

# Feasibility Assessment Framework

Developed by: Robert Potter

For: Mountain Bike Network – Tasmania

**February 2024**

# Introduction ↙

This Feasibility Assessment Framework provides a structured and consistent approach to determining the potential of a trail development proposal. It is developed by the Mountain Bike Network - Tasmania and made available by the MBNT to any organisation looking to develop mountain bike trails.

The Framework is made up of a weighted attribute scoring matrix and scoring guide.

The attributes included in the matrix impact the economy of trail development and maintenance, the quality of visitor experience, the competitiveness of MTB product in the domestic market, benefit provided and support of host communities. These have been assessed through observation, research and consultation with the trail industry, land managers, trail managers, business operators and tourism organisations involved in the development of MTB product in Tasmania.

The Feasibility Assessment Framework is broken down into:

- **ATTRIBUTES:** The broad categories of attributes that influence MTB product feasibility.
- **VARIABLES:** The variables that collectively establish the attributes that define MTB product feasibility.
- **DIMENSIONS:** Specified where a higher level of resolution and consideration of further factors is required to score variables.

While the Framework has been designed to help organisations assess the feasibility of MTB development proposals, it can be used to compare alternative development locations for the same product or alternative concepts within the same location.

This Feasibility Assessment Framework is intended to help organisations assess the value of a proposal in attracting or retaining visitors, but the matrix can easily be adapted to assess proposals for local or regional recreational developments.

# Requirements

Use of the Framework requires a proponent to specify the development area, a clearly articulated concept including specification of what kind of MTB product is being proposed and what market or market segment it is intended to appeal to even if that is identified as 'broad'.

Scoring of several attributes requires early engagement with the respective Government agencies and the host community.

To assess Demand, data or research demonstrating demand is required and the relationship between demand and the proposal demonstrated by the proponent.

External expertise may be required to accurately score some variables where proponents do not possess the relevant experience or understanding.

# Scoring

Feasibility Assessment is undertaken by completing the scoring matrix composed of the hierarchy of Attributes, Variables and Dimensions.

Where a calculation is required to produce a score, that is detailed in the attribute or variable column heading in the scoring matrix.

Some variables require engagement with Government agencies or communities to be scored accurately.

Where a variable is not applicable to a particular proposal, it may be omitted.

For dimensions and variables that require more specialised understanding, a detailed guide to scoring is provided. Despite this and depending on resources available, external expertise may be required to increase the accuracy of assessments of some variables.

# Score Weighting

Attributes have been assigned relative weighting to reflect the importance of each in establishing a competitive MTB product aligned with the Tasmanian MTB vision.

By working through the dimension scoring, then variable scoring, an attribute score is generated. This attribute score is then multiplied by the attribute weighting to produce a weighted attribute score. The weighted scores are then added to produce the proposal score.

# How it Works

## STEP 1: DIMENSION SCORE

For variables that are made up of multiple dimensions, score the dimensions using the guide.

---

## STEP 2: VARIABLE SCORE = average of dimension scores.

or for variables with no dimensions, just the variable score determined using the guide.

Score the variables using the guide. For variables without dimensions this is the variable score. For variables with dimensions, average the dimension score and this is the attribute score.

---

## STEP3: ATTRIBUTE SCORE = average of variable scores.

Average the variable score for each attribute. That is the attribute score.

---

## STEP 4: WEIGHTED ATTRIBUTE SCORE = attribute score x attribute weight.

Multiply the attribute score by the attribute weighting. That is the weighted attribute score.

---

## STEP 5: PROPOSAL FEASIBILITY SCORE = sum of weighted attribute scores.

Add all the weighted attribute scores together. That is the proposal feasibility score.

---

## STEP 6: PROPOSAL FEASIBILITY

Compare the proposal feasibility score to the Proposal Feasibility Score Guide.

