

Ngauranga to Airport Steering Group
AGENDA updated with MINUTES

Meeting information

Time:	10am – 12pm	
Date:	Wednesday 17 June 2015	
Location:	Greater Wellington Council Chamber, Shed 39, 2 Fryatt Quay	
Members:	Wayne Hastie (GWRC) Deb Hume (GWRC) Luke Troy (GWRC) Geoff Swainson (WCC) Anthony Wilson Selwyn Blackmore (NZTA)	Lyndon Hammond (NZTA) (Acting Chair) Amy Kearse (Secretariat)
Other Attendees	Jim Bentley (N2A Programme Manager) Chrissie Little (BRT Project Manager)	
Member Apologies:	-	
Reading:	-	

Agenda

Item	Description	Activity	Time
1	Welcome		10.00-10.10
2	Approve 16 April minutes and review action register	Approve/review	10.10-10.15
3	Update on N2A programme	Discuss	10.15-11.15
4	Update on BRT project	Discuss	11.15-11.30
5	Preparation for Governance Group meeting 23 June	Discuss	11.30-11.45
6	General Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm actions • Next meeting July TBC 	Discuss	11.45-12.00

MINUTES

Item	Description	Actions
1	<p><i>Welcome</i></p> <p>LH introduced Aideen Larkin (Senior Project Manager, NZTA) who is supporting JB on N2A programme management.</p>	-
2	<p><i>Approve 16 April minutes and review action register</i></p> <p>16 April minutes approved.</p> <p>Action register reviewed and amendments made.</p> <p>Under discussion of action 13, WH noted for the importance of transparency amongst the partners that GWRC is intending to submit on the Town Belt Bill (as relevant for BRT).</p> <p>Speaking to action 18, CL noted that the BRT approval pathway is a living document.</p>	
4	<p><i>BRT project</i></p> <p>JB recapped on N2A workshop on 28 May, noting he came away encouraged that conversations were open, and based on discussion there and follow-up discussions, a draft N2A programme has been developed. Before taking the BRT business case forward and committing funding, JB noted a need to first check for alignment with what we have signed up to in N2A, and on BRT, which will enable the group to move forward with certainty or invest more time to figure this out.</p> <p>The group discussed the need for clarify on the type of BRT, the potential length of the implementation period, development potential, and the importance of protecting the corridor. The group agreed there was a need for concurrent consideration (and design) of active modes and public transport, and that the Urban Cycleways Fund (UCF) has heightened this.</p> <p>The group discussed whether there was shared understanding at the governance and steering levels of the scope of BRT, that the business case helps provide clarity on this through its articulation of the options, one of which is based on a WCC-developed option.</p> <p>The group discussed the wording in the N2A corridor strategy noting this is consistent with wording around developing the spine, subject to business casing. The group discussed the trade-offs inherent with road space allocation amongst different modes, that the business case is likely to land in a pragmatic space where a BRT solution can be achieved without significant dis-benefits to other modes.</p> <p>The group further discussed the importance of being clear on what is meant by BRT, noting that some options are likely to be lower than what has been promoted. The group discussed the potential for examining phasing between options, particularly during the next business case phase, and being clear on what the long term aspiration is, and how BRT interacts with delivery of the roading improvements and the PT transformation programme. The group spoke of the potential to communicate consistently regarding the Wellington solution, which includes new timetable, new routes, intersection improvements, bus stop rationalisation and a philosophy of continuous improvement.</p> <p>The group agreed that when it reports to the GG, BRT should be presented as a component of the total solution, so we are showing the integration and alignment, explaining the parts.</p> <p>The group discussed its role in reviewing the business case. It noted the potential for the business case to articulate the</p>	

	<p>opportunity to move from one option to another over time, and keeping the options open for consideration.</p> <p>The group discussed the need for a cover report from the SG to the GG, which should highlight particular issues around parking (type, locality and what is prioritised), integration of BRT with the other N2A activities, and being clear about what will be covered during the next business case phase. The group discussed the importance of managing expectations both of the end product and also where we are in the process, as they do want to see the answer, and explanation of where you will get detailed answers in next phase, and importantly, communicating that there is a case worthy of further investment (ie, BCRs are looking good, well over 1 and that costs are more reasonable than PTSS costs had indicated).</p> <p>The group discussed whether BRT was ready to go to the GG next week. WCC noted that next week is KL's last for 6 weeks.</p>	
5	<p><i>Preparation for Governance Group meeting 23 June</i></p> <p>JB noted that he will provide an update on the programme, and in terms of BRT wanted to take some time to do this discussion of options together, and now have enough that we can continue on BRT.</p> <p>CL noted that the BRT project has a product that the group can review next week, send out well in advance and have a session after the governance group.</p> <p>LT summarised the key points to convey to the GG as follows: high level proof of concept for BRT, some of detail not there yet, so may need to elaborate on these later. The steering group has the business case, and has programmed a session to look through it. Our first sense is that there are worthwhile options to pursue, and that's good, and at a high level the costs are better than what we have identified previously.</p> <p>The group agreed it was preferable for the GG to meet from 8.30-9.30 and for the SG to have a session on the business case with the SG for an hour following that.</p> <p>JB to speak to N2A. CL to speak to BRT. LH and JB put a draft governance group agenda and paper together with slots for workstream leads to fill.</p>	<p>CL to send out Business Case report to SG.</p> <p>AK to arrange for SG workshop invitation from 9.45-11.15am on Tuesday 23 June.</p> <p>LT to arrange meeting room at GWRC for SG workshop.</p> <p>CL to invite PWC to SG workshop.</p> <p>LH and JB put a draft governance group agenda and paper together with slots for workstream leads to fill.</p> <p>Subject to confirmed agenda, AK to arrange for GG meeting time to be altered to 8.30-9.30am.</p>
3	<p><i>Update on N2A programme</i></p> <p>JB advised that an input to the programme was the N2A workshop, since formed working group. AL has put together programme plan. AL explained programme, noting key dependencies, including Basin best and worst case. The group discussed minor changes and AL agreed to email the draft programme plan to allow SG members an opportunity to provide further comment. The group confirmed the format was good but it would be useful to add more dependencies.</p> <p>The action arising from 28 April GG meeting to report back on the programme plan was raised and it was agreed that this should be presented to the GG as a 'starter' programme plan.</p>	<p>AL to email draft programme plan to SG members.</p> <p>SG members to provide feedback on draft programme plan by Friday 19 June.</p>
6	<p><i>General Business</i></p> <p>DH suggested JB as future chair to free LH to represent P&I view more fully. LH responded that the intent was for the Chair position to be rotating and that he is filling initially, but will give the suggestion some thought.</p> <p>LH concluded meeting at 11.50am (finishing 10 minutes early).</p>	