, 2002, pg 7)
**B. Information statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans and Cycle Plans in the South West Region of NSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The principal investigator in this project is: Tracey Parnell – School of Community Health, CSU – Phone 02 6051 6954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The co-investigator for this project is: Rod Pope – Centre for Inland Health, CSU – Phone 02 6933 2877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two of the programs that the NSW Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) has include the promotion of safety and access for pedestrians and cyclists in community contexts. To this end, the RTA has developed guides for use by local councils in developing Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans (PAMP) and Bike Plans. The aim of this evaluation project is to evaluate the PAMP and Bike Plan programs in the South West Region of NSW. In line with its commitment to contributing to the health, welfare and safety of Australian communities, Charles Sturt University (CSU) and its Centre for Inland Health and School of Community Health have agreed to undertake this evaluation for the RTA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are invited to participate in this evaluation project. The project will endeavour to document and explore your experiences and those of others in the initiation, development and/or actioning of PAMPs and/or Bike Plans. It will include discussion about your satisfaction and that of others with the development process, the resulting plan/s (if developed) and the actions taken as a result of the developed plan/s. The project team will also consider the degree to which developed plans meet the RTA guiding objectives and the broader outcomes of interest to stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information you may choose to provide will be collected by the researchers via a general call for written submissions and/or via one interview with you which may be conducted by telephone or face-to-face. Interviews, if conducted, are expected to take between 30 and 90 minutes to complete, depending on what you wish to discuss. The research team will contact you to invite your participation in one or both of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information you provide will be handled in strict confidence by the research team. Detailed personal information and affiliations will not be required for the purposes of this evaluation and any personal details that are collected in the course of an interview or that are provided in a written submission will be kept confidential. No personal details will be published or provided to the RTA or any other party without your written permission, and so your comments and discussion points will not be linked to you or to your local community in reports to the RTA or other parties unless you provide written permission for this to occur. While no distress is anticipated to arise from your involvement, the investigators will have information about support and counselling services available to you, should you require it. You do not have to discuss issues that are sensitive or private and you can refuse to answer any of the questions that may cause you distress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All interviews will be digitally audio-recorded if you give permission for this to occur. The recording of the discussion will be transcribed by the research team and your information will be collated with that from other discussions and sites in order to meet the project objectives. The research team will seek out common themes, and also different/unusual experiences, in order to provide recommendations and feedback to the RTA regarding the value of the PAMPs and Bike Plans processes and outcomes. In order to maintain confidentiality, your identity and location, and that of participating organisations will be disguised in any publication of the results.

You are under no obligation to participate in this project and can withdraw from the project at any time. You can also withdraw any information you have provided, at any time until the draft evaluation report is compiled and submitted to the RTA. There is no penalty associated with non-participation or withdrawal from this project.

If you agree to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form. Any questions you may have prior to participating in any aspect of this project can be discussed with the principal investigator, whose details are at the top of this page.

NOTE: The Charles Sturt University, School Of Community Health Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this project. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this project, you may contact the Committee through the Secretary:

Andree Pender  
Secretary  
School of Community Health Ethics in Human Research Committee  
Charles Sturt University  
PO Box 789  
Albury 2640  
Ph: 02 6051 6820  
Fax: 02 6051 6772  
Email: apender@csu.edu.au

Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully and you will be informed of the outcome.
C. Consent form

Evaluation of Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans and Cycle Plans in the South West Region of NSW

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this evaluation of the Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans and Cycle Plans in the South West Region of NSW. It is being conducted by Tracey Parnell (tparnell@csu.edu.au, 02 6051 6954) and Dr Rod Pope (r pope@csu.edu.au, 02 6933 2877), both of Charles Sturt University. The results of the evaluation will be written up in the form of a report to the Roads and Traffic Authority and may also be presented as journal articles and at conferences.

Please read the following statements and sign and return the form, if you agree to participate.

I give my informed consent to participate in this evaluation.

I understand that I am free to withdraw my participation in the evaluation at any time, and that if I do I will not be subjected to any penalty or discriminatory treatment.

