Minutes - Working group discussion - Mission Bay safety improvements (1)

Date:	15 May 2019
Time:	13.00 – 15.00
Venue:	Function room at Good George 71 Tamaki Drive, Mission Bay
Attendees:	Andrew Allen, AT EGM Service Delivery Andrew Garratt, AT Principal Trans. Eng. [redacted], Chair Business Assoc. [redacted], Business Assoc. Councillor Desley Simpson Randhir Karma, AT EGM Safety (Acting) [redacted], Chair Residents Assoc. [redacted], Business Assoc. Carmel Claridge, Orakei Local Board Amanda Miller, AT (minutes)
Apologies:	Alix Crosbie, Auckland Council

Item		Responsible
1	**Purpose and how we work together**	
1.1	**Purpose** - A forum to consider community feedback and investigate options on how we can effectively make changes to the proposed design that reflects and addresses the concerns of the community. This may result in additional consultation, the process will be something that is worked through with the working group. **Going Forward** - The working group (and community) would like to understand the safety risks, where they are and how they will be addressed: - Evidence supporting the engineering safety interventions needs to be verified by an independent road safety expert before the working group can consider any design changes for the town centre. - When reviewing designs, feedback themes identified in the consultation feedback will be taken into consideration. **Key Messages** - AT is working together with the community. AT agree to allow sufficient time for the working group to get back to its members prior to any changes being adopted.	

	- The Mission Bay road safety improvement proposal is discontinued in its current form. Following the public consultation feedback and independent review, the parties will work together to achieve a desired outcome. - The project timeframes for the proposed engineering improvements will be reset by the group following the outcome of the independent review. This will allow the time required to work through the evidence with the working group and agree on the best way forward. - Media. It was agreed that any media statements to be made by any of the working group parties would be aligned with the "keep it simple" principle. - Once minutes have been circulated and agreed by the working group, then the content may be discussed wider. - Agreed that Mission Bay is a community with a wider footprint. It is slightly different to St Heliers in that Mission Bay receives many visitors (a popular weekend destination) and also experiences through traffic. **Concerns raised** in relation to the consultation and feedback received. - There was a general feel from the community that the consultation process did not highlight why AT was proposing the changes, what the problems were, and what evidence there was to support the changes. - Concern that some feedback may be diluted, as the consultation did not clearly articulate that the consultation process was two-fold, namely speed bylaw and safety improvements for the town centre. - During the meeting Andrew acknowledged that with the value of hindsight, AT could have done a better job of consulting with the local community and key stakeholders particularly with respect to the rationale for change (i.e. the problem and evidence underpinning the proposal).	
2	**Terms of reference and proposed action plan**	

2.1	AT are in the process of drafting a Terms of Reference (ToR) for an independent road safety expert to review the evidence and basis for the need for the proposed engineering safety improvements.
	- AT will share the draft ToR with the working group for comment and input.
	  ▪ The ToR to articulate what evidence will need to be included within the review.
	- Once the ToR is agreed, AT will go to market to engage an independent road safety expert and share with the working group which independent road safety expert has been appointed.
	  ▪ Independent, road safety experts will be excluded if they have previously been employed by AT to do work on the speed management programme, or have submitted feedback on the consulted proposal.
	- The scope of work will be to review the evidence supporting the need for road safety engineering improvements.
	  ▪ The scope of work does not include reviewing the proposed design that was consulted on.	

