

Ngauranga to Airport Steering Group
AGENDA updated with MINUTES

Meeting information

Time:	3.00pm – 4.00pm	
Date:	25 March 2015	
Location:	NZTA Wellington Regional Office, Co-operative Building (PSIS House), 20 Ballance St - Board Room	
Members:	Jane Davies (GWRC) Wayne Hastie (GWRC) Geoff Swainson (WCC) Selwyn Blackmore (NZTA)	Lyndon Hammond (NZTA) Amy Kearse (Secretariat)
Other Attendees	Raewyn Bleakley (NZTA) Greg Campbell (GWRC) Kevin Lavery (WCC)	Chrissie Little (BRT Project Manager) Urban Transformation and Local Roads project manager (Geoff Swainson)
Member Apologies:	Anthony Wilson (WCC)	
Reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft N2A Steering Group Terms of Reference • BRT Project Initiation Document 	

Agenda

Item	Description	Activity	Time
1	Welcome		3.00-3.05
2	Draft Terms of Reference for the Steering Group	Discussion Paper	3.05-3.20
3	Governance Group preparation	Discussion	3.20-3.35
4	BRT Project Initiation Document	Approve PID	3.35-3.45
5	Status reports (to be tabled at meeting): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BRT Project • Inner City RoNS • Urban Transformation and Local Roads 	Note status reports	3.45-3.50
6	General Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of meetings • Next proposed meeting date 		3.50-4.00

MINUTES

Item	Description	Actions
1	<i>Welcome</i>	-
2	<p><i>Draft Terms of Reference for the Steering Group</i></p> <p>LH introduced the draft ToR and sought feedback on whether these are fit for purpose.</p> <p>KL noted that the draft ToR are <u>good</u> but what is important is <u>how</u> we work, including the importance of officers having sufficient time to develop the business case and network plan.</p> <p>GC noted the need for programme management of these complex projects eg, agreeing objectives, success factors, who is doing what, gaps, and actions to resolve – working this out at the steering level then escalating higher as necessary.</p> <p>It was agreed that the aim should be to resolve issues at the SG first, with CEs and RB/DB to assist as necessary, before final escalation of unresolved items to the GG. This reduces risk of GG members getting individual reports that only present part of the picture.</p> <p>Other points touched on included the scope of the SG being confirmed as N2A, rather than just BRT, clarity for the forward programme and how funding is aligned in LTP/RLTP, the opportunity with key people around the table, NZTA as host for this phase, and the need for the GG to see outputs, to have confidence, and consistency of message.</p> <p>Approved Terms of Reference for the N2A Steering Group.</p> <p>The need for a programme management across N2A was further discussed, with RB noting the potential for this to be resourced from the RoNS team. RB suggested NZTA confirm whether this is feasible and report back on this and other options for programme management.</p> <p>RB noted the need for this to be dedicated and agreed resource rather than BAU. GC noted that programme management is what we want and GWRC is happy to cover its share of costs.</p> <p>CL's view was sought. CL's advice was that a programme manager is <u>absolutely needed</u> and that the other key gap is clarity on the senior responsible owners and the lack of programme resourcing across the workstreams.</p>	<p>LH to work with 3 workstream project managers (CL, SB, GS) and come back to the SG offline with options for resourcing an N2A programme manager.</p>
3	<p><i>Governance Group preparation</i></p> <p>The timing of meetings was discussed, noting the next RTC meeting is on 28 April. A GG meeting on 31 March had been scheduled. RB asked that CG and KL confirm whether their respective GG members were happy to next meet on 28 April rather than 31 March.</p> <p>It was noted that in a best practice sense, there would be another group between the SG and the GG. It was agreed that rather than establish another formal group it would be preferable to pull CEs into SG as necessary.</p> <p>There was general discussion that material prepared for the GG should be at a higher level than that presented to the SG and adequately provide the GG with the framework, tools, and messages they need for any public communication, including on two key issues (clarity on whether activities are sequential or concurrent to the Basin, and alignment of implementation plans).</p> <p>It was suggested that at least one SG member from each</p>	<p>GC and KL to confirm with respective GG members their comfort with the GG next meeting on 28 April rather than 31 March.</p> <p>RB to invite CEs, all SG members, and CL to the next GG meeting.</p> <p>GG Secretariat to add confirmation of chair as first item of next GG meeting.</p>

