

Ngauranga to Airport Steering Group
AGENDA updated with MINUTES

Meeting information

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| Time: | 4pm – 5pm | |
| Date: | 28 May 2015 | |
| Location: | NZTA Wellington Regional Office, Co-operative Building (PSIS House) 20 Ballance St - Board Room | |
| Members: | Wayne Hastie (GWRC) Luke Troy (GWRC) Geoff Swainson (WCC) Anthony Wilson Selwyn Blackmore (NZTA) | Lyndon Hammond (NZTA) (Acting Chair) Amy Kears (Secretariat) |
| Other Attendees | Jim Bentley (N2A Programme Manager) (via telephone) Chrissie Little (BRT Project Manager) | Chris Money (PwC) from 4.30pm |
| Member Apologies: | Anthony Wilson | |
| Reading: | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BRT IBC Assurance Plan • IBC approval roles and responsibilities • BRT approval pathway (diagram) • BRT Project status report <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em; display: inline-block;"></div> | |

Agenda

| Item | Description | Activity | Time |
|------|--|--|--|
| 1 | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> |
| 2 | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> |
| 3 | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> |
| 4 | BRT Project Assurance | Approve | 4.15-4.20 |
| 6 | BRT IBC approval process | Discuss | 4.20-4.30 |
| 7 | BRT options update (PwC) | Discuss | 4.30-4.50 |
| 8 | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> |
| 9 | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> | <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 1.2em;"></div> |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <p>and/or approval, then these should also be considered, documented, and the relevant people engaged.</p> <p>LT commented that if there are areas such as undertaking more modelling that TB recommends (noting that GWRC disagrees with this), then such matters should be brought to the SG for consideration.</p> <p>CL further clarified that Beca's IQA is for the BRT project and SG members' consideration whilst TB's review is for a HNO VAC requirement however this would be shared once concluded. CL reiterated that if there are additional steps required by any agency these can be included as part of the approval process.</p> <p>JB noted that the assurance framework does not specify a role for the programme manager. CL clarified that this was an error on the BRT project's part as this was created when JB was not yet onboard, and that the framework will be amended to include JB. It was noted that both Figure 1 and the roles and responsibilities chart require amendment. It was also noted that reference to JD needs to be replaced with reference to LT.</p> <p>BRT Project Assurance Framework was approved subject to changes discussed. CL to distribute final version.</p> | <p>CL to make adjustments to the IQA documents to reflect JB's role as programme manager, and to replace JD with LT and distribute final version to SG.</p> |
| <p>6</p> | <p><i>BRT IBC approval process</i></p> <p>CL noted that the approval process for the BRT IBC had been worked through with reps from the partner organisations. CL noted the two stages of review and approval and asked for SG feedback on aspects of the process that may need adjustment.</p> <p>GS noted that the WCC committee is called 'Transport and Urban Development' and its role is not to <i>inform</i> but <i>recommend</i> to Council.</p> <p>WH suggested splitting the decision-making paths of each organisation so as not to confuse the sequencing. CL also clarified that stakeholder engagement is not proposed during this process and the box referring to this would be removed.</p> <p>The SG discussed options for sequencing, noting that some steps may need to be conditional on others, and that it will be important to get a good steer from the GG on their preferences.</p> <p>GWRC clarified that their Council's function would be to 'support conclusions' and agree to retain current provision in the LTP for the next stage.</p> <p>GS noted that the question should be put to KL about WCC decisions. CL noted that RB is keen to get the GG's thoughts and that the SG meeting on 17 June will be an opportunity for RB, KL and GC to discuss prior to the GG on 23 June.</p> <p>CL noted that an action to tidy up diagram based on feedback, test with SG again, WCC and GWRC officers to discuss with CEs, and then the SG to finalise at its next meeting.</p> <p>WH queried whether the IBC will make a recommendation on a preferred option. CL clarified that in general, if the outcome of analysis is clear, there is no need for a recommendation. If outcome is not clear, then there is a question about how much flex is needed to make a decision.</p> <p>WH noted the need for a joint report that sits on top of the business case, and sets out the recommendations for progressing BRT and actions required by partners. General support was expressed for this idea.</p> <p>SB queried whether there is an expectation that the other workstreams would be discussed. JB advised that this flows from the roles and responsibilities chart, and that it needs to be</p> | <p>CL to amend BRT approval pathway diagram.</p> <p>GS and WH/LT to discuss BRT approval pathway with CEs prior to next SG meeting.</p> <p>CL to add an item to BRT project schedule for preparation of a joint report to accompany the business case.</p> |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <p>explicitly understood that anything that goes up has been considered across the programme, and that the pathways have to be compatible.</p> | |
| <p>6</p> | <p><i>BRT options update (PwC)</i></p> <p>CM outlined the purpose of his update was to provide an overview of the options being considered in the BRT IBC, and that he would cover: do minimum; scope of options; materiality of trade-offs between options; and the evaluation approach.</p> <p>CM noted that the strategic case is currently out for feedback.</p> <p>Do-Minimum – CM advised that the Basin and associated projects are included as is higher capacity buses. CM noted that he was happy to take feedback on board.</p> <p>LH commented about the inclusion of higher capacity buses within the Do-Minimum and how that fits with building the BRT brand. CM noted that this activity is common to all options, that it does make a difference having this included as it is a big part of the BCR and delivers many benefits (eg, reduction in operating costs), however it is unfair to count the benefits as is going to happen regardless of BRT.</p> <p>LH noted that despite this there remains an opportunity to explain how higher capacity buses are part of the BRT solution.</p> <p>CM noted that the team is doing a reconciliation back to the PTSS numbers and will be able to track evolution of costs/benefits.</p> <p>Options – CM noted that timing and sequencing variants were workshopped by the BRT working group. He noted segregation/dedication drives costs and conversely that intersections drive benefits. CM noted that the team is continuing to have discussion around modelling and differences across the options from a network perspective. There was further discussion about the cost range and achieving confidence in costs and range; and the impact or relativity between options to impact on their viability and ultimately which option/s are taken forward to the next stage.</p> <p>The SG also discussed practicality and do-ability; and whether the issues for each option will be highlighted and go or no-go points identified; and whether it was possible to understand the impact on the network without micro-simulation modelling. It was agreed that Paramics modelling was better suited to the next stage.</p> | |
| <p>7</p> | <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> | |
| <p>8</p> | <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> | |