

6 September 2021

Bevan Woodward  
[fyi-request-16350-3539f595@requests.fyi.org.nz](mailto:fyi-request-16350-3539f595@requests.fyi.org.nz)

REF: OIA-8631

Dear Bevan

**Request made under the Official Information Act 1982**

Thank you for your email of 9 August 2021 requesting the following information under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act):

- 1) ***This Herald article: <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/auckland-harbour-bridge-can-no-longer-be-strengthened-traffic-could-be-restricted-says-nzta/5D65SRWXVHIMTRTSEMO2MQFQCI/> states "A November briefing paper to Transport Minister Michael Wood warned the "loading restrictions" would be needed within the next 20 years". Please provide:***
  - a. ***a copy of the November briefing paper to Transport Minister Michael Wood***

The November briefing paper referred to is attached as Attachment 1 – BRI-2066 AWHC briefing note. Certain information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act to protect the privacy of natural persons.

- b. ***a copy of the technical advice to NZTA that advises the AHB cannot be further strengthened***

Section 6.1 of the 'SkyPath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report – AHB Alliance (10 December 2014) includes advice on previous strengthening of the extension bridges to their maximum feasible capacity. A copy of the report is provided as Attachment 2. Certain information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act to protect the privacy of natural persons. Please note the report is based upon Box Girder Strengthening design completed in 2009.

- c. ***a copy of the most recent load capacity study (draft or finalised) and any peer reviews prepared for NZTA.***

The 'SkyPath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report – AHB Alliance' (10 December 2014) is the most recent study for the AHB extension bridges' live load capacity to carry traffic, walking and cycling loads.

- 2) ***Please specify what work NZTA has been had done to determine the actual measured differential temperature effects on the AHB Box Girders, including;***
  - a. ***providing a copy of the report on the details of the work and the results***

Section 4.3 of the 'SkyPath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report – AHB Alliance' summarises the assessment of temperature effects on the AHB box girders in accordance with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency standards. This report includes a summary of results from the assessment in Appendix D.

Points 4 and 5 in the letter 'AHB SkyPath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report Comments – Beca' (20 April 2015) address the query of measurements of differential temperature on the AHB, which supported the use of the relevant standards.

- b. *advising whether such work has been used to update the load capacity studies (in particular that referred to in 1(c) above) done for NZTA?***

No further work has been done to update load capacity studies.

- 3) *At the NZTA Board meeting on 20 August 2018, management advised the SkyPath design was “a buildable project, which can run in conjunction with vehicles, subject to the need to control flow.” (See page 14:***

***[http://www.getacross.org.nz/uploads/1/2/2/8/122895821/nzta\\_board\\_minutes-20180820\\_pg\\_14.pdf](http://www.getacross.org.nz/uploads/1/2/2/8/122895821/nzta_board_minutes-20180820_pg_14.pdf)***

- a. *Please provide the technical reports to support this advice to the NZTA Board.***

Section 7.1 of the 'SkyPath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report – AHB Alliance' (10 December 2014) includes a summary of load limits assessed for the proposed SkyPath design.

- b. *What consideration was given to adopting the AHB strengthening solution prepared by Holmes Consulting Group in order to remove the requirement for “the need to control flow” for the SkyPath design?***

***[http://www.getacross.org.nz/uploads/1/2/2/8/122895821/ahb\\_strengthening\\_for\\_nzta\\_-\\_holmes.pdf](http://www.getacross.org.nz/uploads/1/2/2/8/122895821/ahb_strengthening_for_nzta_-_holmes.pdf)***

'AHB Cycleway – Holmes Submission' (8 September 2009) considers the concept by Holmes Consulting Group in relation to connecting the Auckland Harbour Bridge extension bridges to the truss bridge.

- 4) *Following the NZTA Board meeting on 20 August 2018, the NZTA chair wrote to the Minister of Transport advising: “Assuming the detailed business case confirms the economic case, the Skypath project will be able to proceed to implementation. Once the necessary designs are complete and consents in place construction can begin.” NZTA letter dated 21 August 2018***

***[http://www.getacross.org.nz/uploads/1/2/2/8/122895821/nzta\\_board\\_assurance\\_to\\_minister\\_re\\_skypath\\_21\\_august\\_2018.pdf](http://www.getacross.org.nz/uploads/1/2/2/8/122895821/nzta_board_assurance_to_minister_re_skypath_21_august_2018.pdf). Please advise the course of events and with supporting documentation and technical reports, including dates of key decisions, to explain why NZTA chose not to proceed with the SkyPath design.***

NZ Transport Agency Board Paper – 5.2 - Auckland Harbour Bridge Walking and Cycling Single Stage Business Case (18 December 2019) was presented to the Board on 18 December 2019. The Business Case is provided in Attachment 5.

Certain information has been withheld under section 9(2)(j) of the Act to allow Waka Kotahi to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations). Certain information has also been withheld under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the Act which allows for the withholding of information to maintain the effect conduct of public affairs through free and frank expression of opinions by or between employees of a public service agency.

The Waka Kotahi Board approved the recommendations made in the Business Case at a meeting on 18 December 2019. The minutes of this meeting can be found on the Waka Kotahi website: [www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/About-us-2/docs/board-meeting-minutes-2019/minutes-20191218.pdf](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/About-us-2/docs/board-meeting-minutes-2019/minutes-20191218.pdf). I am therefore refusing this aspect of your request in accordance with section 18 (d) of the Act, as the information is publicly available.

