

Attendance at workshop sessions:

Workshop 1 - North (22 Feb 2022)

| Council/organisation | | Participants |
|---|------------|--|
| Break O'Day Council | BODC | Eddie Biernat |
| Dorset Council | Dorset | Wayne Williams, Malcolm Beattie |
| Launceston City Council | Launceston | Adrian Tanner, Joanne Swan, Nick Browne, Uriel Walters, Paul Gimpl, Gary Wellman |
| Meander Valley council | MVC | Jonathan Harmey |
| Northern Midlands Council | NMC | Jonathan Galbraith |
| West Tamar Council | WT | Fred Schoenmaker |
| Clarence City Council | Clarence | Glen Popowski |
| Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia | IPWEA | Steve Verity |
| Local Government Association of Tasmania | LGAT | Michael Edrich |

Workshop 2 - South (24 Feb 2022)

| Council/organisation | | Participants |
|---------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| Brighton Council | Brighton | Callum Pearce-Rasmussen |
| Central Coast Council | CC | Paul Breaden |
| Central Highlands Council | CH | Adam Wilson, Lyn Eyles |
| Derwent Valley Council | Der | Amanda McCall, Jamie Craven |
| Glenorchy City Council | Glenorchy | Ning Huang, Patrick Marshall |
| Kingborough Council | Kingborough | Andrew Coombe |
| Sorell Council | Sorell | Paul Markey, Julie Mann |
| Southern Midlands Council | SMC | Tim Kirkwood +3 |
| Meander Valley Council | MVC | Rob Little |
| State Grants Commission | SGC | Ivan Dzelalija |

Workshop 3 - North West (28 Feb 2022)

| Council/organisation | | Participants |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Burnie City Council | Burnie | Gary Neil |
| George Town Council | George Town | Malcolm Aitken, Cheryl Hyde |
| Latrobe & Kentish Councils | Latrobe, Kentish | Jonathan Magor |
| Break O'Day Council | BODC | Eddie Biernat, David Jolly |
| Glamorgan Spring Bay Council | GSB | Peter Porch |
| Launceston City Council | Launceston | Samantha Rautner, Kathryn Pugh |

Total number of councils represented: 20

Feedback on Preliminary Decisions made to date:

Preliminary Decision 1: Use of Asset Preservation Model (APM) based on a road hierarchy system, road profiles etc: -

Each council's relative need for road grant funding will continue to be assessed using a combination of:

- a functional road hierarchy category system;
- a standard profile for each road category;
- an assessment of lifecycle activities involved in the management of each road category and their respective life expectancy and frequency;
- the costing of the respective activities; and
- a system of cost adjustors and, if deemed necessary, allowances, to recognise the relative advantages or disadvantages that each council faces in preserving their respective road network assets.

No objections were raised by any councils regarding the fundamental approach of using a hierarchy of roads system costs as per above to calculate Asset Preservation Need.

MVC queried whether, in determining the whole of life cost, the Commission looks ahead at what the renewal of the road is going to be or is it looking at "like for like"? Example raised was if a concrete road is being replaced now, it is likely to be replaced with asphalt or more modern top and also take into consideration engineering needs as well. This point essentially is a question on the assumptions and basis of the Road Costing Model and if, and how, it captures and reflects current engineering techniques and improvements in road management processes in the assessment of road preservation need.

Position Clear: Preliminary Decision stands.

Preliminary Decision 2: No Special recognition of concrete roads in the RPM:

Due to the relatively small number of concrete roads as a proportion of the total road network, the Commission will not provide any specific recognition or provision for concrete road lengths in its new RPM assessment process.

All councils supported the preliminary decision to not provide any special recognition for concrete roads in the RPM. Some councils agreed that the relative share of these roads would be extremely small and the system did not need to be complicated by these roads. Other councils also confirmed the IPWEA advice that while the initial cost of such roads was higher, the annualised lifecycle costs were very low.

Position Clear: Preliminary Decision stands. Concrete roads will be included in council reported road lengths at the standard road classifications, with no additional factor or recognition for concrete roads applied in the RPM.