	<p>organisation should attend, and there was discussion whether project managers should attend GG meetings. No decision on this, but for the first meeting it was agreed that CL (BRT project manager) should be introduced to the GG.</p> <p>RB noted the suggestion from CWB and FW was that NZTA host the GG meetings and DB chair them. RB suggested the first item on the GG agenda should be to confirm DB as the chair.</p>	
5	<p><i>Status reports</i></p> <p>Status reports for the BRT and RoNS workstreams were tabled.</p> <p><i>BRT:</i> CL spoke to the BRT status noting the biggest issue is resourcing although GWRC and WCC SG members had confirmed just prior to the meeting that their respective organisations have sufficient local share of funding available, so this will change the overall status of the project from red to amber.</p> <p>JD agreed to fund at approximately 25% but noted disappointment that NZTA not funding from HNO perspective, but despite this GWRC is being pragmatic and will fund its share accordingly, but this should not set a precedent and there is a need for further discussion of the contribution from each organisation going forward.</p> <p>SB noted that NZTA had not requested any contribution from GWRC or WCC for work undertaken in relation to BRT planning and design for the Mt Vic Tunnel Duplication project.</p> <p><i>RoNS:</i> SB spoke to two key areas: the Basin Appeal process and outlined the key dates (as per the status report); and the need for a decision on the preferred BRT option along Ruahine Street so that the project team can move forward with detailed design. SB noted the option chosen will have implications for Town Belt land.</p> <p>GS noted the need to take a report to Council on this.</p> <p>WH noted that the BRT option along Ruahine St is pivotal to the overall BRT concept and standard of BRT.</p> <p>SB sought clarity over the decision-making mechanism.</p> <p>LH advised that SG is the first mechanism, and then to CEs if SG cannot agree on the approach.</p> <p>It was agreed that SB work with CL and GS to advance approvals for Mt Vic Tunnel BRT concept (noting the urgency with preparing this) and prepare an item for the next SG.</p> <p><i>Urban transformation and local roads:</i> GS noted that he had not prepared a report for the local roads workstream. GS sought clarity on which activities were covered by the other workstreams and what remained for the local road workstream to report on.</p>	<p>SB to prepare an item for the next SG meeting reporting on results of modelling for BRT design on Ruahine Street, and work with CL and GS to set out the forward approval path.</p> <p>GS to work with CL and SB to review table of N2A activities (compiled by GWRC) and refine what is in the WCC-led workstream and regular status report.</p>
4	<p><i>BRT Project Initiation Document (PID)</i></p> <p>CL spoke to PID circulated with the agenda, and asked if SG happy to approve.</p> <p>WH spoke to several details within PID that were not quite correct. Minor changes were noted in relation to the following sections of the report: project objectives, branding, GWRC BRT enabling projects, out of scope areas, constraints, interfaces, product description.</p> <p>CL requested that the SG approve the PID with the changes sought by WH – this was agreed.</p> <p>Approved BRT Project Initiation Document with changes</p>	<p>CL to make changes to PID sought by WH and circulate final version to the SG.</p>

	sought by WH.	
6	<p><i>General Business</i></p> <p>LH concluded the meeting noting that if the SG is next week, we'll need to get an agenda sorted promptly, but we'll wait for confirmation of whether the 31 March meeting is to proceed.</p> <p>The next SG meeting will be approximately 2 weeks before the next GG meeting on 28 April – will schedule for either 14 or 16 April for 1.5 hours.</p>	<p>Next SG meeting to be scheduled on either 14 or 16 April for 1.5 hours.</p>

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT