

EXAMPLES OF RATINGS (SHORT AUDIT)

ASPECT	A = Acceptable (Standard met)	NI = Needs improvement (Moderate risk)	D = Dangerous (High risk)
1. Responsible party	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STMS/TC is at attended site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC at attended site but STMS arrives after allowed time limit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No STMS/TC at attended site, or No STMS responsible for the site
2. TMP (only for attended sites)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TMP on site, and Appropriate to the situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TMP on site, and Appropriate to the situation, but There are some safety issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TMP not on site, or TMP not appropriate to situation
3. High-visibility garment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worn by all Done up Condition acceptable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worn by all, and All high-visibility garments done, and Condition of high-visibility garments marginal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not everyone wearing high-visibility garments, or Some high-visibility garments not done up, or High-visibility garments have unacceptable condition
4. Signs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All necessary signs present Correct order and distances Conflicting signs covered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some signs are either missing, of poor quality, or inadequate distance and visibility, but An adequate message given to motorists, or Some conflicting signs not covered, or Some signs not well supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some signs are either missing, not visible or conflict with other signs, or blown over, or Motorists are not reasonably warned; causing a hazard to road users
5. Delineation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects working space/other features Taper lengths compliant Spacings of cones close enough Sufficient positive traffic control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects working space/other features but could be better, or Taper lengths should be longer, or Cone spacings need to be reduced, or Not sufficient positive traffic control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not protect working space/other features, or Does not provide sufficient positive traffic control
6. Pedestrian needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Footpath widths OK Surfaces and ramps in place Appropriate protection provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe passage for pedestrians but footpath width could be greater, ramps and surfaces could be better, entry point could be more obvious 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient footpath widths, or No safe passage for pedestrians, or Surfaces not suitable for pedestrians, or Pedestrians forced onto road close to fast traffic or past a dangerous site without sufficient protection Pedestrians not using option provided
7. Cyclist needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle widths OK Surfaces OK Safe passage provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safe passage provided for cyclists, but Widths need to be greater, or Surfaces need to be better, or Signage more appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle widths not acceptable, or No safe passage for cyclists provided, or Surfaces not suitable for cyclists, or No positive traffic management to enable cyclists to merge
8. Traffic needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient lane widths OK Speed limit appropriate No significant delays Surfaces OK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lane widths not narrow enough for positive traffic management needs, or Too narrow and causing a nuisance, or Some unnecessary delays Surfaces rough and uneven 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lane widths causing hazard by failing to positively control traffic, or Speed limit not appropriate to site, or Surfaces unacceptably rough
9. Property access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupants well catered for and informed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some minor access difficulties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serious access difficulties