

RECORD OF THE POINT OF ENTRY

Context	
Initiative name	Wharf Street Safety Improvements
Author	Laura Goodman and Les Dowdle (on behalf of DCC)
Lead organisation or business group	Dunedin City Council
Problem owner	Hjarne Poulsen (DCC)
Transport Agency point of contact	Chad Barker
File reference	12513123
Date	14 April 2020
Background	
<p>Wharf Street is a key corridor in central Dunedin, classified both as a priority freight route and an important cycle link to Southern Dunedin. Average Daily Traffic (ADT) estimates for Wharf Street are estimated at 15,000 vehicles per day (vpd) northbound and 13,200 vpd southbound, making it one of Dunedin's busiest roads (MobileRoad, 2019). With growth occurring in Dunedin and a goal to increase cycling across the city, the efficiency and safety of this route cannot be understated.</p> <p>The three intersections on Wharf Street with Roberts Street, Birch Street and Kitchener Street are not considered by Dunedin City Council (DCC) to be fit for purpose due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • poor level of service for vulnerable users • access to the harbourside industrial area being impacted by traffic volumes on Wharf Street • historic safety issues from the proximity of the Jetty Street overbridge resulting in late lane changes and complex turning movements across two lanes • wide carriageways widths resulting in high traffic speeds uncondusive to vulnerable users. <p>Concept designs for improving the safety and accessibility of the corridor have been previously developed but were put on hold due to uncertainty regarding the future of rail lines across the eastern side of Wharf Street. With the removal of the railway lines there is now scope to improve the road corridor.</p> <p>In addition to the removal of the rail tracks which were the initial obstacle, the Wharf Street corridor is planned for pavement rehabilitation during the 2020/21 construction season. The intention is to undertake any safety improvement alterations concurrently with this pavement rehabilitation. The concept design produced will reduce the extents of pavement renewal required by narrowing the corridor. This will significantly reduce the spend required from the pavement renewal project hence the need to confirm design prior to the rehabilitation.</p>	
Setting out the problem or opportunity	
Problem or opportunity description	<p>Identified Problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wharf Street has become traffic dominated with high traffic volumes, speeds and noise which reduces the appeal of the shared path as a safe transport choice ○ The current lane layout requires drivers to make complex movements and often results in late lane changes which places a high demand on all road users

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Side roads are wide intersections with sweeping kerb alignment encourages high vehicle turning speeds through the intersection and crossing point. This also results in long crossing distances for vulnerable users at intersection throats ○ Wharf Street is identified by MegaMaps as a Top 10% DSi Saving Network Section <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Accessibility (for all travel modes): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delays for vehicles turning onto Wharf Street from the industrial area and conflict of turning movements, along with visibility issues, can result in vehicles overhanging into the through lanes of Wharf Street ○ Narrow shared paths widths present conflicts between users and are insufficient to cater to future demands ● Network efficiency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wharf Street has become traffic dominated with high traffic volumes, speeds and noise as it is an essential corridor for movement of goods through Dunedin ○ The challenge is to maintain an efficient network whilst improving connectivity, user experience and safety, particularly for vulnerable road users <p>Identified Opportunities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Encourage greater uptake of active travel modes in Dunedin ● Reduce urban severance by better connecting the Harbour and the Central City ● Effectively utilise investment by undertaking this project in parallel with the scheduled pavement rehabilitation project
<p>Outcomes sought</p>	<p>The main identified outcomes sought are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Safety improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Upgrading cyclist and pedestrian facilities and amenity ○ Reducing driver decisions and weaving of traffic on a high volume traffic route by rationalising movements along the corridor ○ Wharf Street’s design to be better differentiated to align with its function and accommodate multimodal forms of transport ● Access improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Create better links to the harbourside industrial area ○ Improved active travel linkages along Wharf Street to align with wider transport planning considerations including the development of Dunedin’s waterfront, and increased active travel movement between the CBD and the waterfront ● Efficient traffic movement along the freight corridor to support the economic growth of the District ● Value for money
<p>Ensuring alignment with strategy (see Note 6)</p>	
<p>Describe how the investment aligns with strategy</p>	<p><u>Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-30/31 (draft)</u></p> <p>This project will contribute to the following strategic directions as outlined in the GPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Safety: the project will improve comfort and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists using Wharf Street and make crossing movements safer for all road users ● Better Travel Options: making Wharf Street safer for vulnerable users will give people better travel options, reducing the urban severance ● Improving Freight Connections: the access improvements to Dunedin’s industrial area will improve convenience of the freight route

