

Luke Troy

From: Luke Troy
Sent: Monday, 14 March 2016 4:28 PM
To: Kay Baxter (Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz)
Subject: Transport Workstream

Importance: High

Hi Kay

Greg reported back from the CE Forum that you have changed the consultants for the next phase of work on the Transport workstream from Castelia to Martin Jenkins. Would be keen to hear your rationale for this – are you able to fill me in?

Thanks

Luke

Luke Troy | General Manager Strategy

GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Te Pane Matua Taiao

142 Wakefield St | PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142

T: 04 830 4155 | M: 021 456 947

www.gw.govt.nz

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

Luke Troy

From: Luke Troy
Sent: Friday, 1 April 2016 4:12 PM
To: Kay Baxter
Subject: RE: Economic Development and Transport Workstreams

Thanks Kay

Yes Greg would be keen to meet Nick on WREDA.

Thanks for the heads up on Transport.

Luke

From: Kay Baxter [<mailto:Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>]
Sent: Friday, 1 April 2016 3:12 p.m.
To: Luke Troy
Subject: RE: Economic Development and Transport Workstreams

Hi Luke
Thanks for your email.

ED Report

Martin Jenkins are doing limited interviews for their scoping report. Nick Davis has met with Mayor Guppy, Peter Biggs, Chris Whelan, and Nicola Shorten and Colin Drew. You might recall Kevin at the CEs Forum asked that we do a desk top exercise only, but we felt a few interviews were needed to round out the report. Nick has also asked to meet with Kevin Lavery and offered to meet with Greg if he wanted to add anything to Nicola and Colin's discussion. Let me know what Greg would like to do and I'll get Nick to set something up.

Timing: We are aiming to send a draft to councils in mid-April (depending on interview timing) and allow four weeks for council feedback on the draft.

Transport

We are working on information requests and methodology now with MartinJenkins/Cranleigh, which we will send out on Tuesday for discussion at CEs on Friday 8th.

As a heads up, MJ is considering requesting (TBC):

- current resources and capability (e.g. staffing) of each council
- basic information on the physical networks managed by each authority (i.e. length by category)
- book value and ownership arrangements of all relevant assets
- current funding disaggregated by channel, source and authority
- a description of all transport activities/functions currently undertaken
- current service and performance levels and target (probably from LTPs)
- results of any relevant customer satisfaction surveys
- relevant transport strategies and policies – e.g. walking and cycling strategies, accessibility strategies etc.

We don't have a timeline for this information yet. I'll let you know asap as I appreciate it will take substantial resource to put together. If this distracts from the Wairarapa information request, I think the Wairarapa material has clear priority!

In terms of engagement with councils, we are keen to use the council workshops we have booked, CEs Forums and Mayoral Forums. We are also planning to set up two other workshops involving councillors and officers – in late April and early May (probably two consecutive Wednesdays - 6.30-8.30pm).

Give me a call if you want to discuss any of this.

Cheers

Kay

From: Luke Troy [mailto:Luke.Troy@gw.govt.nz]
Sent: Friday, 1 April 2016 10:05 a.m.
To: Kay Baxter
Subject: Economic Development and Transport Workstreams
Importance: High

Hi Kay

Just checking in on these other workstreams and have a couple of queries:

Econ Dev – I note that Martin Jenkins have been doing interviews with some limited people currently involved with WREDA for their scoping exercise. Just wondering how extensive this exercise is and whether people like Greg would be interviewed at some point as well? Also when is the scoping report due to be completed? Will we see a draft?

Transport – I received the final Castelia report and note Martin Jenkins have been appointed for the IBC stage. I am unclear however on the timing and extent of involvement for GWRC in this next stage – presumably a working group will be re-established and further information will be needed from all councils including us – what’s the timing on this?

Would be great if you could clarify these issues

Thanks

Luke

Luke Troy | General Manager Strategy

GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Te Pane Matua Taiao
142 Wakefield St | PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142

T: 04 830 4155 | M: 021 456 947

www.gw.govt.nz

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any

Luke Troy

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 11 April 2016 1:44 PM
To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; Luke Troy; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'
Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; Paul Clarke; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'
Subject: Information requested by 22 April and 29 April
Attachments: MJ Wellington Transport Business Case - Scoping Report 04042016 v2.pdf

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Afternoon

Information request by 22 April and 29 April

The attachment to this email sets out information that the Commission is requesting from each council to develop the indicative business case for the transport work.