Conversation Starter Workshop sessions Council Feedback by topic:

Background info:

The Local Government Road Hierarchy (LGRH) (Refer Table 1 and 2) focuses on the function, purpose and connectivity of a road to determine how a road should be classified. It does not reference or define standard road profiles/dimensions. The LGRH provides guidance on both the features and guidance metrics to use to determine the appropriate classification for each section of road and includes whether the road is an urban or rural road, the running surface of the road, the carriage way's form (number of lanes), whether the road is a public transport route or not, whether Heavy Vehicle access is permitted or not, and guidance metrics of Average Annual Daily Traffic rates and Average Annual Daily Truck Traffic or Equivalent Heavy Vehicles rates. The current alignment of the LGRH compared to the Commission's road categories are detailed in Table 3.

If the Commission decides to adopt the LGRH, the expectation is that councils determine each section of road's classification based on the function and purpose of the road and the typical traffic flows for a road of that general design, rather than any expectation of councils undertaking periodic or regular physical traffic counting exercises to determine the classification of a road each year. Rob Little, who was involved in the preparation of the LGRH document in 2015, confirmed in Workshop 2 that the function and purpose criteria for determining the classification of a road was put in to the LGRH so that councils could make an assessment based on the service provided by the road and councils didn't have to undertake a lot of traffic counts in order for them to classify their roads.

During the Workshop sessions, councils were advised that if the LGRH was to be adopted, there is no expectation from the Commission's perspective that they would be required to undertake, or provide traffic count data, in the CDC to support their classification of roads. Rather, the expectation is that a road's classification, once determined, would be fairly stable over time. However councils themselves are free to use traffic counts for their own purposes, which Sorell advises helps inform their capital and maintenance program priorities.

Table 5 details Council road lengths, population density and share of assets 2021-22 FA Road Grants Model as background to the following.

Adoption of Local Government Road Hierarchy (LGRH), impacts and timing (CS Questions 1-5):

Council Feedback:

Most councils supported adopting the LGRH, with the strongest support coming from urban councils. Most councils not already on the LGRH or that are using a hybrid system of asset management road classification, (while acknowledging conversion will require considerable resources for some councils) do see a benefit in converting their asset management data to the LGRH. Clarence, which is not currently using the LGRH, indicated their hierarchy mapped fairly well to the LGRH such that differences were more terminology and not significantly different. Clarence is finding some roads are moving from minor collector roads to major collector roads, but these not becoming arterial roads.

SMC¹ recommended keeping the model as simple as possible and was strongly opposed to adopting the LGRH. SMC supports staying with the current three road categories (urban sealed, rural sealed, unsealed).

Questions were raised as to whether similar roads are already being classified consistently across councils. Consistency in classification is needed to result in fair split of the funding pool.

A concern was raised regarding the risk of councils trying to classify roads at a higher category to gain extra funding but this was seen by other councils as minimal and only associated with those councils that are not already using the LGRH. One council suggested this risk can be addressed through providing clarification and direction.

If the LGRH is not adopted, one city council noted that some splitting of the urban sealed category in the Commission's methodology would be necessary as the current classifications currently treat all urban roads the same, when that is not the case. However, another city council in another workshop session was opposed to the suggestion of fragmenting existing categories to create yet another dataset to manage.

If a move to the LGRH is to occur, all councils supported going straight to the LGRH without having a transition through any interim road categories, only to then move to the LGRH categories. Councils supported "ripping the Band-Aid off once" and moving in one hit to the expanded categories.

Councils advised that the data would need to be seen to determine if any future combination of road categories would be appropriate or not. Some councils suggested that once data is being collected according to the LGRH categories, some road categories might become candidates for merging and simplifying the process if their road lengths are not material enough to justify continuing with both categories in the RPM (e.g. local access and minor access might be future candidates). Another (urban) council suggested that it would be easier to combine rural road categories than combining urban road categories as the differences in construction standards are not as large for rural roads as they are for urban roads.

An important point councils raised was that issues associated with moving to the LGRH are not isolated to their asset management systems. The area of most concern for any change related to the need to modify finance systems to align with road categories. While council expenditure by road categories is not currently collected in the CDC returns, council work order systems, budgets and capital expenditure plans are linked to their road categories. Note not all councils have a link between their finance system and asset management system.

An example of the impacts on other systems was provided by George Town. George Town advised assistance would be required to convert its current data to the LGRH both in its asset management data/system and the financial accounting system. While George Town currently uses the LGRH hierarchy to a degree in its work order system, checks for

¹ SMC has approximately 400 individual roads and is ranked 3rd in Tasmanian councils by road length.

correctness and consistency will also be required, together with updates within the GIS to identify roads per the new hierarchy. George Town anticipates this work would be contracted.