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Change: the continued promotion of safe and efficient cycling and walking networks will encourage mode shift from vehicles <p><u>Dunedin City Integrated Transport Strategy 2013</u></p> <p>The following are the key focus points identified in the Transport Strategy that this project will contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: prioritising safety improvements according to risk • Travel choices: prioritising investment and space to improve the provision of active modes and public transport • Connectivity of centres: improving connections within and between centres and the central city for public transport and active modes • Freight: efficiently and effectively moving freight • Resilient network: integrating land use and transport to reduce demand for vehicle travel and increasing the resilience of the transport network <p>Importantly, Wharf Street forms part of the South Dunedin Cycle network where DCC aims to create safe, user-friendly cycling links between centres, and from centres to the central city. Improvements to cycle facilities on Wharf Street will help DCC towards their Transport Objective 2 Goal and better connect the central city to the waterfront:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage of Dunedin census respondents who cycle, walk or take a bus to work increases from 16% at the 2006 census to 40% by 2024 <p><u>Dunedin City Council 10 Year Plan 2018-2028</u></p> <p>Listed under major projects and key decisions includes a focus on urban cycle ways with respect to road safety and encouraging cycle uptake as well as improving level of service for vulnerable users. This must be achieved in combination with delivering a city that enables a prosperous and diverse economy, which relies on the efficient movement of freight along freight corridors like Wharf Street.</p>		
Level of risk, uncertainty and complexity (see Note 7)			
Key risks	Stakeholders: Members of the local business community have been upset previously (2014) when upgrades to Wharf Street were planned and may slow the project.	Overall risk level:	Low
Key uncertainties	<p>GPS: Project aligns to GPS and is anticipated to be funded, however, 2020 is an election year which may see a change in Government/strategy. Project is expected to be completed in this financial year.</p> <p>Development: Dunedin Hospital and Waterfront redevelopments will see changes to traffic movements through Dunedin. This project presents an opportunity to improve active travel links to align with the progression of development.</p>	Overall uncertainty level:	Low
Level of complexity	Extent: Stand-alone project with a clearly defined scope with only a few options that will require evaluation but will require alignment with the Dunedin Liveability PBC/SSBC outcomes. DCC and NZTA have considered the interaction of the two projects and do not consider there to be any conflicts.	Overall complexity level:	Low