We presented the attached paper at CEs Forum on Friday and the CEs asked that I contact you directly with this information request.

There are two tranches of information: priority items requested by 22 April and secondary items requested by 29 April.

I appreciate this information will take some resource and time to put together and I thank you in advance for your cooperation. FYI, the timeline for the project is driven by the need to make substantial progress before local body electioneering takes off in earnest.

Working with council officers

Paul Clarke at MartinJenkins will also be seeking a meeting with you and your Chief Executive to test the strategic case and early stage economic case. Paul has reviewed the initial work you did in August/September for our workshops (what's working well and not well etc.), our workshops notes, as well as your council's feedback on the Castalia report. Therefore these interviews will build on the input you've already given us.

Full council workshops

Up to this point, we have been presenting the same information at the CEs Forum for input, then the Mayoral Forum and then at council workshops – the same content at each council. However, given the time it takes to get around all the councils, we will be running a slightly different approach for this next stage of work. This means that the content for discussing with councils will have evolved slightly at each council workshop. We will send you and your CE an agenda and slides before each council workshop so there are no surprises.

Joint economic case workshops

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials. Dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm, venue TBC. We'll be writing to your Mayor's Office today to invite them. I'll copy you in.

Any queries, please contact me or Paul.

Kind regards

Kay Baxter

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Monday, 4 April 2016 1:13 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; Wayne Heerdegen; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Afternoon

Castalia report finalised

Just in case this didn't come through your internal system, please see email below to your Mayor/Chair.

Thanks for your input and effort to help us put this report together.

Through February and March, we presented the report at workshops with all councils except WCC and KCDC.

Councillors' response was generally muted interest. A couple commented that the framework was useful considering the options and they appreciated having a broad range of options up for discussion. Most of the questions made it clear that more specificity was needed in terms of the challenges in practice and the options to resolve them (e.g. governance arrangements).

Information request coming

The next step will involve us asking you for detailed information to support an indicative business case, which will be more specific and practical than the Castalia report. I flagged this at CEs Forum last month. The timing and specifics of the request are TBC but it will likely involve significant work for you and your people this month.

Councillor and officer workshops planned

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials.

Tentative dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm.

Workshop participants would work with the consultants to:

- Confirm the short list of options, including the extent to which they provide a suitably complete description
- Confirm the critical success factors
- Assess short listed options against investment objectives and critical success factors.

As preparation for the workshops, the consultants will build on Castalia's work to:

- Develop the issues identified into a clear problem statement against which the case for change can be assessed
- Draft proposed investment objectives for any change
- Ensure that the options identified are suitably complete, for example by being clear about the governance arrangements
- Propose a short list of 3 or 4 options for more detailed consideration in the workshops.

The preparation work will be tested with CEs and Mayors at upcoming Forums on 8 April and 22 April.

I'll keep you updated as the work progresses and send you any papers.

Kind regards

Kay

From: Sandra Preston

Sent: Tuesday, 29 March 2016 10:07 a.m.

To: 'raewyn.bleakley@nzta.govt.nz'; 'ray.wallace@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'Ross Church'; 'chris.laidlaw@gw.govt.nz'; 'john.booth@cdc.govt.nz'; 'lynp@mstn.govt.nz'; 'wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'themayor@swdc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@wcc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@pcc.govt.nz'

Cc: 'Wira Gardiner'; Kay Baxter; 'Tony Stallinger'; 'Greg Campbell'; 'Pat Dougherty'; Sarah Gunn; Don Mackay; 'Kevin Lavery'; 'Wendy Walker'; 'Chris Upton'; 'Pim Borren'; 'Paul Crimp - CEO'; 'Jane Davis'

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Dear Wellington Mayoral Forum and NZTA Central Region Director

We are pleased to provide you with the finalised Castalia report on options for changing transport arrangements in the Wellington region.