Transition arrangements: Timing and phase in.

Discussions on timeframe for any changeover resulted in differing views but were generally around being given “sufficient notice”. Generally councils thought a 2-3 year transition period would be sufficient. Others supported a shorter timeframe as long as adequate notice and assistance is provided. Transition over an extended period was noted as not supporting consistency of data across the sector. Some councils suggested the timing of adoption of the LGRH should be when the council next does its road revaluation.

The time estimates for undertaking the change in their systems ranged from a couple of days (for a council that doesn't currently link its finance system to its asset management system) to 6-12 months, primarily due to the work required in the finance systems space rather than the asset management system. Some councils indicated they would not be able to transition to the LGRH without assistance being provided. One council noted that those councils that aren't already using the LGRH and for which a change-over would be problematic and they require assistance, would need to put a submission in for assistance, in the next project phase.

Several councils supported the idea of leaving the road categories as they currently are for the time being and then changing to the new LGRH categories at the end of the transition period/once everyone has adopted the LGRH i.e. allow all councils to get ready and then press the button and get the results. They did not support having interim groupings in the meantime.

Some councils responded in relation to transition of implementation of methodology changes and grant allocations. Councils advised that if there will be significant changes in grant allocations, then a phasing in over a period e.g. 2-3 years would be necessary. Significant changes in grant allocations impact council rating policy decisions. For example Launceston indicated that a change of \$1M in their road grant allocation represents a 0.5% increase in rates over 3 years.

Form of Assistance required (Qtn 6):

The resource requirements and type of assistance councils need to transition to the LGRH, if the Commission decides to take this route, depends on when the implementation/adoption of the LGRH occurs and the council. Councils currently undertake an assessment of their road conditions/road revaluations every three or four years. These are staged and staggered across councils.

If the timing of adoption of the LGRH is when the council next does its road revaluation, then some councils advised the amount of assistance that would be required would be less, or possibly even not required, as the classification of roads based on the LGRH could be done as part of the road revaluation process. If this was the approach taken, then at the end of the 3 year period, you would expect that almost all 29 councils would be using the LGRH.

If a fixed deadline is set for adoption of the LGRH and this falls prior to the next road revaluation cycle for a council, then the preferred form of assistance is physical resources (personnel) for some councils, while other councils preferred funding support so they could engage contractors to undertake the task. One council advised it would be forced to engage consultants to redesign the way work orders are categorised in their finance system and there might be another 1-2 weeks work needed for external consultants to remodel and modify system to report different road categories. This council would also need support to provide back filling support for the relevant council staff member to free up their priorities and enable them to undertake the task in their asset management system. Some councils advised that they could manage the change in their asset systems within their existing resources, but would need to check if there are any implications for their finance system.

Launceston indicated that they may be able to provide assistance to other councils. Adrian Tanner, Senior Asset Management Advisor at Launceston, who has an Honours Degree in Mathematics majoring in data analysis, has also offered assistance to the Commission to analyse data for the project.

Summary: Most councils supported adopting the LGRH, with the strongest support coming from urban councils. SMC, which is ranked as having the third highest road length in Tasmania but ranked 21st in terms of both population and population density, strongly opposes the move and supports retaining the current three category system. The main hurdle for implementation are council finance systems. Assistance required are both physical resources and funding for consultancies. If the Commission decides to change to the LGRH, several options exist for the timing of implementation. Councils do not support any interim classifications as transitional measures to a change in hierarchy.

Urbanisation Allowance v recognition of arterial and collector roads (Questions 7-8):

Background:

In the 2021-22 RPM, the urbanisation allowance resulted in \$1.3 million in Total Road Asset Preservation value of \$183.7 million i.e. 0.71% or approximately \$307,000 in Road Grant funding.

Council Feedback:

Councils did not generally support the use of lane count for the CBD allowance. Clarence, having only two roads with 2 lanes would be able to provide lane data but queried the materiality as they don't have much CBD road length. Launceston queried whether lane counts would unnecessarily complicate the model and cautioned against making the model too complicated.

Several councils preferred square metre measures as this information is readily available from their systems (councils have width and length measurements) and council road valuations are based on square metres.

Some councils noted that the arterial and collector roads (which can still be single lane roads but are wider than normal urban roads, have wider footpaths, parking lanes on both sides, 1.5m bicycle lanes and 3.5m turning lanes) are generally not in the CBD of councils.