	Programme: Physical works able to be completed without requiring intensive bespoke solutions.		
Previous and related work (see Note 8)			
Summarise previous work	<p>For this project there has been a considerable amount of previous work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intersections of Birch Street / Wharf Street and Roberts Street / Wharf Street have previously been investigated and various iterations of consultation undertaken • In 2014, GHD were engaged by DCC to investigate options for a proposed cycle link from Portsmouth Drive to the Jetty Street Overbridge. This included options for intersection alterations to Birch and Roberts Intersections to achieve cycle safety improvements at these locations. GHD also helped facilitate workshops with the local business community to work through the potential intersection alterations and in particular the proposed vehicle movement restrictions • In 2016, TDG were engaged by DCC to produce consultation plans for the Wharf Street intersections, including signalisation of Kitchener Street • Further progress on Birch Street and Roberts Street intersections had been deferred until 2019 due to the unknown future of the Wharf Street rail lines • In 2019, GHD were engaged by DCC to re-visit and produce concept designs for safety improvements at Birch Street and Roberts Street intersections including investigations for alterations of the adjacent Wharf Street corridor and crossing points for cyclists and pedestrians 		
Summarise related work	<p>Wharf Street is part of the 'Eastern Bypass' freight route which provides a bypass of the Dunedin Central City for Port traffic, connecting SH1 and SH88. A project to improve this route has been identified, named the Eastern Bypass Freight Route Upgrade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'Eastern Bypass' freight route consists of Strathallan Street – Portsmouth Drive – Wharf Street – Thomas Burns Street – St Andrew Street to Anzac Avenue • The project to improve this strategic freight corridor is considered a high priority for DCC, the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and Otago Regional Council (ORC) • The purpose of this project is to reduce conflict between vulnerable users and freight movement, whilst reducing the number of freight vehicles using the one-way system in the Central City 		
Planning the next stage (see Note 9)			
Recommended next phase	<p>Due to the low risk, low cost and low complexity of this project (i.e. right-sizing the business case approach), as well as the previous work done to date which establishes the strategic context for the project, a Lite Single Stage Business Case is recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birch and Roberts Street investigations and concept designs have already been produced (2019) and will be evaluated in the Lite SSBC • Previous work for Kitchener Street (2016) requires review and updating based on latest information including traffic modelling and cost estimates 		
Scope of next phase	<p>The next phase is to complete a Lite SSBC which will start on NZTA endorsement of PoE:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reconfirm the strategic context and need for investment • Multi-criteria analysis of options to confirm preferred option delivers value for money, is the best way to respond to the problems and takes advantage of any available opportunities 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risks, benefits and costs of preferred option to be detailed with financial, commercial and management aspects of the project described
Target completion date	April 2020
Budget requirements	<p>Proposed funding for the Lite SSBC is \$19,200 which includes traffic modelling and economic evaluation of the scheme. The Lite SSBC will follow the example released by NZTA (Happyvale City Council, Big Tunnel – Business Case for Resilience).</p> <p>Proposed implementation funding is to be shared between DCC and the Transport Agency. DCC have identified the upgrade of Wharf Street with the Transport Agency as an important project and planned for their share of the implementation funding required for this project.</p>
Business case pathway (see Note 10)	
<p>The Lite SSBC will recommend a preferred package of upgrades to Wharf Street. It is anticipated, that following development of the SSBC, the recommended solution would be able to apply for implementation funding. It is unlikely that there will be a need for a pre-implementation phase due to the low risk/complexity of the project.</p> <p>The Council can use the existing work together with the PoE and SSBC to support their funding application. Following receipt of approval for funding from NZ Transport Agency, an implementation plan would be developed and designs prepared for Tender/Construction in order for a timely physical works procurement process to be undertaken.</p>	
Decision/next steps (to be completed by Lead Organisation – Problem owner)	
Decision (signature required)	<p>Recommended / Not recommended (circle as applicable)</p> <p>Name: <i>The person who is accountable for addressing the problem (see Note 2).</i></p> <p>Role:</p> <p>Date:</p>
Decision/next steps (to be completed by NZ Transport Agency - Senior Manager, System Planning)	
Decision (signature required)	<p>Endorsed / Not endorsed (circle as applicable)</p> <p>Name: <i>The person who holds the delegation for PoE Endorsement.</i></p> <p>Date:</p>
Conditions and/or agreements required	<i>Set out any conditions or agreements that the decision is contingent upon.</i>
NZTA Assessment for Endorsement (Completed by NZTA Staff only)	
Additional relevant Context/Background	
Confirmation of Strategic Context	
IAF Results Alignment Assessment (if Applicable)	

Timing/Urgency	
Funding Position	
Recommendation	
Reasons for Recommendation	

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR RECORDING THE POINT OF ENTRY FINDINGS

The Point of Entry is where we consider whether to begin the development (or not) of a business case for investment, and if so, how that should start.

The Point of Entry phase is designed to allow meaningful discussion and the use of critical thinking.

Completion of this Record of Point of Entry is an important step and about much more than form-filling or compliance. It is important that effort and attention is given to completing the PoE phase well, rather than rushing to complete it to get started. Often the reason business cases don't progress, or have significant problems, is because the PoE didn't identify the scope the work properly.

Carrying out a Point of Entry should precede the initiation of **any** business case. However, for the Transport Agency to **endorse** a PoE, certain information is needed: that information is set out in this form. In part this is because endorsement of a PoE signals that the Transport Agency believes the proposed investment is both needed and aligned with current priorities for NLTP investment.