The Wellington Mayoral Forum, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the LGC commissioned the transport report last year, as part of our collaborative process to investigate local government functions in the region. You will recall Castalia gave a presentation on the draft report to the Mayoral Forum meeting in December 2015. A similar presentation has also been made to most of the councils in the region. Most councils provided detailed comments on the draft report in January 2016.

We've also attached councils' comments and a version of the final report with tracked changes, showing how those comments were incorporated into the final version.

We would appreciate you sharing the final report with your councillors.

We are continuing with the next step of the transport work – to **develop an indicative business case for the options, which will also include governance options and implementation phasing**. The first step of that work is to consult with your chief executives and NZTA (at the next CEs forum next week) on a scoping report covering:

- how the business case process will be executed
- what information we would like to request from your officers, and
- how we continue to involve councillors in the development of the work.

We appreciate councils' collaboration in this project and your continued support for this work.

Kind regards,

Sandra

Sandra Preston | Chief Executive Officer | Local Government Commission

Department of Internal Affairs Te Tari Taiwhenua

Phone + 64 4 495 9326 | Mobile 027 807 9540

Luke Troy

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 12 April 2016 9:45 AM
To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; Luke Troy; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Baz Kaufman'; Tamsin Evans
Subject: FYI: Invitation : Transport Arrangements Business Case Workshop : 27 April and 4 May 2016
Attachments: FINAL PDF Wellington Regional Transport Report.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Sandra Preston
Sent: Tuesday, 12 April 2016 9:32 a.m.
To: 'john.booth@cdc.govt.nz'; 'ray.wallace@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'Ross.Church@kapiticoast.govt.nz'; 'lynp@mstn.govt.nz'; 'mayor@pcc.govt.nz'; 'themayor@swdc.govt.nz'; 'wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@wcc.govt.nz'; 'chris.laidlaw@gw.govt.nz'; 'Raewyn.Bleakley@nzta.govt.nz'
Cc: 'jane@cdc.govt.nz'; 'tony.stallinger@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'patrick.dougherty@kapiticoast.govt.nz'; 'pimb@mstn.govt.nz'; 'wwalker@pcc.govt.nz'; 'ceo@swdc.govt.nz'; 'chris.upton@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'kevin.lavery@wcc.govt.nz'; 'greg.campbell@gw.govt.nz'; Kay Baxter
Subject: Invitation : Transport Arrangements Business Case Workshop : 27 April and 4 May 2016

Dear Mayors and Chair

At the end of March I provided you with the finalised Castalia report on options for changing transport arrangements in the Wellington region. We are progressing this work on transport and continuing the collaborative approach of Wellington's councils and the Local Government Commission working together to strengthen local government in the region.

We would like to invite one to two councillors and a senior officer for each council, and one to two NZTA officials to two transport workshops.

Dates: Wednesday 27 April and 4 May
Venue: TBC, Upper Hutt
Timing: 6.30pm-8.30pm

A light meal will be served from 6.00pm.

It would be preferable to have the same people at each workshop if possible, as the second will build on the first.

Please RVSP to Ms Charlie Park (charlie.park@dia.govt.nz) by Friday 22 April.

The purpose of the workshops is to develop the indicative business case for changed transport arrangements, including

- Describing the options in detail – including governance options and implementation phasing
- Confirming what any change should achieve (investment objectives)
- Assessing the options

In order for all of your councillors to have visibility of this work and input into the indicative business case, we will be discussing it at workshops with each of your councils in late April and May.

Thank you for your continued support for this work.

Yours sincerely
Sandra Preston

Sandra Preston | Chief Executive Officer | Local Government Commission
Department of Internal Affairs Te Tari Taiwhenua
Phone + 64 4 495 9326 | Mobile 027 807 9540

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 20 April 2016 3:05 PM
To: 'mayor@wcc.govt.nz'; 'john.booth@cdc.govt.nz'; 'Lyn Patterson'; 'Adrienne Staples - Her Worship the Mayor'; 'ray.wallace@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'ross.church@kapiticoast.govt.nz'; 'mayor@pcc.govt.nz'; Chris Laidlaw - Chair
Cc: 'kevin.lavery@wcc.govt.nz'; Greg Campbell; Luke Troy; 'Pim Borren'; 'Pat Dougherty'; 'Tony Stallinger'; 'Chris Upton'; 'Jane Davis'; 'Paul Crimp - CEO'; 'Wendy Walker'
Subject: FYI - Media inquiry from DomPost re Castalia transport report

Afternoon

We've been contacted by the DomPost to provide comment on the Castalia transport report, which has been leaked.