The purpose of the evaluation has been explained to me, including the (potential) risks/discomforts associated with the evaluation and I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the evaluation and received satisfactory answers.

I understand that any information or personal details gathered in the course of this evaluation about me are confidential and that neither my name nor any other identifying information will be used or published without my written permission. I am happy for my words to be quoted as long as it is anonymous. I understand that any interviews I participate in will be recorded using a digital recording device.

I understand that Charles Sturt University’s, School of Community Health Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this study. I also understand that if I have any complaints or concerns about this research I can contact:

Andree Pender
Secretary
School of Community Health Ethics in Human Research Committee
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789
Albury NSW 2640
Phone: (02) 6051 6820
Fax: (02) 6051 6772
Email: apender@csu.edu.au

Signed: ...............................................

Printed Name: .......................................................

Date: .............................................................
**D. Initial call for submission guiding statements**

Evaluation of Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans and Bike Plans in the South West Region of NSW

Below are a number of guiding questions and comments to assist you in providing preliminary feedback regarding your involvement in the initiation, development, and actioning of Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans and Bike Plans. Please feel free to add further comments of relevance that may not be covered by the points below. Your responses to the above areas (and any other relevant comments you may wish to make) do not need to be entered on this form; a separate document (numbered accordingly) would be appropriate. Submissions, including the signed consent form, should be returned in the postage paid envelope by **17th April 2008**.

1. Describe your experience in the following stages of the Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plan and/or Bike Plan processes; where possible include details about issues and/or costs faced during the processes.
   - Initiation of the process leading to the approval of funding to develop the plan/s.
   - The development process including consultation, the identification of attractors and generators, prioritised strategic routes and works to deliver the strategic plan.

2. For actions that have been undertaken in response to the developed plan/s, outline the work undertaken and discuss your level of satisfaction with the actions. (If not recommended actions have been undertaken, please outline the reason/s for this).

3. Please outline any funding you are aware of that has been secured for the community as a result of the plan/s and recommended actions (including works in these plans funded in association with other projects and from various stakeholders).

4. Discuss the ongoing use, review and updating of the developed plan/s to ensure the plan/s represent Council’s current strategic priorities.

5. To what degree do you believe the developed plan/s meet the RTA Guiding Objectives (considering – reduced reliance on cars; accessibility; safety; links with other transport; strategic provision of appropriate facilities; integration with other planning instruments; ecological sustainable development; promote health through active transport)?

6. To what degree do the plans meet the objectives of other stakeholders?

7. Discuss your level of satisfaction with the developed plan/s. Note any areas where, upon reflection, you believe the plans/s or process could be enhanced.
E. Summary of themes from calls for submissions

| Evaluation of Pedestrian Access and Mobility Plans and Bike Plans in the South West Region of NSW |
| Summary of themes from calls for submissions |

1. **Usability of RTA guidelines/information**
   - Design of programs/plans
   - Issues to do with rural/remote areas; large versus small councils (geographic and population)
   - Priority of this program, developed plans and works in comparison to other council obligations/priorities
   - Availability of training and support

2. **Availability of resources to participate in PAMPs and Bike Plan programs.**
   - Staffing (including staff turnover)
   - Staff knowledge (eg of geographical area, community needs)
   - Availability and access to RTA funding
   - Council having funds to match RTA funding
   - Access to other funding opportunities
   - Use of external contractors

3. **Response of community to these programs**
   - Involvement in process
   - To plan development
   - To works completed

4. **RTA guiding objectives**
   - Responsiveness of developed plan and completed work to these
   - Problems/barriers to achieving these objectives
   - Congruence with the needs of the community

5. **Unexpected/unanticipated benefits from the plans and associated works for council and/or community**
   - Environmental
   - Health
   - Particular groups
   - Financial

6. **Other factors that complicated plan development or completion of works**

7. **Suggestions/strategies to further improve these programs**
   - Funding
   - Improving responsiveness to rural/regional council needs
   - Information and training
   - Guidelines
F. Map of current status of PAMPS in South West Region of NSW