**5) NZTA's HARBOUR BRIDGE SHARED PATH – SSBC (Dated 6 January 2020) states on Page 20 with regards to Option 1: "the Agency's engineering advice is that the design would need to be altered to enable delivery of a technically achievable scheme. The extent of the design changes are likely to be sufficient that variations to the consents would be needed".**

**Please provide:**

- a. details of this engineering advice, including what aspects of the SkyPath design would need to be altered and why.**
- b. details of the likely variations to the consents.**
- c. copies of any technical report(s) relied upon in providing such advice.**

The 'Auckland Harbour Bridge Shared Path Single Stage Business Case' (6 January 2020) – The section "Shortlist Evaluation – Option 1: Underslung option (as designed by the SkyPath Trust)" is the technical report relied upon in providing this advice and details the likely variations to the SkyPath resource consents.

This report is available on the Waka Kotahi website at: [www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/northern-pathway/docs/AHB-shared-path-SSBC-20200106.pdf](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/projects/northern-pathway/docs/AHB-shared-path-SSBC-20200106.pdf). I am therefore refusing your request under section 18 (d) of the Act because the information you are requesting is publicly available.

**6) In terms of assessing the traffic impacts by taking the western-most traffic lane (per Option 3, NZTA's HARBOUR BRIDGE SHARED PATH – Single stage business case dated 6 January 2020), has (or will) NZTA include modelling which takes into account the effect of road pricing?**

No, road pricing was not taken into account in modelling for the Auckland Harbour Bridge Shared Path Single Stage Business Case.

**7) This media statement from Hon Michael Wood: <https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/new-northern-pathway-gets-green-light> states "In the meantime, Waka Kotahi will continue to work on how to provide safe temporary trials of using lanes on the existing harbour bridge for cyclists and pedestrians." OIA-8193 RESPONSE advises "We have discussed a trial versus regular access on the bridge with the Board who have asked for and extra work necessary to understand the cost and risks associated with providing access. Any decision to provide access will be made by the board". Please advise when the NZTA Board intends making its decision regarding access for pedestrians and cyclists across the Auckland Harbour Bridge.**

The Waka Kotahi Board will be presented with the interim findings of pedestrian and cycling access across the Auckland Harbour Bridge at its meeting in September 2021.

**8) On Saturday, May 29 we learnt from Auckland Transport's that the western clip on lanes of the AHB would be closed to traffic for the Bike Auckland rally. On Sunday, May 30 NZTA's traffic management vehicles were in place ready for the rally. Please advise:**

**a. Given NZTA had organised to close the western clip-on lanes to traffic on Sunday, May 30, why did NZTA position their moveable barrier so that of the six remaining available traffic lanes, only two were northbound?**

Waka Kotahi had not planned to close lanes to facilitate the event, the associated planning was in the form of contingencies to ensure public safety. As such, the moveable lane barrier operations remained as business as usual (4x4 configuration).

While the option to move the moveable lane barrier during the event was available, an operational decision was made not to undertake this move, as we had identified that the duration of disruption (lanes closed) was likely to be in the order of 60 minutes only, which makes movement of the moveable lane barrier more disruptive than beneficial. In addition, the informal nature of the lane closures adjacent to the cycle activity we did not want to encourage a high-speed environment to exist in the adjacent lanes.

**b. Please provide a copy of correspondence between NZTA and Auckland Transport or NZ Police in relation to the traffic management for the Bike Auckland rally on Sunday, May 30.**

This is provided in Attachment 6 – Correspondence. Certain information has been withheld under section 9(2)(a) of the Act to protect the privacy of natural persons.

With respect to the information that has been withheld, I do not consider there are any other factors which would render it desirable, in the public interest, to make the information available.

Under section 28 of the Act, you have the right to ask the Ombudsman to review my decision to withhold this information. The contact details for the Ombudsman can be located at [www.ombudsman.parliament.nz](http://www.ombudsman.parliament.nz).

If you would like to discuss this reply with the Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency, please contact Ministerial Services by email to [official.correspondence@nzta.govt.nz](mailto:official.correspondence@nzta.govt.nz).

Yours sincerely



**Andrew Thackwray**  
National Manager Infrastructure Delivery

### OIA-8631 Document Schedule

Ref	Document	Date	Information being withheld/reason for withholding
1.	BRI-2066 AWHC briefing note	12 November 2020	Personal contact details withheld under s 9(2)(a)
2.	SkyPath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report – AHB Alliance	1 December 2014	Names withheld under s 9(2)(a)
3.	AHB Skypath Concept Structural Assessment Technical Report Comments	20 April 2015	Names and personal contact details withheld under s 9(2)(a)
4.	AHB Cycleway – Holmes Submission	8 September 2009	Names and personal contact details withheld under s 9(2)(a)
5.	NZ Transport Agency Board Paper – 5.2 – Auckland Harbour Bridge Walking and Cycling Single Stage Business Case	18 December 2019	Information withheld under s 9(2)(j), to allow Waka Kotahi to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations, and 9(2)(g)(i), to maintain the effect conduct of public affairs through free and frank expression of opinions by or between employees of a public service agency.
6.	Correspondence		Names and personal contact details withheld under s 9(2)(a)