

**Ngauranga to Airport Steering Group**  
**AGENDA updated with MINUTES**

**Meeting information**

<b>Time:</b>	2.00pm – 4pm	
<b>Date:</b>	16 April 2015	
<b>Location:</b>	NZTA Wellington Regional Office, Co-operative Building (PSIS House), 20 Ballance St - Board Room	
<b>Members:</b>	Jane Davies (GWRC) Wayne Hastie (GWRC) Geoff Swainson (WCC) Selwyn Blackmore (NZTA)	Lyndon Hammond (NZTA) Amy Kearse (Secretariat)
<b>Other Attendees</b>	Chrissie Little (BRT Project Manager) Luke Troy (GWRC) Stewart McKenzie	Andy Ford (GWRC) Nick Sargeant (GWRC)
<b>Member Apologies:</b>	Anthony Wilson (WCC)	
<b>Reading:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes of 25 March 2015 meeting</li> <li>• N2A Action register</li> <li>• BRT Project status report</li> <li>• State highway status report</li> <li>• Urban transformation and local roads status report</li> </ul>	

**Agenda**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Time</b>
1	Welcome		2.00-2.05
2	Approve 25 March minutes and review action register	<b>Approve/review</b>	2.05-2.10
3	Report back on N2A programme resourcing (LH)	<b>Endorse</b>	2.10-2.30
4	Status report discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Migration of activities from N2A table</li> <li>• Frequency of reporting</li> <li>• GWRC report? Plans and strategies?</li> </ul>	<b>Discussion</b> <b>Accept</b> status reports	2.30-2.50
5	Governance Group preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next meeting on 28 April</li> <li>• Draft agenda and report</li> </ul>	<b>Discussion</b>	2.50-3.05
6	BRT design on Ruahine Street – update on modelling and approval pathway (CL, AF, SB)	<b>Discussion</b>	3.05-3.30
7	Wellington Urban Growth Strategy (SB)	<b>Discussion</b>	3.30-3.45
8	General Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review actions</li> <li>• Meeting schedule</li> <li>• upcoming meetings 14 May, 4 June (tbc)</li> </ul>	<b>Discussion</b>	3.45-4.00

## MINUTES

Item	Description	Actions
1	<p><i>Welcome</i></p> <p>JD noted that this is her last meeting and that LT will be replacing her on the Steering Group.</p>	-
2	<p><i>Approve 25 March minutes and review action register</i></p> <p><b>Approved</b> minutes of 25 March 2015 noting the level of detail was appropriate.</p> <p>Steering Group reviewed action register. No changes to the status of actions.</p>	
3	<p><i>Report back on N2A programme resourcing</i></p> <p>LH introduced the memo 'N2A Programme Management Approach' (dated 9 April 2015) outlining a proposal for programme management to support successful integration and delivery of the N2A Corridor Strategy in a 'one network approach'. SB outlined Jim Bentley's background and experience in consideration for the Programme Manager (PM) role.</p> <p>WH also queried the end date of October for N2A resourcing. SH advised that it is significant from a SH perspective, and CL also reiterated that it is good for BRT also.</p> <p>CL noted that BRT resources will assist the PM; that these are already part-time, and that one of the PM's first actions will be to confirm the resources needed for N2A programme management.</p> <p>LH raised the issue of Chair, noting he has been chairing meetings by default, and that RB has been considering and spoken to some of the SG members about an independent chair such as [REDACTED].</p> <p>WH queried who would fund. LH advised that it was envisaged that an independent chair would be appointed in a voluntary capacity.</p> <p>The SG discussed the pros and cons of an independent chair and potential candidates for such a role including both [REDACTED] and Jim Bentley.</p> <p>The SG agreed that Lyndon should report back to RB to enable her to have a further conversation with WCC and GWRC CEs.</p> <p>The SG then further discussed the value add of having a stakeholder perspective and the option of using groups such as the PT Users Group and PT Reference Group engaged throughout the PTSS or the Chamber of Commerce Infrastructure Group. CL noted her support for engaging with stakeholders on BRT.</p> <p>The SG concluded discussion on this item and accepted the recommendations set out in the 'N2A Programme Management Approach' memo:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Agree the need to establish a N2A Programme Manager to lead and drive the 'one network approach' outlined in the N2A Corridor Strategy.</li> <li>b. Agree the appointment of Jim Bentley as the contracted Programme Manager.</li> <li>c. Note that HNO have offered to fully fund the Programme Manager role through to end of October 2015.</li> <li>d. Note that a small virtual Programme Management</li> </ol>	<p>LH to update RB as follows for further discussion with KL and GC: the SG can see value in an independent chair and considered two candidates ([REDACTED] and Jim Bentley).</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