WCC and GW have also been contacted for comment – thank you for letting us know.

Here's our response for your information:

What is the purpose of the report and the work on transport?

The purpose of the Castalia report is to look at whether there are ways to strengthen the region's transport system.

- What happens next for the options?

We are continuing to work with councils on the case for change, understanding the implications of all the options – and getting a clearer picture of what we collectively want to achieve.

We will be inviting public feedback and holding interest-group workshops in June on the case for change and how we could achieve it. Later in the process public consultation will take place on detailed preferred options.

- How and when could any possible changes take place?

It is too early to say. The timing of change depends on the options chosen: a small roading entity could be in place in a year; a larger entity involving public transport and roading would take several years to implement.

- Who makes the final decision on any proposed changes/retention of the status quo?

This depends on options chosen; councils could implement some options by themselves. Others would need the Commission's mandate to implement.

Background

In June 2015, the Local Government Commission released its decision that a single unitary council with local boards for the Wellington region is off the table. While the Wellington public made it clear they didn't want a super-city, about 40 per cent of people who made submissions wanted improvements to local government.

The Commission has since been working with the region's councils to find opportunities to strengthen the region's local government. The Wellington Mayoral Forum, NZTA and the Commission have prioritised an investigation of whether transport can be delivered in a better way - without amalgamating councils.

The Castalia report sets out, at a high level, a range of issues and options for changing the region's transport arrangements. The options range from a small multi-council organisation for roading maintenance covering part of the region to a fully integrated Auckland Transport type arrangement across all or most of the region's nine councils.

There is a lot more work to do before we could consider putting a change proposal on the table. The Commission, NZTA and councils would need to be satisfied change would provide a real improvement for people using and paying for the region's transport network. Questions like whether the system would be resilient, sustainable and responsive to communities' needs will also need to be answered.

Kay Baxter

Lead Adviser – Reorganisation

Local Government Commission Mana Kāwanatanga Ā Rohe

DDI +64 4 495 9331 | Extn: 5331 | 021 802 176

147 Lambton Quay | P O Box 5362, Wellington 6145, New Zealand | www.lgc.govt.nz

Luke Troy

From: Luke Troy
Sent: Wednesday, 27 April 2016 12:55 PM
To: Kay Baxter
Subject: RE: Officers at transport workshops?

Yes me and Greg will be there

From: Kay Baxter [mailto:Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz]
Sent: Wednesday, 27 April 2016 12:54 p.m.
To: Luke Troy
Subject: Officers at transport workshops?

Hi Luke

Are you and Greg (and Wayne?) coming this evening to the transport workshops? I presumed you were but didn't actually check.

27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm, Upper Hutt Cossie Club

Cheers
Kay

From: Luke Troy [mailto:Luke.Troy@gw.govt.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 12 April 2016 11:23 a.m.
To: paul.clarke@martinjenkins.co.nz
Cc: Kay Baxter; Wayne Hastie; Greg Campbell; Chris Laidlaw - Chair; Andrea Houlihan; Helen Plant; Christine Kelly
Subject: Re: Information requested by 22 April and 29 April

Hi Paul

good to catch up the other day. As requested here are our key contacts for this work:

- interviews: Greg Campbell (CE), Luke Troy (GM Strategy), Wayne Hastie (GM PT)
- contact point for information and project: Luke Troy
- councillors to attend workshops: Chris Laidlaw (Chair) and Barbara Donaldson (1 workshop only)

In terms of finding suitable meeting dates, it is best to contact Andrea, Christine or Helen (see emails above) in the first instance.

Regards

Luke

Sent from my iPad

On 11/04/2016, at 1:45 pm, Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz> wrote:

Afternoon
Information request by 22 April and 29 April

The attachment to this email sets out information that the Commission is requesting from each council to develop the indicative business case for the transport work.

We presented the attached paper at CEs Forum on Friday and the CEs asked that I contact you directly with this information request.

There are two tranches of information: priority items requested by 22 April and secondary items requested by 29 April.