Launceston undertook a review of its asset management system and advised that arterial roads, with the exception of the number of lanes, have similar profiles to CBD roads but the construction costs are not quite as high.

Some councils thought the urbanisation allowance may not be required if moving to the LGRH whereas some councils did support the retention of the CBD allowance, albeit perhaps not at the 3x factor level. Generally though, councils were not sure as they didn't have enough information to make an informed view. While suspecting the times factor might reduce, no council suggested what times factor should be applied. Councils advised they would need to look at the data otherwise it would be a case of "plucking numbers out of the air". Adopting the LGRH was seen as making it easier to identify the important roads for a council, more so than the current Urban Sealed category.

Burnie outlined the additional operational activities associated with CBD roads, confirmed that its arterial and collector roads are generally found outside the CBD (consistent with the advice from several other councils), and advised there is a clear differentiation between CBD v arterial and collector roads. Burnie referred to the 2017 data it provided to the Commission for its last review of the CBD factor which indicated the additional operational cost included: higher maintenance works, street cleaning, presentation, wider footpaths, different pavement frequencies etc. The 2017 data indicated the additional costs of Burnie's CBD roads at that time was 2.5x.

Essentially councils advised that arterial roads and collector roads fall outside the CBD areas of councils and are in more residential and industrial/commercial areas. They are different roads and there would be very little overlap, if any.

If arterial and collector roads are recognised, Kingborough Council may qualify for additional asset preservation need recognition than under the current methodology. Currently Kingborough is excluded from the Commission's Urbanisation Allowance because it is not a declared City under the LG Act.

No council argued against the Commission's current process of only recognising one CBD area per council.

Summary: Support for some degree of CBD Allowance still exists among city councils as adopting the LGRH will recognise significant lengths of (higher cost) arterial and connector roads which are primarily outside CBD areas. However, the times factor may not need to be at the current 3x level.

Industrial Roads (Question 9)

It was acknowledged that industrial roads involve much deeper and wider pavements than the normal road and so are much more costly for councils. In its road valuations process Launceston values its industrial roads separately to other road categories because they have much wider and deeper pavements than a normal road of that traffic volume. Clarence advised it has a few industrial roads and they are growing year on year, especially in Cambridge near the airport. These are generally low volume but have significant width to accommodate large vehicles. Clarence, Kingborough and MVC all advised they do not separate or distinguish industrial roads into a separate category. Burnie noted that it also

had a “whole mismatch of light industrial and commercial areas with all sorts of different road standards”.

Northern Midlands Council has approximately 2kms of industrial roads at Translink, all constructed to slightly different standards, with the possibility of more to be constructed in the future. Brighton advised it only has 1-2kms as most of industrial roads in its industrial precinct are state owned roads. Generally, most councils with industrial roads only have a small number e.g. 1-2-3kms and report these in the Urban Sealed roads category. Only George Town advised that it had more industrial roads length which experience 300 Heavy Vehicles per day and this is expected to increase in the future. George Town advised it reports these roads in the urban sealed road lengths in the CDC. George Town has since provided the following information:

George Town Council maintains the following industrial type roads which could require extra funding consideration if changing RPM:

- Mobil Rd 1100m x 11m K & C – High use industrial connecting road carrying loads for 2 woodchip mills, log yard deliveries, local business and traffic from Norfolk St
- Norfolk St 610m x 7m – Med use industrial road carrying loads for fuel distribution depot, Sims metal recycling and Log yard.
- Temco Rd 520m x 9m – High use industrial road connecting road carry loads for Temco, local business traffic and traffic from industrial section of Old Bell bay.
- Old Bell Bay Rd (industrial only) 1730m x 6.4, 7 & 9m Med use industrial road carrying loads for wood mill, rail freight terminal and WWTP.

Total industrial type roads 3.960km or 1.5% of network or 2% of sealed roads.

Growth in the Bell Bay Industrial precinct will require the upgrade of these roads and higher maintenance costs.

Summary: The general view of councils was that the limited road lengths involved did not warrant a separate category being recognised for industrial roads and complicating the model, similar to the reasons for not making separate provision in the methodology for concrete roads. George Town Council, having approximately double the industrial road length of other councils sought special recognition for these in the RPM.