# Scoring Matrix ↙

ATTRIBUTE	ATTRIBUTE WEIGHT	WEIGHTED ATTRIBUTE SCORE = ATTRIBUTE SCORE X ATTRIBUTE WEIGHT	ATTRIBUTE SCORE = AVERAGE OF VARIABLE SCORES	VARIABLE	VARIABLE SCORE = AVERAGE OF DIMENSIONS WHERE APPLICABLE	DIMENSION	DIMENSION SCORE
LEGISLATION	10%			TENURE			
				PLANS			
				VALUES			
LOCATION	20%			GEOLOGY		AREA	
				TOPOGRAPHY			
MARKET	40%			ENVIRONMENT			
				DEMONSTRATED DEMAND			
				BUSINESS MODEL			
				COMPLIMENTS AND DIVERSIFIES			
CONNECTIVITY	20%			UNIQUENESS		TRAIL/HOSPITALITY INTERFACE	
				HOSPITALITY AND TRANSPORT		HOSPITALITY CAPACITY	
						SHUTTLE ACCESS	
				DISTANCE		PROXIMITY TO POPULATIONS	
						EXISTING VISITOR FLOWS	
				COMPLIMENTARY ACTIVITIES			
				EMERGENCY SERVICE RESOURCES AND ACCESS			
COMMUNITY	10%			EVENTS			
				COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT			
				EXISTING RIDING COMMUNITY AND CULTURE			
PROPOSAL FEASIBILITY SCORE							

Proposal Feasibility Score Guide

SCORE RANGE	FEASIBILITY
0-4	LOW
5-7	MODERATE
7-10	HIGH

Scoring Guides ↙

# Legislation ↙

\*Requires engagement with Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania (PWS) or land manager where not PWS.

Legislative requirements not only determine whether MTB trail development is possible within an area, in areas where development is possible, they impact the cost, complexity and time required to advance a proposal.

Legislative requirements are generally correlated with the tenure type, any management plans in effect and natural or cultural heritage considerations including Aboriginal heritage values.

While legislation is assigned less weight in the scoring matrix it is the only attribute that in isolation can render a proposal unfeasible due to its location in an area where development is not possible or appropriate.

# Tenure

It is possible to quickly identify land tenure using [www.thelist.com](http://www.thelist.com) Add layer > Cadastre > Land Tenure.

Scoring of tenure and values should occur following engagement with the land manager, to ensure land manager support and to explore whether any factors relating to tenure, for example Management Plans and understood natural, cultural and social values could influence development.

There are other tenure types not listed and where a trail development is proposed across these areas, engagement with the land manager to understand whether development is possible and appropriate is advised.

Trail development is possible across a wide range of tenure types including private freehold. The most common tenure types across Tasmania that have supported MTB trail development are Reserved Land, Crown Land, Permanent Timber Production Zone Land (PTPZL) and Future Potential Production Forest Land (FPPFL).

The manager of Reserved land and FPPFL across Tasmania is the Parks and Wildlife Service (PWS). Proposed developments on land managed by the PWS including Crown Land are assessed through the Reserve Activity Assessment (RAA) process. There are three levels of RAA with the level of RAA required determined by the extent of the proposals impact on values. A guide to the RAA process is available at <https://parks.tas.gov.au/Documents/Guideline%20RAA%20process%20overview.pdf>

Sustainable Timber Tasmania (STT) manage PTPZL. At the time of developing this scoring guide (May 2023) STT have indicated that further development of MTB trail infrastructure on PTPZL will not be supported. Aside from existing and high-value trail areas that require access to PTPZL for expansion, even in the event of a change of position from STT, development is not recommended in PTPZL due to the incompatibility of visitor expectations and forestry activities.

Reserves are managed in accordance with the National Parks and Reserves Management Act 2002, the Nature Conservation Act 2002 and the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act.

The Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area (TWWHA) covers a range of Reserve types though for this purpose is included due to the additional complexity of assessments and approvals development within the TWWHA would require.