	▪ Objective is to establish the base line data from which the working group will work from. A single source of truth, i.e. not based solely from crash data but to include traffic flow data and pedestrian counts. ▪ Independent review will take into consideration future and historical data, and risk. ▪ It is proposed to have the same independent road safety expert undertake the work for both Mission Bay and St Heliers to ensure a consistent matrix.	
2.2	Proposed plan and timeframes agreed by the working group. - ToR to be circulated next week (20-24 May) - Allow 10 – 14 days for the working group to review and provide comments. Comments will be submitted via email - If there is a specific concern that cannot be addressed via email, a working group meeting will be convened. - Once the ToR is agreed, AT will go to market to source the independent road safety expert. - Before the independent expert is appointed, the short list will be brought back the group for input and support. - A one month selection process is expected from going to market and shortlisting a consultant. - During the evidence based investigation, the independent road safety expert will meet with the working group. - Once review is completed, the working group will then be in a position to commence phase two (expect late July, early August).	
2.3	Consultation Feedback AT are currently analysing approximately 900 submissions. AT anticipate that the review will be completed by mid-June. Themes and sub themes have been identified. Submission data will be shared with the working group, and then with the public. It was noted at the meeting that there was some confusion between the consultation on the speed limit bylaw and the proposed infrastructure improvements. Auckland Speed Limits Bylaw AT is currently reviewing and analysing all feedback from the public consultation on the proposed Speed Limits Bylaw. The proposal will be submitted to the AT Board in July 2019 for a decision. Some members of the working group would like AT to consider excluding Mission Bay from the proposed Speed Limits Bylaw. The working group is currently working in good faith that AT will be reviewing and considering public feedback on the proposal. This was considered an important perception point for the public.	

	It was suggested at the meeting that in the spirit of working together in good faith, that the AT Board acknowledge and consider the process (working group and evidence review) and the outcome prior to making a decision on the speed limit bylaw for Mission Bay. **Action:** Andrew A to discuss with CE and Executive.	AA
3	**Vision zero – rational for change / mandate from Central Govt.**	
3.1	AT's Safe Systems Approach – a safe road system increasingly free of death and serious injury. - AT have adopted the internationally recognised Safe System approach, which has been effective in reducing death and serious injuries. This has been endorsed by the AT Board and is part of the Central Government and Auckland Council mandate for road safety as a top priority. The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) have also adopted this approach, and it forms part of the NZTA Speed Management Guideline. - The Safe System approach looks at identifying key components of a transport system and road user behaviours that can be improved on to make the system more forgiving so that when people make mistakes it does not cost their life. Most crashes are caused by people making mistakes. Regardless of what causes a crash, if speeds are lower the severity of the crash is reduced and survivability is increased. - Exposure in town centres is higher for pedestrians and other vulnerable road users due to their high numbers. - The working group reviewed and discussed briefly the Safe System Assessment Framework and the score resulting from the existing conditions in Mission Bay and the revised score should the proposed engineering improvements be introduced. (appendix 1) ▪ Confirmed that when the working group is reviewing the design solutions, it will have the ability to test different scenarios against the Safe Systems Assessment ratings. The tool does have the ability to analyse and give new scores against changes in a design. ▪ It was discussed that reducing the score of the existing infrastructure in the Safe Systems Assessment is only one part of the equation. The working group will need to take into consideration cost, and how we manage any potential unintended consequences. ▪ It was also discussed how important is it to reduce the existing Safe Systems Assessment risk score as this takes into account the risks of vulnerable road users in Mission Bay. The working group feel that there have been zero deaths and few serious injuries on the roads in Mission Bay during the past five years. - The working group also reviewed and discussed the results of the pedestrian surveys undertaken during April 2019 (appendix 2)	

	- At the meeting the Safe System Assessment Framework (SSAF) was discussed and there was some scepticism at the meeting about the appropriateness of it as the basis for review.	
3.2	A 30km speed reduction is proposed in town centres but a 40km speed limit is present around schools. Were school children not our most vulnerable users? - The 40km speed limit around schools was implemented at the time when the rules and statutory framework supporting the setting of speed limits dictated this outcome. The Speed Limits Bylaw is a three year programme and safe speeds at schools will be reviewed in subsequent years.	
	Action Items Summary	
	Andrew to speak with the CE and Executive regarding Mission Bay speed reduction exception.	AA
Next Meeting - tbc		

Meeting closed at 15.00