

Caitlin McInnarney

From: Kathryn King
Sent: Monday, 11 July 2022 8:55 AM
To: Jurgita Klein; Graham O'Connell
Cc: Kevan Fleckney; s 9(2)(a) (ASM)
Subject: RE: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

Kia ora Jurgita,

Apologies for the slow response, it took some time for me to remember who was involved in the November paper.

The first version of the paper was drafted by Rosie Doherty in Neil Walker's team and then I took it and added in all the event information.

She worked with Neil on the Resolve commission.

Out of Scope but I understand Graham has been in contact with Resolve to get clarification.

From: Jurgita Klein <Jurgita.Klein@nzta.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 1 July 2022 1:45 pm
To: Graham O'Connell <Graham.OConnell@nzta.govt.nz>
Cc: Kathryn King <Kathryn.King@nzta.govt.nz>; Kevan Fleckney <Kevan.Fleckney@nzta.govt.nz>; s 9(2)(a) @asm.nzta.govt.nz
Subject: RE: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

I was thinking that the person who prepared the I&D paper and used the number would know where it came from?

Kind regards


Jurgita

From: Graham O'Connell <Graham.OConnell@nzta.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 1 July 2022 1:29 PM
To: Jurgita Klein <Jurgita.Klein@nzta.govt.nz>
Cc: Kathryn King <Kathryn.King@nzta.govt.nz>; Kevan Fleckney <Kevan.Fleckney@nzta.govt.nz>; s 9(2)(a) @asm.nzta.govt.nz
Subject: RE: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

Hi Jurgita,

I agree this seems to be about how the traffic modelling system creates an output.

However if ASM is not aware of where the 17,000 number has come from I am not clear how we can respond. I will speak to few people, but the ASM I would have thought was the origin of the number...?

From: Jurgita Klein <Jurgita.Klein@nzta.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 1 July 2022 10:39 am
To: Graham O'Connell <Graham.OConnell@nzta.govt.nz>

Cc: Kathryn King <Kathryn.King@nzta.govt.nz>; Kevan Fleckney <Kevan.Fleckney@nzta.govt.nz>; s 9(2)(a) @asm.nzta.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

Hi Graham

I think his question is about how we arrived at 17,000 vehicles figure. Is this based on some sort of traffic demand number and whatever calculations formula the modelling uses? I think it is a bit clearer in the Phase 2 Traffic Impact Assessment of June 2022 (slide 52 specifically mentions 17,000 vehicles), but we referred him to the Assessment of June 2021, which doesn't have the same detail. Because the 17,000 vehicles and 10% reduction was mentioned in the I&D paper in Nov 2021, it must have come from somewhere 😊

I was hoping that ASM would be able to clarify this as they have produced the Traffic Impact Assessment report of June 2021, but s 9(2)(a) advised that he doesn't know where the figure of 17,000 quoted in the I&D paper came from. I attach both Assessments FYI.

I can go back as clarify with s 9(2)(a) what he means exactly but it is too late to restart the clock. Also, if he doesn't get back before the OIA is due we need to go with our own interpretation. Please let me know if you still need me to go back to s 9(2)(a)

Thank you

Kind regards

Jurgita

From: Graham O'Connell <Graham.OConnell@nzta.govt.nz>

Sent: Friday, 1 July 2022 9:38 AM

To: Jurgita Klein <Jurgita.Klein@nzta.govt.nz>

Cc: Kathryn King <Kathryn.King@nzta.govt.nz>; Kevan Fleckney <Kevan.Fleckney@nzta.govt.nz>; s 9(2)(a) @asm.nzta.govt.nz>

Subject: RE: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

Hi Jurgita,

Please provide the basis for the calculation of these figures: "greater than 17,000 vehicles per day or a 10% reduction" per page 2 of the Investment and Delivery "Auckland Harbour Bridge walking and cycling event" dated 22 November 2021.

I think we are getting a question looking for something specific while phrased in an open ended manner, having read this statement a number of times this could be interpreted in a number of ways.

Can you go back to the customer and establish what exactly is meant by "***basis for the calculation of these figures***". If we can remove all ambiguity we can hopefully save on follow up requests.

Would a clarification request stop the clock on the OIA timeline?

Happy to discuss

Regards
Graham

From: Kathryn King <Kathryn.King@nzta.govt.nz>

Sent: Friday, 1 July 2022 8:36 am

To: Graham O'Connell <Graham.OConnell@nzta.govt.nz>; Kevan Fleckney <Kevan.Fleckney@nzta.govt.nz>; s 9(2)(a)
[REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@asm.nzta.govt.nz](mailto:[REDACTED]@asm.nzta.govt.nz)>

Subject: FW: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

Is anyone able to help me answer the question below?

From: Jurgita Klein <Jurgita.Klein@nzta.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, 30 June 2022 8:00 pm

To: Kathryn King <Kathryn.King@nzta.govt.nz>

Cc: Lydia Haigh <Lydia.Haigh@nzta.govt.nz>

Subject: URGENT advice required please: OIA-10263 - follow up from a previous OIA response

Hi Kathryn

A while ago we responded to s 9(2)(a) OIA-9647. His question was:

Please provide the basis for the calculation of these figures: "greater than 17,000 vehicles per day or a 10% reduction" per page 2 of the Investment and Delivery "Auckland Harbour Bridge walking and cycling event" dated 22 November 2021.

The relevant snapshot is below.

Modelling suggests a dedicated single walking and cycling lane would require a significant reduction in daily traffic volumes on the bridge to have a neutral effect on the wider Auckland transport System (greater than 17,000 vehicles per day or a 10% reduction), much greater than is achievable through the provision of walking and cycling access on the bridge alone.

You advised that this modelling is from the Resolve report (which is based on the Traffic Impact Assessment dated June 2021) - s 9(2)(a) already has both, but he couldn't find the details that would provide a basis for the calculation. Are you able to advise which exact modelling you have used when writing the I&D paper? Do you have a copy of these calculations?

I've contacted ASM who have produced that Assessment but they were not sure where the calculation in the I&D paper came from. Since then, ASM produced two additional (Phase 1 and Phase 2) Traffic Impact Assessment reports. They say that Phase 2 report seems to contain some assessment that arrives at similar values, but this is not in the original report to which we referred s 9(2)(a)

The questions we are trying to answer are in yellow below. If we referred s 9(2)(a) to the June 2021 Traffic Impact Assessment incorrectly, then we need to fix it.

I would really appreciate your advice on this please. The relevant documents are attached.

Please give me a call if it is easier. Thank you.

Kind regards

Jurgita

From: s 9(2)(a)

Sent: Saturday, 4 June 2022 3:10 pm

To: Official Correspondence <Official.Correspondence@nzta.govt.nz>

Subject: Re: OIA-9647 RESPONSE

Importance: High

CAUTION: The sender of this email is from outside Waka Kotahi. Do not click links, attachments, or reply unless you recognise the sender's email address and know the content is safe.

Kia ora, thank for the response to OIA-9647.

1) Unfortunately, the response to Question 2 (provide the basis for the calculation of these figures: "greater than 17,000 vehicles per day or a 10% reduction" per page 2 of the Investment and Delivery paper "Auckland Harbour Bridge walking and cycling event" dated 22 November 2021) is inadequate.

Please specifically advise (on what page and actual content) of the reports provide the basis for the figures: "greater than 17,000 vehicles per day or a 10% reduction" (per the Investment and Delivery paper "Auckland Harbour Bridge walking and cycling event" dated 22 November 2021).

2) Furthermore, please advise to which pathway option, and under which level of traffic demand reduction scenario, does the "greater than 17,000 vehicles per day or a 10% reduction" apply to?

3) We note this [accompanying Board paper](#) presented at the 19 August 2021 Board meeting states: "**We have therefore advised the Minister that we would wait for his feedback on the interim options before a decision is sought from the Board.**" Please provide a copy of the Minister's feedback.

Best,

s 9(2)(a)
Transport Planner

Released under the Official Information Act 1982