TENURE SCORING GUIDE						
<b>TENURE TYPE</b>	Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, National Park, Nature Reserve	Permanent Timber Production Zone Land	Conservation Area, Nature Recreation Area, Regional Reserve, State Reserve	Crown Land	Game Reserve, Historic Site.	Private Freehold
<b>ADMINISTERED BY</b>	Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania	Sustainable Timbers Tasmania	Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania	Crown Land Services/ Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania	Parks and Wildlife Service, Tasmania	Owner
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	0-2	NA	3-8	5-10	0-2	0-10
<b>COMPATIBILITY WITH MTB DEVELOPMENT</b>	Very Low Compatibility	Incompatible	Compatible	Compatible	Very low compatibility	Compatible
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTB trail development in these areas is not recommended and preference given to more passive recreation where a greater attention is given to the natural and cultural setting.</li> <li>Development of trail within the Recreation Zone of the TWWHA is possible and has occurred in the area occupied by Maydena Bike Park though this potential appears limited to that area.</li> <li>Development may be possible and appropriate within these Reserve classes in exceptional circumstances, conversely development of MTB trail within these areas may be precluded by legislation and present an impasse.</li> <li>Any trail developed within these areas should provide a more passive ride experience with the focus on utility or experience of the setting rather than a highly dynamic trail experience consistent with the Management Objectives of the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further trail development of PTPZL is not supported by STT and proposals requiring use of PTPZL are unlikely to advance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This group of Reserve classes is generally compatible with the development of MTB infrastructure to attend to recreational and market demand.</li> <li>Within these Reserves areas of significant natural and cultural values are likely, and engagement with the Parks and Wildlife Service is strongly advised to understand these values and ensure a proposal minimises avoidable impacts.</li> <li>Proposed developments these Reserves will require a Reserve Activity Assessment (RAA). The level and complexity of the RAA is determined by PWS based on the significance of values and impact of a proposal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unallocated Crown land, with low natural and cultural values is a good tenure type for MTB development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The management objectives of these two Reserve types are considered incompatible with MTB development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where a development is proposed by the owner of the development location, this should score highly.</li> <li>Public development on private freehold through lease or agreement should be scored to reflect the security and assurance of ongoing access the trail proponent will have over the developed trail.</li> </ul>

# Plans

PLANS SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In addition to the various Acts defining management objectives and responsibilities, there may be a Management Plan in effect for a Reserve and these may impact the viability of trail development beyond the requirements of the various Acts.</li><li>• Scoring of statutory and non-statutory requires engagement with the land manager.</li><li>• Higher scores should reflect compatibility with any plans in place and lower scores with incompatibility and increased assessment and approval complexity.</li></ul>

# Values

VALUES SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Generally, areas of higher Reserve status reflect higher natural and cultural values and should be considered less compatible with trail development.</li><li>• Progressing proposals in these areas involves far greater assessment and approval complexity, greater cost, higher risks of community opposition, is less consistent with the Tasmanian MTB Vision and presents a potential risk to Tasmanian MTB brand.</li><li>• Even in lower Reserve classifications, the presence of significant values that would be impacted by trail development are likely.</li><li>• Desk top review of available information and engagement with the land manager is strongly recommended. Where there are previously recorded sites of cultural or natural significance in an area, they should be avoided by proposed development.</li><li>• If Aboriginal or European cultural heritage sites are known to occur within the proposed development area, early engagement with the Aboriginal community and PWS is essential.</li><li>• Proposals should score highly where recorded values are not impacted by a proposal and where values assessments have not been undertaken previously, advice indicates significant natural or cultural values are unlikely to exist in the proposal area.</li></ul>

# Location ↙

The physical attributes of an area are critical to determining the type and quality of trail experiences developed in it. Key location variables that impact trail development are geology, topography and the experience the natural environment provides.

# Geology

Geology has a significant impact on the experience trails provide as well as the development and maintenance costs.

Tasmania offers a range of geology types conducive to the development of high-quality trail experiences.

The following guide differentiates between different geology types and some soil properties defined by particle size. These distinctions have been chosen due to the role each plays on rider experience and development and maintenance cost.

The guide that follows is not exhaustive and does require a basic understanding of geology and soils.

Determining the geology and soils occurring across a development area is best done through observation on the ground though high level information is available at [www.thelist.tas.gov.au](http://www.thelist.tas.gov.au) Add layer > Geology and Soils > Geology > Geological Polygons 25/250K.

Many trail areas, particularly extensive trail networks will traverse a range of geology and soil types. Averaging of scores is recommended in that case in a manner that reflects the proportion of each geological/soil type.