I appreciate this information will take some resource and time to put together and I thank you in advance for your cooperation. FYI, the timeline for the project is driven by the need to make substantial progress before local body electioneering takes off in earnest.

Working with council officers

Paul Clarke at MartinJenkins will also be seeking a meeting with you and your Chief Executive to test the strategic case and early stage economic case. Paul has reviewed the initial work you did in August/September for our workshops (what's working well and not well etc.), our workshops notes, as well as your council's feedback on the Castalia report. Therefore these interviews will build on the input you've already given us.

Full council workshops

Up to this point, we have been presenting the same information at the CEs Forum for input, then the Mayoral Forum and then at council workshops – the same content at each council. However, given the time it takes to get around all the councils, we will be running a slightly different approach for this next stage of work. This means that the content for discussing with councils will have evolved slightly at each council workshop. We will send you and your CE an agenda and slides before each council workshop so there are no surprises.

Joint economic case workshops

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials. Dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm, venue TBC. We'll be writing to your Mayor's Office today to invite them. I'll copy you in.

Any queries, please contact me or Paul.

Kind regards

Kay Baxter

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Monday, 4 April 2016 1:13 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; Wayne Heerdegen; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Afternoon

Castalia report finalised

Just in case this didn't come through your internal system, please see email below to your Mayor/Chair.

Thanks for your input and effort to help us put this report together.

Through February and March, we presented the report at workshops with all councils except WCC and KCDC.

Councillors' response was generally muted interest. A couple commented that the framework was useful considering the options and they appreciated having a broad range of options up for

discussion. Most of the questions made it clear that more specificity was needed in terms of the challenges in practice and the options to resolve them (e.g. governance arrangements).

Information request coming

The next step will involve us asking you for detailed information to support an indicative business case, which will be more specific and practical than the Castalia report. I flagged this at CEs Forum last month. The timing and specifics of the request are TBC but it will likely involve significant work for you and your people this month.

Councillor and officer workshops planned

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials.

Tentative dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm.

Workshop participants would work with the consultants to:

- Confirm the short list of options, including the extent to which they provide a suitably complete description
- Confirm the critical success factors
- Assess short listed options against investment objectives and critical success factors.

As preparation for the workshops, the consultants will build on Castalia's work to:

- Develop the issues identified into a clear problem statement against which the case for change can be assessed
- Draft proposed investment objectives for any change
- Ensure that the options identified are suitably complete, for example by being clear about the governance arrangements
- Propose a short list of 3 or 4 options for more detailed consideration in the workshops.

The preparation work will be tested with CEs and Mayors at upcoming Forums on 8 April and 22 April.

I'll keep you updated as the work progresses and send you any papers.

Kind regards

Kay

From: Sandra Preston

Sent: Tuesday, 29 March 2016 10:07 a.m.

To: 'raewyn.bleakley@nzta.govt.nz'; 'ray.wallace@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'Ross Church';

'chris.laidlaw@gw.govt.nz'; 'john.booth@cdc.govt.nz'; 'lynp@mstn.govt.nz';

'wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'themayor@swdc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@wcc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@pcc.govt.nz'

Cc: 'Wira Gardiner'; Kay Baxter; 'Tony Stallinger'; 'Greg Campbell'; 'Pat Dougherty'; Sarah Gunn; Don Mackay; 'Kevin Lavery'; 'Wendy Walker'; 'Chris Upton'; 'Pim Borren'; 'Paul Crimp - CEO'; 'Jane Davis'

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Dear Wellington Mayoral Forum and NZTA Central Region Director

We are pleased to provide you with the finalised Castalia report on options for changing transport arrangements in the Wellington region.

The Wellington Mayoral Forum, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the LGC commissioned the transport report last year, as part of our collaborative process to

investigate local government functions in the region. You will recall Castalia gave a presentation on the draft report to the Mayoral Forum meeting in December 2015. A similar presentation has also been made to most of the councils in the region. Most councils provided detailed comments on the draft report in January 2016.

We've also attached councils' comments and a version of the final report with tracked changes, showing how those comments were incorporated into the final version.

We would appreciate you sharing the final report with your councillors.