Bridges & Culverts (Questions 10-12):

Background:

Each year the Commission spends considerable resources on checking and investigating anomalies in the reporting of bridges and culverts by councils. In 2021-22 the share of total Road Grant funding of \$43.3 million allocated based on asset preservation needs of bridges was \$1.9 million (4.48%) and culverts \$225 000 (0.52%). Over time the relative share of the Road Grant funding pool allocated based on asset preservation need for bridges and culverts has been declining (at the overall State level²) e.g. from 5.18% in 2018-19, 5.11% in 2019-20, 5.07% in 2020-21 and 5.0% in 2021-22. The declining share reflects the bridge renewal program that has been occurring over recent years.

² Note the shares for individual councils will differ based on their individual assets.

The current expectation is that the Commission continues using its four bridge types as they are currently i.e. CON, TIM, STL and OTHER. Timber and Timber composite bridges (which represent the bulk of OTHER) still represent approximately 15% of Tasmanian bridge deck area. This quantity of timber/timber composite bridges is still considered too significant to enable the simplification of bridge types at this stage.

The ALGA definition for recognition is based on measuring structures that:

- span a **waterway cross-sectional area** in excess of three (3) square metres; and/or
- exceeds 1.8 metres in height, width or diameter; and
- are located on a declared road or public road reserve.

Council Feedback

A small number of councils spoke of the concentrated costs of bridges compared to roads and supported the idea of setting a pre-determined share of the road grant funding (and also increasing the share from the current 5%) to be specifically allocated based on bridges & culvert asset preservation needs. However, the general view supported by most councils is for continuing the current process of assessing the bridge and culvert share based on calculating the asset preservation need of all road assets - roads, bridges and culverts together and the allocation being however that falls (i.e. assessing each council's asset preservation needs based on each councils' bridges and culverts and adding this result to the road asset preservation need in order to determine the total asset preservation need for each council. The relative shares for allocating the FA Grant funding are based on each council's share of the total asset preservation need). IPWEA added that it depended on where you are in an asset's life cycle as to the argument regarding costs and that the whole life cycle of the asset needs to be taken into consideration. IPWEA recently prepared the 2021 National State of the Assets report for ALGA and in that process generally found that bridges (across Australia) were in a relatively good condition with only a very small number of exceptions. IPWEA emphasised that how the assets are performing is a key consideration.

Some councils advised they could work with the Commission's definitions but their issue was the bridge types - whether the bridge is Timber, Concrete or composite bridge types. Several councils confirmed that they classify bridges by type based on the bridge super structure i.e. the material on the deck of the bridge. Another council advised that it experienced difficulty completing the current returns as its bridge and culvert data is not held in its system in a format that it can easily extract the data.

BODC advised that it is still replacing short span Timber bridges on low traffic volume roads. Bridges greater than 10 metres in length are being replaced in permanent materials (Concrete).

Some councils supported not making any change to the existing bridge & culvert definitions, in part because that they found the current definition easy to apply, the amount of money that is distributed based on this aspect of the asset preservation need is small (currently only 5% of the funding pool (\$2M)) and it involves considerable work. A similar number of councils supported the Commission definition being made consistent with the ALGA definition.

BODC and George Town councils supported retaining the current approach/definitions.

Latrobe/Kentish and Burnie were happy to continue with the current methodology and stay with what is currently used unless there is a benefit in, or an imperative to adopt the ALGA definition. Latrobe/Kentish suggested the definitions need simplification rather than tidying up and prefers using one definition if there is uncertainty regarding who is reporting on what basis. Burnie reiterated that the amount of funding is small and the impact on Burnie is not significant.

Kingborough is okay with the current definitions and minimums/criteria applied by the Commission, and thinks the current definition which require a clear span of 3 metres and the sum of the culvert widths to be 3 metres is easily understood. However, Kingborough concedes that ALGA definition goes into it more thoroughly.

MVC advised that while the current definitions for bridge and culvert are okay (for its current purpose), having consistency across reporting of bridges and culverts across all areas would be helpful. MVC noted the ALGA definition is trickier to calculate (as it is currently defined looking at clear waterway opening area) but perhaps we can look at a common definition.

Central Coast supported adoption of the ALGA definition as it does not rely only on width but also takes into account height. The impact of a bridge on council is material but the impact on the road grant is minimal (depending on the current dimensions criteria). Central Coast wants the calculation so it is consistently acknowledging everything that is a bridge or a culvert regardless of its dimensions. Central Coast, while noting the current minimum requirement for a bridge and being okay with the current approach, believes the ALGA definition works better as it measures the waterway open area.