GEOLOGY SCORING GUIDE					
GEOLOGY TYPE	Granite	Mudstone, Siltstone	Quartz, conglomerate and siliceous gravels	Dolerite, basalt.	Sands, silt and clayey sands.
SCORING RANGE	5-10	3-8	3-7	1-7	0-7
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Granite produces rocks and soils conducive to high quality riding experiences and relative to other geology types, lower construction and maintenance costs.</li> <li>There may be some reduced compatibility between granite areas and trail style where there is a greater presence of surface or bedrock which reduces the ability to create trail styles requiring more earth moving. For example, beginner and jump trails in rocky areas.</li> <li>There is a range of soils with different properties that may be encountered in areas of granite. Generally, those that are deeper profiles and have higher plasticity (clay content) are better suited to trails. Shallow soils that are sandy with low plasticity are not as desirable.</li> <li>As for other geology types, shallow granite soils over-lying bedrock will limit the style of trail that can be constructed and increase maintenance issues through springs and seeps. This is more likely at higher elevation where there has been less soil accumulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mudstone and siltstone, where sufficient moisture is present can provide an excellent riding experience and a good medium for larger scale jump and flow trails.</li> <li>Construction and maintenance costs in these areas is typically low when appropriate consideration is given to minimizing trail gradients and need for braking is reduced through trail design.</li> <li>In dry areas, these soils may degrade quickly and are moderately prone to erosion, where there is sufficient rainfall and ground moisture.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This range of loose gravels with low plasticity (ability to be formed into shapes) is common across much of the West Coast with smaller areas elsewhere.</li> <li>They limit the style of trail that can be constructed and is less suitable for the development of beginner trails due to the loose surface they typically produce. Is better suited to more natural style trails with few constructed features.</li> <li>The free-draining characteristics enable year round riding in wetter climates, again typical of the West Coast across which they are found.</li> <li>They are highly erodible and reducing the maximum sustainable trail grades though this can be mitigated where bedrock is available to use as trail tread.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dolerite and basalt produce dense, compact and often clayey soils that are stable and erosion resistant.</li> <li>Across Reserved land the rocky, shallow clayey soils typical of dolerite and basalt areas increases construction and maintenance costs as well as reducing trail experience for most users across most types of trail.</li> <li>Dolerite and basalt soils are prone to issues related to sub-surface water movement, saturation and liquification of clays, springs and seeps that require costly mitigation approaches to provide year-round riding.</li> <li>More natural trail styles are better suited to these areas rather than large-scale jump or flow trails that require large cuts and fill.</li> <li>Developing trails in areas of dolerite and basalt is best restricted to where there is high demand and areas of other geology are not available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This group is based on soil properties rather than a single parent material and is included due to impact the range of characteristics of this group has on trail development and rider experience.</li> <li>The properties are determined by particle size; that is the proportions of sand, silt and clay, and their behaviour varies with climate/moisture.</li> <li>Silts and sands with no clay content (and plasticity) irrespective of climate are not suitable for MTB trail without costly approaches to stabilise them and would only be advised.</li> <li>Clayey sands can make pleasant riding surfaces though tend to degrade quickly in dry conditions</li> </ul>

# Topography

Topography describes the landforms that make up an area and is defined by dimensions including the area available, aspect (which direction slopes face), gradient (how steep or flat an area is, the severity of a slope), and elevation range.