The Transport Agency expects that its advice and input will be sought at an early stage in completing the PoE phase (not just this record), and that endorsement of the Point of Entry phase will be needed **before** work commences on any future stages. Failure to do so means that the lead organisation continues work at their own risk and carries a high likelihood that rework will be needed or that funding will not be available.

The level of detail that is captured should be consistent with the recommended starting point. If a strategic case needs to be done before the scope of work can be fully understood, the information will be a best-estimate, based on what is currently known. It should be possible to provide more detail for the development pathway if there is information from earlier phases.

[Guidance on completing a Point of Entry and recording the results](#)

Notes:

1. Provide the name of the organisation that will be accountable for the investment and will lead development of the business case. This will be either:
 - a. An Approved Organisation, or;
 - b. The relevant business group within the Transport Agency.
2. Identifying who will be accountable for the business case is an important early step, as this person needs to sign the PoE to confirm they agree with the findings and recommendations. Forms that are not signed by an accountable person will not be accepted for endorsement. The name provided must be an individual, not a business group or organisation. A problem owner may want to consider a RASCI matrix for their proposed investment (Responsibility, Accountability, Supporting, Consultation, Information). This will help to identify the accountable person, and who else needs to be involved.
3. Provide the name of the primary Transport Agency contact for the business case, including PoE and subsequent phases.
4. When describing the problem (or problems) for the purposes of PoE, it is expected that the PoE phase will include discussions to better understand the problem. The description provided should be based on the best initial understanding of the problem and should be phrased simply and clearly. Avoid long and detailed explanations – clarity is more important. Also avoid statements that point to a specific solution or response, for example 'we need to increase bus services'. If in doubt, consult a representative of the Transport Agency, who can help guide you through this step.
5. Similarly, in describing anticipated outcomes or benefits it is not necessary to have completed a detailed benefit definition exercise. The PoE phase should focus on understanding the overarching outcomes, and whether they will deliver a significant or minor contribution.

6. The proposed investment must be well-aligned with strategy to justify developing a business case. If the PoE is being completed by a Transport Agency staff member seeking internal funding, be clear about the alignment to the Transport Agency's strategic directions.
7. Understanding the levels of risk, uncertainty and complexity are key factors when determining the level of effort required for any business case. Risks and uncertainties are treated differently for the purposes of investment. Whole-of-life costs are typically unknown at the PoE phase and cannot be estimated with any confidence. The degree of complexity is often used instead, to help in determining the likely level of effort required.

[Guidance on the risk-based approach](#)

8. Provide a summary of relevant pre-existing work. This might include strategic cases, programme business cases or reports. Include any references made to the problem or opportunity in regional land transport programmes (RLTPs) or the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP). Does the pre-existing work help to respond to any of the 16 investment questions? Would it pass an assessment by the Agency? Are there existing documents that relate to this investment, and do they address some or all of the requirements for any phases of business case development?

[16 investment questions for the business case approach](#)

9. The starting point will either be a strategic case or some later phase. If it is a strategic case the information can be relatively brief, but will need to answer these questions as a minimum:
 - How will problem and benefit definition be carried out?
 - If Investment Logic Mapping (ILM) workshops are to be used, what level of facilitation will be needed?
 - Who will need to be involved – including stakeholders, the people who hold the most knowledge about the problem, and any Transport Agency staff?.
 - Who will write the strategic case, and will they need any specific support from other parts of the organisation?
 - What approvals will be needed?
10. If the start point is beyond a strategic case the information provided needs to demonstrate how the requirements of a strategic case have been met. The scope of the next stage should also include details of how any gaps in previous work will be addressed and be able to justify the value of any NLTP funding application needed for the phase to proceed. If available, a project plan can be attached to this PoE record.

Information about the indicative pathway for completion of the business case is required at the PoE development stage. This includes the expected pathway for the business case process and investment decision(s), ensuring all stakeholders have visibility of the phases of development likely to be necessary to complete development of the business case and the decision-making process.

[Guidance on how to plan for and describe the anticipated pathway](#)