We are continuing with the next step of the transport work – to **develop an indicative business case for the options, which will also include governance options and implementation phasing**. The first step of that work is to consult with your chief executives and NZTA (at the next CEs forum next week) on a scoping report covering:

- how the business case process will be executed
- what information we would like to request from your officers, and
- how we continue to involve councillors in the development of the work.

We appreciate councils' collaboration in this project and your continued support for this work.

Kind regards,

Sandra

Sandra Preston | Chief Executive Officer | Local Government Commission
Department of Internal Affairs Te Tari Taiwhenua
Phone + 64 4 495 9326 | Mobile 027 807 9540

<MJ Wellington Transport Business Case - Scoping Report 04042016 v2.pdf>

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

Luke Troy

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 10 May 2016 8:55 AM
To: Luke Troy
Subject: RE: Transport and RTC

Hi Luke

I meant to ask you about this last night. That sounds like a good idea but my feeling is that the 24 May would be too early. To take up the RTC's time we'd need to have moved things on a bit - i.e. having provided something for more detailed consideration by officers. When's the next meeting?

Agreed - Workshop would be preferable.

Also we were thinking that the consultants should be talking to Paul Swain...even if he has moved on to his Fire Service job. Are you ok for us to set that up?

Cheers
Kay

-----Original Message-----

From: Luke Troy [<mailto:Luke.Troy@gw.govt.nz>]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 May 2016 8:27 a.m.
To: Kay Baxter
Subject: Transport and RTC

Hi Kay

We have the Regional Transport Committee meeting on 24 May. We are keen to have a discussion on the LGC workstream, progress update and options. Would someone from your team be available to attend this and lead the presentation?

Whilst the membership will be largely the same as your other workshops, this is an opportunity for the them to consider the options from a different perspective and focus on impacts and issues from the RTC perspective.

We could make it a workshop rather than a meeting of preferable.

Let me know what you think?

Thanks Luke

Sent from my iPhone

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

Luke Troy

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 12 May 2016 6:04 PM
To: Luke Troy
Subject: RE: Transport and RTC

Hi Luke

I think not for this RTC meeting - but possible for the August one.

Cheers
Kay

-----Original Message-----

From: Luke Troy [<mailto:Luke.Troy@gw.govt.nz>]
Sent: Thursday, 12 May 2016 2:39 p.m.
To: Kay Baxter
Subject: RE: Transport and RTC

Hi Kay

We are finalising the agenda for RTC now - are you wanting to come along to this meeting on 24th? The next one being in August. If you could let me know either way that would be helpful

Thanks

Luke

-----Original Message-----

From: Kay Baxter [<mailto:Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 May 2016 8:55 a.m.
To: Luke Troy
Subject: RE: Transport and RTC

Hi Luke

I meant to ask you about this last night. That sounds like a good idea but my feeling is that the 24 May would be too early. To take up the RTC's time we'd need to have moved things on a bit - i.e. having provided something for more detailed consideration by officers. When's the next meeting?

Agreed - Workshop would be preferable.

Also we were thinking that the consultants should be talking to Paul Swain...even if he has moved on to his Fire Service job. Are you ok for us to set that up?

Cheers
Kay

-----Original Message-----

From: Luke Troy [<mailto:Luke.Troy@gw.govt.nz>]
Sent: Tuesday, 10 May 2016 8:27 a.m.
To: Kay Baxter
Subject: Transport and RTC

Hi Kay

We have the Regional Transport Committee meeting on 24 May. We are keen to have a discussion on the LGC workstream, progress update and options. Would someone from your team be available to attend this and lead the presentation?

Whilst the membership will be largely the same as your other workshops, this is an opportunity for the them to consider the options from a different perspective and focus on impacts and issues from the RTC perspective.

We could make it a workshop rather than a meeting of preferable.

Let me know what you think?

Thanks Luke

Sent from my iPhone

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

Luke Troy

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Friday, 13 May 2016 4:51 PM
To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; Luke Troy; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'; 'Tamsin Evans'
Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Gunther Wild'; Sarah Gunn
Subject: LGC transport workshops - invitation list
Attachments: LGC invite list for targeted transport workshops.xlsx

Afternoon

I've attached our proposed invitation list for our transport workshops in June & July. Let me know if we've missed anyone by Friday 20 May.