It is unclear if the differences in the ALGA definition and the Commission's current parameters result in different reporting outcomes³. A review of a small sample of council 2019-20 CDC returns (being the first year of the new ALGA definitions) did not indicate differences.

AUSSPAN manages almost all Tasmanian councils' bridge & culvert data, with the exception of a couple of councils. As such there should already be a lot of consistency of information on bridges and culverts across councils. AUSSPAN provides councils with information every 6 months and the data is easily filtered to find 3m+ culverts etc. It is unclear if the AUSSPAN data is set up to include each structure's waterway measurement, rather than the asset's physical dimensions (height, width and diameter measurements). Latrobe/Kentish did not think it would be difficult for AUSSPAN to add an extra column to the spreadsheet they provide councils. This could indicate whether the asset is a bridge or (major) culvert according to the definition (based on assessment of height, width and length). This would only involve an initial piece of work/one-off effort to create, with most councils having <100 bridges and culverts.

³ The data collected by ALGA involves "number of assets" whereas the Commission collects a listing of assets and calculates area based on specific minimum widths for bridges and minimum and maximum lengths for culverts.

No council suggested a different definition or profile to adopt as an alternative to the ALGA definition.

Summary: Councils generally supported the funds allocated to bridges and culverts being based on their relative share of asset preservation costs and not a predetermined portion of the road grant funding pool. Councils were evenly divided on continuing with the current bridge and culvert definitions, and adopting the ALGA definition of bridges and culverts.

Use of the ALGC in the assessment process (Qtn 13).

There was very little interest from councils for using the ALGC system in the assessment process. One council (MVC), noting that the councils with the longest road lengths are those with the smallest populations, thought that the ALGC might potentially be used as an overlay. MVC suggested whether residential income (residential rates?) could be compared to road lengths. This idea was supported by Sorell. SMC suggested the dispersion and isolation cost adjusters to also be applied in the RPM.

Councils advised that the classification of the council itself in the ALGA system does not determine how they report their road lengths.

Summary: There was minimal interest from councils for using the ALGC classifications in the RPM assessment process. Several other suggestions were received.

Additional Issue: State owned roads

Some councils noted that the State roads running through their towns resulted in those councils having arguably busier roads than some CBD roads, with councils having to provide higher standard of parking, etc on these roads which are excluded from the road asset data reported in the CDC returns as they are not attached to a council road. Some of these roads have road shoulders and seal area (outside the 3.7m State growth road lane width), kerb and guttering, street trees and footpaths on one or both sides of the road which is owned by council (section 52 of the Bylaw?). The cost of these “State owned road footpath assets” are included in the council’s reported expenditure figures, but not road lengths. The Commission does not reference road expenditure figures in the RPM.

Table 1: Tasmanian Local Government Road Hierarchy - Urban Roads

| Classification | 1. Arterial | 2. Collector | 3. Link | 4. Local access | 5. Minor access | 6. Unformed |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Functional Criteria | | | | | | |
| Function/ predominant purpose | Provide the principal links between urban centres, or between urban centres and rural regions. | Connect arterial roads to local areas and supplement arterial roads in providing for traffic movements between urban areas, or in some cases rural population centres. | Provide a link between the arterial or collector roads and local access roads. | Provide access to residential properties and in some cases commercial properties, at a local level. | Provide access to residential properties and irregular access to community facilities such as parks and reserves. | Roads not maintained by the council or non-constructed/maintained road reserves or roads that have a very low level of service. |
| Connectivity description | High connectivity - connecting precincts, localities, suburbs, and rural population centres. | High connectivity – supplements arterial roads in connecting suburbs, business districts and localised facilities. | Medium connectivity – connects traffic at a neighbourhood level with collector and arterial roads. | Low – connects individual properties within a neighbourhood to link roads. | Low – provides access to properties. | Future roads or roads that have a very low level of service. |
| Guidance Metrics | | | | | | |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) | >10 000 vehicles per day (vpd) | 3 000 - 10 000 vpd | 1 000 - 3 000 vpd | 50 - 1 000 vpd | <50 vpd | N/A |
| Heavy vehicles permitted | Yes - thoroughfare | Yes - thoroughfare | Yes - some through traffic | No thoroughfare, local access only | No thoroughfare, local access only | N/A |
| Average Annual Daily Truck Traffic or Equivalent Heavy Vehicles (AADTT / EHV) | >1 000 AADTT or >10% EHV | 250 - 1 000 AADTT or >10% EHV | <250 AADTT or >10% EHV | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Public transport route | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | N/A |
| Carriageway form | 2 or 4 lanes | 2 lanes | 2 lanes | 1 or 2 lanes | Typically 1 lane | N/A |
| Running surface | Sealed | Sealed | Sealed | Sealed/unsealed | Sealed/unsealed | Unformed |

Table 2: Tasmanian Local Government Road Hierarchy - Rural Roads

| Classification | Arterial | Collector | Link | Local access | Minor access | Unformed |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Functional Criteria | | | | | | |
| Function/ predominant purpose | Provide the principal links between rural population centres and regions. | Connect arterial roads to local areas and supplement arterial roads in providing for traffic movements between rural population centres. | Provide a link between the arterial or collector roads and local access roads. | Provide access to residential properties and in some cases commercial properties, at a local level. | Provide secondary access to residential properties and irregular access to community facilities such as parks and reserves. | Roads not maintained by the council or non-constructed/maintained road reserves or roads that have a very low level of service. |
| Connectivity description | High connectivity - connecting rural population centres. | High connectivity – supplements arterial roads in connecting towns, rural centres and localised facilities. | Medium connectivity – connects traffic at a neighbourhood level with collector and arterial roads. | Low – connects individual properties within a neighbourhood to link roads. | Low – provides access to properties. | Future roads or roads that have a very low level of service. |
| Guidance Metrics | | | | | | |
| Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) | >2000 vehicles per day (vpd) | 300 - 2000 vpd | 100 - 300 vpd | 30 - 100 vpd | <30 vpd | N/A |
| Heavy vehicles permitted | Yes - thoroughfare | Yes - thoroughfare | Yes - some through traffic | No thoroughfare, local access only | No thoroughfare, local access only | N/A |
| Average Annual Daily Truck Traffic or Equivalent Heavy Vehicles (AADTT / EHV) | >300 AADTT or >20% EHV | 60 - 300 AADTT or >10% EHV | <60 AADTT or >10% EHV | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Public transport route | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | N/A |
| Carriageway form | 2 or 4 lanes | 2 lanes | 2 lanes | 1 or 2 lanes | Typically 1 lane | N/A |
| Running surface | Sealed | Sealed | Sealed/unsealed | Sealed/unsealed | Sealed/unsealed | Unformed |

Table 3: Indicative Alignment of Road Hierarchy Systems

| Local Government Road Hierarchy | State Grants Commission Hierarchy |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Urban Roads | |
| Arterial | Urban Sealed |
| Collector | Urban Sealed |
| Link | Urban Sealed |
| Local Access | Urban Sealed |
| Minor Access | Urban Sealed |
| Rural Roads | |
| Arterial | Rural Sealed |
| Collector | Rural Sealed |
| Link | Rural Sealed/Unsealed |
| Local Access | Rural Sealed/Unsealed |
| Minor Access | Rural Sealed/Unsealed |

Table 4: Definition of urban and rural roads used by the State Grants Commission. (LGRH - June 2015)

| Road classification | Description |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Urban sealed road | A road usually but not necessarily within town boundaries, that has predominant frontage development of either business or residential, often with kerb and guttering and/or footpath that has a running surface of bitumen in any form (e.g. flush seal or asphalt) or concrete. Note: All streets/roads within town boundaries are not necessarily urban; frontage development is the controlling factor. |
| Rural sealed roads | A road that has a running surface of bitumen in any form (e.g. flush seal or asphalt) or concrete without predominant frontage development either within or outside town boundaries. |
| Unsealed road (urban and rural) | Any other road, usually with a running surface of gravel, but may include roads on natural surface, whether formed or cleared only (provided always that these latter roads are maintained by the council). |