TOPOGRAPHY SCORING GUIDE				
DIMENSION	AREA	ASPECT	ELEVATION	GRADIENT
SCORING RANGE	0-10	0-10	0-10	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An area of sufficient size with attributes conducive to development of the proposed product and anticipating future expansion should be available.</li> <li>A larger development area will allow greater flexibility with trail design and construction reducing the need for different trails to intersect or compete for optimal conditions.</li> <li>A buffer beyond the initial proposal should exist and reflect the maximum future development area and aspirations.</li> <li>Limits to the available area may include different tenure types, areas with topographic attributes incompatible with the proposed development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The aspect of a slope or the range of slopes that make up an area determines how much of any prevailing weather and the amount of sunlight an area receives.</li> <li>Northerly slopes receive most sunlight and consequently maintain higher evaporation rates which assists with keeping trails dry through wetter months.</li> <li>For areas of lower rainfall and for soils that are fragile when dry, avoiding northerly aspects is preferable. As most development areas will encompass multiple slopes with different aspects scoring should reflect the range and proportions of different aspects across the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elevation range, also described as relief is the difference between the highest and lowest points within a landscape.</li> <li>Different elevation ranges are better suited to different trails and riders.</li> <li>Generally, access to a wide elevation range is well suited to most developments that will involve a range of trails of different difficulty levels.</li> <li>The development of shuttle products and gravity trails is best achieved with more than 300 metres elevation.</li> <li>Easy/beginner shuttle products are better suited to smaller elevation ranges in recognition of the lower fitness and confidence and the benefits of providing more frequent access to services for these riders. This can be achieved through easier trails being located at lower elevations and in the case of shuttle products, having shuttle drop-off points accessing easier trails part way up the available elevation.</li> <li>The greater the elevation range and the consistency of slopes increases the continuity and for many riders the appeal of shuttle and gravity products. While trails that traverse large elevation ranges will lead to many riders stopping to regroup or rest part way down the hill, most riders will prefer that over multiple, short descents broken up by climbs or by more frequent shuttles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gradient is the steepness of a slope. Depending on the type of trail experience proposed and the geology of an area, different gradient slopes may be best suited to the purpose. For proposals including a range of trails of different styles and TDR, a range of gradients is preferred.</li> <li>Steeper slopes (20-50%) enable steeper trail gradients which are suitable for more advanced trails where geology and other factors support their sustainability.</li> <li>Gentler slopes (15-30%) are better suited to easy/beginner trails as they reduce exposure of the sides of trails and allow greater flexibility in design and construction specifically wider radius switchback corner with small elevation changes through the corner.</li> <li>Flat areas are generally undesirable as they may present drainage problems and a dull riding experience.</li> </ul>

# Environment

ENVIRONMENT SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The environment in which a trail is located contributes significantly to the experience the trail provides and environment type is a common way to differentiate between trail experiences and destinations. Trails appealing to visitors and competitive in the destination market combine engaging trail dynamics, appropriate to the rider with high quality natural or aesthetic settings.</li><li>• Trails appealing to visitors and competitive in the destination market combine engaging trail dynamics, appropriate to the rider with high quality natural or aesthetic settings.</li><li>• Examples of high-quality natural experiences are intact (or appearing intact) environments with little evidence of human activity outside of the trail corridor.</li><li>• Trails should seek to provide experience of viewpoints natural features like creeks, rivers, waterfalls, rock formations, coastlines, mountains, vegetation communities,</li><li>• While some trail styles, like dynamic gravity trails rely less on their setting to create quality riding experiences, a high-quality setting will still further enhance the experience these trails provide.</li><li>• Future development should seek to provide visitors access and experience of unique Tasmanian environments not currently accessible by MTB where it is appropriate as a way of diversifying our product offering.</li><li>• Trail development should seek areas that provide strong aesthetic experiences within low conservation significance areas avoiding areas of significant natural and cultural values. This minimises environmental impacts, reduces approval and assessment complexity, and increases the likelihood of a proposal achieving social license.</li></ul>

# Market ↙

Market assessment considers the relationship between the proposal and market demand, the range of existing Tasmanian MTB product as well as alignment with the Tasmanian and regional Brands.

# Demonstrated Demand

\*Requires supporting data or research.

DEMONSTRATED DEMAND SCORING GUIDE	
SCORE RANGE	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstration of demand requires a proposal to specify the nature of the proposed product, the market or market segment it appeals to and the fit of the proposal to that market.</li><li>• As detailed information describing market behaviours and opportunities is limited, proponents may need to undertake primary research to determine demand. This approach has been pursued by other destinations around Australia and demonstrates the increasing competitiveness and sophistication in approaches.</li></ul>

# Business Model

BUSINESS MODEL SCORING GUIDE	
SCORE RANGE	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A sustainable MTB industry must be economically sustainable. Proponents should describe the business model for the proposed trail development including how ongoing operating costs will be met.</li><li>• Data describing demand is required to model visitation and revenue. Without an understanding of demand, any modelling or projections will be less robust and should be scored lower.</li><li>• Operating costs including trail maintenance, ongoing development and trail renewal must be assessed and related to income attributed to the proposal.</li><li>• Proposals relying on indirect economic benefit to broader community should be scored lower within the range, though commitment to measuring visitation and economic benefit through reliable mechanisms may increase the score and serve to maintain community support.</li><li>• Proposals should score more highly where revenue sources are specified, and their contribution assessed. This may be through per-rider fees, shuttle license fees, trail lease fees, event income or other novel income streams.</li></ul>