The dates for the workshops are below. I'm not expecting you guys will attend – but if you wanted to come, you'd be welcome. Please let me know.

Have a good weekend.

Kay

Transport Workshops

	Date	Time	Venue
Wellington	June 13	1000-1200	CAANZ Conference Centre
Greytown	June 23	1000-1200	Joe Rewi Room, Greytown Town Centre
Kāpiti	July 4	1000-1200	Kāpiti Pavilion
Hutt	July 4	1400-1600	The Dowse

From: Kay Baxter
Sent: Friday, 22 April 2016 4:48 p.m.
To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'; Tamsin Evans
Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; 'Paul Clarke'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; Gunther Wild
Subject: RE: Information requested by 22 April and 29 April - Thank you

Thank you very much to those who have provided the information we requested below – much appreciated.

Mayoral Forum today

Martin Jenkins and Doug Weir were at today's Mayoral Forum presenting their take on the problem definition, investment objectives, CSFs - building on the Castalia report & workshops, and your notes on what's working well etc. Slides attached FYI.

Joint economic case workshops – 27 April and 4 May

We look forward to seeing some of you next week at the Upper Hutt Cossie Club. Don't go to the Gray Bartlett gig by mistake. We've got a good mix of councillors and Mayors (12), CEs (5) and council officers (7) coming.

Community engagement

We are planning some community engagement for transport at the same time as our Wairarapa engagement through June and early July. We'll be doing online engagement to test the case for change and ways to address it, including CCOs.

This engagement will be more specific than "Let's get Welly moving" and will fit between that campaign's public engagement.

We also plan workshops for interested business, community and transport groups in early/mid June in Kāpiti, Wairarapa, Lower Hutt and Wellington – by invitation rather than by public advertising. If there is anyone you think we should invite, please let me know by 13 May. I'll send you the invitation lists to check over about 10 May.

Have a great long weekend.

Regards
Kay

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Monday, 11 April 2016 1:44 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; Paul Clarke; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'

Subject: Information requested by 22 April and 29 April

Importance: High

Afternoon

Information request by 22 April and 29 April

The attachment to this email sets out information that the Commission is requesting from each council to develop the indicative business case for the transport work.

We presented the attached paper at CEs Forum on Friday and the CEs asked that I contact you directly with this information request.

There are two tranches of information: priority items requested by 22 April and secondary items requested by 29 April.

I appreciate this information will take some resource and time to put together and I thank you in advance for your cooperation. FYI, the timeline for the project is driven by the need to make substantial progress before local body electioneering takes off in earnest.

Working with council officers

Paul Clarke at MartinJenkins will also be seeking a meeting with you and your Chief Executive to test the strategic case and early stage economic case. Paul has reviewed the initial work you did in August/September for our workshops (what's working well and not well etc.), our workshops notes, as well as your council's feedback on the Castalia report. Therefore these interviews will build on the input you've already given us.

Full council workshops

Up to this point, we have been presenting the same information at the CEs Forum for input, then the Mayoral Forum and then at council workshops – the same content at each council. However, given the time it takes to get around all the councils, we will be running a slightly different approach for this next stage of work. This means that the content for discussing with councils will have evolved slightly at each council workshop. We will send you and your CE an agenda and slides before each council workshop so there are no surprises.

Joint economic case workshops

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials. Dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm, venue TBC. We'll be writing to your Mayor's Office today to invite them. I'll copy you in.

Any queries, please contact me or Paul.
Kind regards
Kay Baxter

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Monday, 4 April 2016 1:13 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; Wayne Heerdegen; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Afternoon

Castalia report finalised

Just in case this didn't come through your internal system, please see email below to your Mayor/Chair.

Thanks for your input and effort to help us put this report together.

Through February and March, we presented the report at workshops with all councils except WCC and KDCDC.

Councillors' response was generally muted interest. A couple commented that the framework was useful considering the options and they appreciated having a broad range of options up for discussion. Most of the questions made it clear that more specificity was needed in terms of the challenges in practice and the options to resolve them (e.g. governance arrangements).

Information request coming

The next step will involve us asking you for detailed information to support an indicative business case, which will be more specific and practical than the Castalia report. I flagged this at CEs Forum last month. The timing and specifics of the request are TBC but it will likely involve significant work for you and your people this month.