Table 5: Council road lengths, population density and share of assets 2021-22 FA Road Grants Model

| Data sourced from the 2021-22 FA Grants Model | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---|
| | Total road length assessed | Pop'n (2020) | Council Area (sq km) | Pop'n Density | Ranking based on Pop'n density | Aust Local Govt Classification (ALGC) | Share of Road Length | Ranking based on Road Length | Share of Pop'n | Ranking based on Pop'n Share | Difference in ranking Road length v pop'n |
| Break O'Day | 551 | 6346 | 3521 | 1.80 | 24 | RAL | 3.869% | 10 | 1.173% | 23 | -13 |
| Brighton | 189 | 18123 | 171 | 105.98 | 5 | UFS | 1.327% | 29 | 3.351% | 11 | 18 |
| Burnie | 349 | 19701 | 610 | 32.30 | 9 | URS | 2.451% | 18 | 3.643% | 10 | 8 |
| Central Coast | 678 | 22157 | 931 | 23.80 | 11 | URS | 4.761% | 9 | 4.097% | 8 | 1 |
| Central Highlands | 739 | 2166 | 7976 | 0.27 | 29 | RAM | 5.189% | 6 | 0.401% | 27 | -21 |
| Circular Head | 766 | 8152 | 4891 | 1.67 | 25 | RAL | 5.379% | 4 | 1.507% | 18 | -14 |
| Clarence | 483 | 58729 | 377 | 155.78 | 4 | UFM | 3.390% | 13 | 10.860% | 2 | 11 |
| Derwent Valley | 333 | 10518 | 4103 | 2.56 | 20 | RAV | 2.341% | 21 | 1.945% | 17 | 4 |
| Devonport | 272 | 25747 | 111 | 231.95 | 3 | URS | 1.911% | 26 | 4.761% | 6 | 20 |
| Dorset | 685 | 6685 | 3223 | 2.07 | 22 | RAL | 4.810% | 8 | 1.236% | 20 | -12 |
| Flinders | 346 | 1004 | 1994 | 0.50 | 27 | RAS | 2.429% | 19 | 0.186% | 29 | -10 |
| George Town | 274 | 7117 | 653 | 10.90 | 13 | RAL | 1.924% | 25 | 1.316% | 19 | 6 |
| Glamorgan Spring Bay | 379 | 4750 | 2587 | 1.84 | 23 | RAM | 2.661% | 17 | 0.878% | 24 | -7 |
| Glenorchy | 320 | 47963 | 121 | 396.39 | 2 | UFM | 2.247% | 22 | 8.869% | 4 | 18 |
| Hobart | 302 | 55250 | 78 | 708.33 | 1 | UCC | 2.123% | 23 | 10.217% | 3 | 20 |
| Huon Valley | 709 | 17966 | 5497 | 3.27 | 18 | RAV | 4.978% | 7 | 3.322% | 12 | -5 |
| Kentish | 471 | 6393 | 1155 | 5.54 | 15 | RAL | 3.307% | 14 | 1.182% | 22 | -8 |
| King Island | 471 | 1612 | 1094 | 1.47 | 26 | RAS | 3.307% | 15 | 0.298% | 28 | -13 |
| Kingborough | 549 | 38628 | 719 | 53.72 | 6 | UFM | 3.855% | 11 | 7.143% | 5 | 6 |
| Latrobe | 288 | 11961 | 600 | 19.94 | 12 | RAV | 2.022% | 24 | 2.212% | 16 | 8 |
| Launceston | 744 | 68813 | 1411 | 48.77 | 7 | URM | 5.226% | 5 | 12.725% | 1 | 4 |
| Meander Valley | 824 | 20037 | 3320 | 6.04 | 14 | UFS | 5.785% | 2 | 3.705% | 9 | -7 |
| Northern Midlands | 960 | 13598 | 5126 | 2.65 | 19 | RAV | 6.743% | 1 | 2.515% | 15 | -14 |
| Sorell | 340 | 16030 | 583 | 27.50 | 10 | RAV | 2.387% | 20 | 2.964% | 13 | 7 |
| Southern Midlands | 814 | 6400 | 2611 | 2.45 | 21 | RAL | 5.716% | 3 | 1.183% | 21 | -18 |
| Tasman | 205 | 2479 | 659 | 3.76 | 17 | RAM | 1.436% | 27 | 0.458% | 26 | 1 |
| Waratah-Wynyard | 539 | 13900 | 3526 | 3.94 | 16 | RAV | 3.785% | 12 | 2.570% | 14 | -2 |
| West Coast | 191 | 4132 | 9574 | 0.43 | 28 | RAM | 1.341% | 28 | 0.764% | 25 | 3 |
| West Tamar | 470 | 24423 | 690 | 35.40 | 8 | UFS | 3.300% | 16 | 4.516% | 7 | 9 |
| Total | 14242 | 540780 | 67912 | 7.9630 | | | 100.000% | | 100.000% | | |