# Compliments and Diversifies

COMPLIMENTS AND DIVERSIFIES SCORING GUIDE	
SCORE RANGE	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Further trail development of MTB product should seek to compliment and diversify the collective Tasmanian offering rather than duplicating or competing with existing destinations.</li><li>• Proposals should be aligned with visitors expectations of Tasmania, the identity and strategy of the region within which it is proposed.</li><li>• Proposals should score highly where they can be demonstrated to differ from existing Tasmanian MTB product and increase the breadth of our collective offering.</li><li>• This may be achieved through developing trails of different style, trails in different unique Tasmanian environments or targeting particular market segments.</li></ul>

# Uniqueness

UNIQUENESS SCORING GUIDE	
SCORE RANGE	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Uniqueness considers a proposals uniqueness in an increasingly competitive and diverse national MTB destination market.</li><li>• It is possible to establish a unique proposal by proposing a unique trail style, a trail in a unique environment or a unique combination of those two factors. As there are already a broad range of trail styles across the range of existing Tasmanian MTB destinations, differentiation based on the environment in which a proposal is located is the most straightforward approach to achieving a unique product.</li><li>• Proposals scoring highly in this dimension should seek to provide novel trail experiences in unique natural or cultural Tasmanian settings.</li><li>• Proposals may also demonstrate uniqueness through offering a different type of trail or targeting a particular market segment.</li><li>• Examples of this may be easy/beginner trails developed for non-MTB riders in an area with existing visitor flows, a focus on descending jump/freeride trails for the full range of rider abilities or multi-day/backcountry singletrack routes.</li></ul>

# Connectivity ↙

Assessment of connectivity involves understanding a proposals accessibility for visitors, the availability of complimentary experiences, whether there are existing visitor flows that product can be developed to appeal to and the demands on Emergency Services resources and their ease of access in the event of incidents.

# Hospitality And Transport

HOSPITALITY AND TRANSPORT SCORING GUIDE			
DIMENSION	TRAIL/HOSPITALITY INTERFACE	HOSPITALITY CAPACITY	SHUTTLE ACCESS
SCORING RANGE	0-10	0-10	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Riders generally prefer 'ride-in, ride-out' hospitality options around trail networks as it increases convenience and provides a more immersive destination experience.</li> <li>The greater the distance from accommodation and hospitality options, the greater the risk that riders will not engage with these businesses or the host community.</li> <li>Observation of visitor behaviour across Tasmanian destinations indicates the optimal distance from hospitality options to the trailhead is surprisingly short at less than 1km. Beyond this distance riders may seek to use vehicle transport, reducing their experience and increasing the likelihood of them engaging with businesses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trail development proposals must consider the existing hospitality capacity of an area, whether it is already at capacity and if so, whether there is potential to develop further capacity.</li> <li>Some level of existing supply is recommended to enable visitation while demand for additional product is demonstrated and developed.</li> <li>MTB visitors benefit from a range of hospitality offerings though all should be reflective of their location and ideally a unique experience that adds to their overall destination experience.</li> <li>Scoring should reflect the type and alignment of existing offerings and ease or likelihood of additional product development to service increase demand.</li> <li>A proposal should score lower where existing hospitality capacity is limited and there are barriers to further development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shuttling is the activity of transporting riders by vehicle to the start of trails. This can include delivering riders to the start and finish of point-to-point trails but is generally referring to transport riders from the bottom of a trail network to higher elevations, ideally to the highest point accessed by trails.</li> <li>Shuttles allow riders to spend a greater amount of time descending than climbing which is attractive to most riders and having a shuttle increases the range of visitors that a trail or network may appeal to.</li> <li>Shuttles provide a direct business opportunity and provide an opportunity for Government trail managers to generate revenue through licensing and per rider fees that can be applied to trail management and maintenance.</li> <li>Shuttles require a suitable 'shuttle-road' that connects a lower trail head to the start of descending trails. Development of a shuttle road, where one doesn't exist is usually very expensive relative to the cost of MTB trail development and construction of a shuttle road may reduce the resources available for actual trails.</li> <li>The quality of a shuttle road is determined by its surface, gradient, capacity and directness. A surfaced road, suitable for larger capacity vehicles and that is direct, reducing the time the riders spend in the vehicle.</li> <li>Roads that are rough, tight, or too steep for 2wd and larger capacity vehicles or are indirect are less desirable.</li> <li>Shuttles are less attractive where riders are required to climb any significant distance from the upper shuttle drop-off.</li> <li>Where a shuttle road does not exist and is relevant to the trail proposal, a score should reflect the cost and complexity of the road development.</li> </ul>

# Distance

DISTANCE SCORING GUIDE		
DIMENSION	PROXIMITY TO POPULATIONS	EXISTING VISITOR FLOWS
SCORING RANGE	0-10	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to populations is a measure of the ease and efficiency with which the proposed product can be accessed from the visitors location of origin.</li> <li>This should include consideration of directness of flight routes, distance of the proposal from Tasmanian points of entry and distance from Tasmanian major centres.</li> <li>The greater the cost and complexity of accessing a destination, the higher quality and more unique it must be to successfully attract visitors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the proposed trails intersect or overlap with other popular tourist attractions, tourist routes or non-mountain bike activities, it can create synergies and attract a broader range of visitors.</li> <li>Existing visitor flows where visitors are drawn to an area by other attractions present an additional opportunity to provide mountain bike products for visitors whose primary purpose of travel is not mountain biking.</li> <li>Flows of non-MTB visitors can also increase the viability of hospitality businesses.</li> <li>Non-MTB visitors require a higher level of support and services including bike-hire, guiding and transport which reflect direct economic opportunities.</li> </ul>

# Complimentary Activities

COMPLIMENTARY ACTIVITIES SCORING GUIDE	
SCORE RANGE	0-10
CONSIDERATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Even the most enthusiastic mountain bike rider will not ride all day, nor every day of a longer visit.</li> <li>A range of complimentary experiences in the local area or within the Region increase the appeal of a riding destination and can increase the duration of stay.</li> <li>Complimentary activities also increase the range of visitors a destination may appeal to by providing opportunities for non-riding visitors.</li> <li>Complimentary activities well aligned with mountain bike visitors include: bushwalking, hiking, kayaking, winery, distillery and brewery visits, museums and visiting cultural heritage sites.</li> <li>Complimentary activities should be scored to reflect the alignment of options, number of options and accessibility.</li> </ul>

# Emergency Service Resources and Access

\*Requires engagement with Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Management.

EMERGENCY SERVICE RESOURCES AND ACCESS SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This assessment should also consider the Emergency Service resources available locally, their distance relative to the proposed development area and the transit time to advance care facilities in the major population centres.</li> <li>• Access involves an understanding of how close to the proposed trails is it possible to access with a standard ambulance, the time required to transport patients on foot or stretcher from potential incident locations on trails to ambulance access and the feasibility of helicopter access which must include recognition of common weather limitations and the availability of approved winch and landing locations.</li> <li>• To score highly, higher risk trails like jump and more difficult trails with potential for greater consequence and higher volume trails should be located close to good vehicle access.</li> <li>• Areas with good local resourcing, are close to advanced care/major centres, provide easy access for ambulances, that locate high risk trails close to access routes/roads and that present few limitations for helicopter extractions should be scored highly.</li> </ul>

## Events

EVENTS SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events provide a valuable opportunity to increase the profile of a destination and high-profile, large-scale participation or spectator events provide significant direct economic benefit.</li> <li>• Events can be used to leverage further development or infrastructure improvements that can enhance destination appeal.</li> <li>• Different event types require different types of trail infrastructure and there are some incompatibilities that must be considered for example a multi-day stage race will require a certain volume of trails in an appropriate format and Enduro WC cannot be held on an isolated point to point trail.</li> <li>• Event compatibility must consider the capacity of the trail infrastructure to support events of different types, the availability of facilities required to conduct events including staging areas, spectator transport, parking and trail access, sufficient hospitality capacity to service anticipated visitor volumes and communications infrastructure for media.</li> </ul>

# Community ↙

Community engagement and an existing mountain bike community can influence the success of mountain bike trail development for visitors by increasing community support and investment, ensuring that planning benefits from local expertise, increases the likelihood of advocacy for further development, it contributes to a welcoming environment for visitors and contributes to the uniqueness and authenticity of a visiting riders experience.