	<p>support team will be needed to support the Programme Manager.</p> <p>e. Agree that the virtual programme support team will initially be merged into BRT contractor roles through to end of July only. The Programme Manager will be required to prepare a resource plan to outline programme resource requirements after July 2015.</p> <p>f. Agree that partner organisations will provide additional planning support resources from existing staffing structures.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p><i>Status report discussion</i></p> <p>The SG reviewed the table showing migration of N2A activities to the N2A status reports, and considered the questions posed by AK about whether each party should report on new plans and strategies of relevance to N2A and whether there was the need for a separate GWRC report.</p> <p>The SG agreed that the BRT report picked up GWRC enough, but that the SG may require particular GWRC-focused reports from time to time if a need is identified (by exception).</p> <p>The SG to have a standing item on the agenda for plans and strategies.</p> <p>The SG <b>accepted</b> the status reports as read.</p> <p>GS advised that the Urban transformation and local roads status report provides a snapshot of WCC work and that WCC has allocated Steve Spence as its internal project coordinator to look after this work and start regular reporting.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on what the sign-off of the cycling strategy by WCC on 30 April entailed. GS confirmed that it was a statement of principles to assist decision-making that was being signed off, not a detailed network plan, but rather a programme approach.</p> <p>SB queried whether the walking and cycling improvements as part of the Mt Vic Tunnel Duplication project were included. This was confirmed; WCC has adopted a corridor approach predicated on those facilities being available.</p> <p>JD queried whether there was anything likely to conflict with the PT Spine – and whether there was an opportunity/need to influence the principles to avoid conflict. GS advised that a principle was included along the lines of “Implementation of cycleways will not introduce travel time delays for PT services”.</p> <p>The BRT report was briefly discussed next. WH noted some changes to the descriptions of enabling projects. CL agreed to amend.</p> <p>CL noted that confirmation of the Senior Responsible Owners for BRT still required. The SRO should be the one to benefit most from the project, and this was really GWRC’s role to push through and advocate for BRT. The SG agreed that Greg Campbell should be confirmed as the Senior Responsible Owner.</p>	<p>AK to add a standing item to SG agenda on strategies and plan updates.</p> <p>CL to make adjustments to the descriptions of enabling projects.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><i>BRT design on Ruahine Street – update on modelling</i></p> <p>AF presented on the results of the Ruahine Street modelling (refer presentation for detail).</p> <p>The following questions were posed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the SG comfortable with the broad concept, noting further work will be done by SM and team?</li> <li>2. Do the SG want the team to wait for BRT IBC to be completed before commencing more detailed design?</li> </ol>	

	<p>The SG considered these questions in depth, including whether there were advantages in presenting a package of activities or demonstrating momentum re Mt Vic/Ruahine Street.</p> <p>WH noted an issue about needing to understand what standards you need to meet (eg does priority at certain times meet this standard) to define the system as BRT.</p> <p>CL noted the risk re branding, and the need to develop the story about BRT and for the GG to understand what a BRT system will look like in Wellington. CL expressed her confidence that a solution could be delivered that is transformational for Wellington and the IBC will define what this looks like.</p> <p>The SG queried whether the best performing option ticked the policy objectives and strategic objectives in plans, including growing patronage. LT advised yes from a PTSS perspective, the option achieves modal shift but that we did not know if it ticked WCC's objectives. SM advised that there was likely to be very little difference between the current option and earlier hybrid option in terms of Town Belt take, particularly with revised curvature for Tunnel and other refinements to reduce overall take, and that it would be useful to advance and set in front of WCC soon.</p> <p>The SG cautioned care around the use of language such as HoV lanes as this has a commonly understood meaning.</p> <p>LH queried whether the team could prepare a pictorial to show the initial concept so as to illustrate the impact on the Town Belt. SM advised that it would need to be quite detailed and would require to start engaging with stakeholders. SM noted his preference to wait until the BRT IBC is finalised.</p> <p>The SG agreed to wait until the IBC is finalised before commencing detailed design for the Mt Victoria Tunnel Duplication project but recommended the project consider further what work if any could commence in the interim to enable the project to advance.</p> <p>The SG sought an update on the process for the Wellington Town Belt Management Bill at or before the next SG meeting.</p>	<p>Mt Vic Tunnel Duplication project to consider what work is any could commence in the interim to enable the project to advance, noting the SG has advised to wait until the BRT IBC is finalised before commencing detailed design for Mt Vic. SM to update the SG on the process for the Wellington Town Belt Management Bill.</p>
6	<p><i>Governance Group preparation</i></p> <p>The SG discussed the tabled draft GG agenda and slides. The SG advised it would be useful to inform the GG of the role of the SG; advise that risks were under currently under control but these will be reported up from time to time as needed; provide clarity on what will be delivered through the business case process; reassurance that workstreams are on-track; confidence that each agency committed to N2A.</p>	
7	<p><i>Wellington Urban Growth Strategy</i></p> <p>SM outlined concerns with WUGP that had limited mention of BRT. GS noted that it was not a statutory document, and there was no linkage between the LTP and the 2040 strategy focused on community aspirations for Wellington.</p>	
8	<p><i>General business</i></p> <p>Upcoming meetings were discussed. The SG agreed that CL should have 1:1 meetings with CEs as needed on BRT business case development, and that the CEs should be invited to the 4 June SG meeting (morning preferred).</p>	<p>CL to schedule 1:1 meetings with GWRC and WCC CEs to brief them on BRT business case development.</p> <p>AK to invite CEs and RB to the 4 June SG meeting.</p>