# Community Support And Engagement

\*Requires community consultation.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engaging with the local community allows stakeholders to provide input and express their opinions on the proposed development.</li> <li>By actively listening to community members' perspectives, project proponents can better understand potential issues and work collaboratively to find solutions. This proactive approach helps build trust, minimizes opposition, and promotes a more harmonious relationship between the project and the community.</li> <li>Gaining community support is vital for the long-term success and sustainability of the mountain bike development. When the community is engaged and involved in the planning process, they are more likely to feel a sense of ownership and pride in the project, it can increase local participation, and contribute to a more welcoming atmosphere for visitors.</li> <li>Mountain bike developments inevitably involve environmental and cultural impacts. Engaging with the community helps identify and address these concerns. By involving local environmental groups, indigenous communities, and other stakeholders, project proponents can incorporate sustainable practices, preserve cultural heritage, and minimize adverse effects on the natural environment. Community engagement ensures that the project is aligned with the values and aspirations of the local community.</li> <li>Engaging with local businesses allows project proponents to understand the community's economic needs and develop strategies to maximize the positive impact on the local economy.</li> <li>Community support is essential for the long-term success and sustainability of the mountain bike development. By maintaining a positive relationship with the community, project proponents can ensure ongoing support, collaboration, and the ability to address any emerging issues or challenges.</li> <li>For proposals independent of population centres/communities broader community support at a state/industry level should be assessed and scored.</li> </ul>

# Existing Riding Community And Culture

EXISTING RIDING COMMUNITY AND CULTURE SCORING GUIDE	
<b>SCORE RANGE</b>	<b>0-10</b>
<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MTB development to increase visitor activity benefits from and can provide benefit to local communities.</li> <li>The experience of visitors is enhanced by a local riding community and the opportunities it provides to engage authentically with local riding culture.</li> <li>A local riding community can also support the range of business that develop to service visiting riders.</li> <li>Where there is not any existing riding community proposals may address this through provision of infrastructure and development programs to support beginner riders and develop a local MTB community and culture.</li> <li>For proposals isolated from population centres, that is without local community, this variable may be omitted.</li> </ul>

# Example: Bluederby

ATTRIBUTE	ATTRIBUTE WEIGHT	WEIGHTED ATTRIBUTE SCORE = ATTRIBUTE SCORE X ATTRIBUTE WEIGHT	ATTRIBUTE SCORE = AVERAGE OF VARIABLE SCORES	VARIABLE	VARIABLE SCORE = AVERAGE OF DIMENSIONS OR VARIABLE SCORE	DIMENSION	DIMENSION SCORE		
LEGISLATION	10%	0.93	9.3	TENURE	8				
				PLANS	10				
				VALUES	10				
LOCATION	20%	1.84	9.2	GEOLOGY	10			AREA	3
				TOPOGRAPHY	7.8			ASPECT	9
								ELEVATION	9
						GRADIENT	10		
				ENVIRONMENT	10				
MARKET	40%	2.8	7	DEMONSTRATED DEMAND	7				
				BUSINESS MODEL	2				
				COMPLIMENTS AND DIVERSIFIES	9				
				UNIQUENESS	8				
CONNECTIVITY 20%	20%	1.3	6.5	HOSPITALITY AND TRANSPORT	7.6	TRAIL/HOSPITALITY INTERFACE	10		
						HOSPITALITY CAPACITY	8		
						SHUTTLE ACCESS	5		
				DISTANCE	8	PROXIMITY TO POPULATIONS	8		
						EXISTING VISITOR FLOWS	8		
				COMPLIMENTARY ACTIVITIES	3				
				EMERGENCY SERVICE RESOURCES AND ACCESS	5				
				EVENTS	9				
COMMUNITY	10%	0.55	5.5	COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT	5				
				EXISTING RIDING COMMUNITY AND CULTURE	1				
PROPOSAL FEASIBILITY SCORE		HIGH 7.42							