Councillor and officer workshops planned

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials.

Tentative dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm.

Workshop participants would work with the consultants to:

- Confirm the short list of options, including the extent to which they provide a suitably complete description
- Confirm the critical success factors
- Assess short listed options against investment objectives and critical success factors.

As preparation for the workshops, the consultants will build on Castalia's work to:

- Develop the issues identified into a clear problem statement against which the case for change can be assessed
- Draft proposed investment objectives for any change
- Ensure that the options identified are suitably complete, for example by being clear about the governance arrangements
- Propose a short list of 3 or 4 options for more detailed consideration in the workshops.

The preparation work will be tested with CEs and Mayors at upcoming Forums on 8 April and 22 April.

I'll keep you updated as the work progresses and send you any papers.

Kind regards

Kay

From: Sandra Preston

Sent: Tuesday, 29 March 2016 10:07 a.m.

To: 'raewyn.bleakley@nzta.govt.nz'; 'ray.wallace@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'Ross Church'; 'chris.laidlaw@gw.govt.nz'; 'john.booth@cdc.govt.nz'; 'lynp@mstn.govt.nz'; 'wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'themayor@swdc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@wcc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@pcc.govt.nz'

Cc: 'Wira Gardiner'; Kay Baxter; 'Tony Stallinger'; 'Greg Campbell'; 'Pat Dougherty'; Sarah Gunn; Don Mackay; 'Kevin Lavery'; 'Wendy Walker'; 'Chris Upton'; 'Pim Borren'; 'Paul Crimp - CEO'; 'Jane Davis'

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Dear Wellington Mayoral Forum and NZTA Central Region Director

We are pleased to provide you with the finalised Castalia report on options for changing transport arrangements in the Wellington region.

The Wellington Mayoral Forum, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the LGC commissioned the transport report last year, as part of our collaborative process to investigate local government functions in the region. You will recall Castalia gave a presentation on the draft report to the Mayoral Forum meeting in December 2015. A similar presentation has also been made to most of the councils in the region. Most councils provided detailed comments on the draft report in January 2016.

We've also attached councils' comments and a version of the final report with tracked changes, showing how those comments were incorporated into the final version.

We would appreciate you sharing the final report with your councillors.

We are continuing with the next step of the transport work – to **develop an indicative business case for the options, which will also include governance options and implementation phasing**. The first step of that work is to consult with your chief executives and NZTA (at the next CEs forum next week) on a scoping report covering:

- how the business case process will be executed
- what information we would like to request from your officers, and
- how we continue to involve councillors in the development of the work.

We appreciate councils' collaboration in this project and your continued support for this work.

Kind regards,

Sandra

Sandra Preston | Chief Executive Officer | Local Government Commission

Department of Internal Affairs Te Tari Taiwhenua

Phone + 64 4 495 9326 | Mobile 027 807 9540

Luke Troy

From: Kay Baxter <Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, 15 June 2016 5:36 PM
To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; Luke Troy; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'; 'Tamsin Evans'
Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Gunther Wild'; Sarah Gunn
Subject: LGC transport workstream - timing and process update

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi all

We had been planning to give councils the draft of the second transport report (i.e the indicative business case being prepared by MartinJenkins, TDG and Cranleigh) in June. This will now be sent to councils in late July and include feedback from the stakeholders' workshops, and then finalised late September.

We updated your CEs on this change in timing on Friday and emailed your Mayors/Chair on Sunday – after we were requested to comment for a media story in Monday's DomPost. You may have seen the article – "Region's transport plans slow down".

The reasons for this change in process are:

- This is a complex area and it has become apparent during our workshops with councils, there was a lot more work to do to understand each option, their strategic and operational implications, and how each option could practically work on the ground.
- The CE's have offered their time and expertise to further work up the options but have advised this wouldn't be possible till August given their other commitments right now (with Annual Plans and such). We think the options would benefit from this additional work at the CE level.
- The work to date has been very focused on engaging with councils and we need to bring a wider group of stakeholders and transport users into the discussion.

Given the complexities of the transport work, it was always happening at a slower pace than the other 4 workstreams (spatial planning, 3 waters, ED, and Wairarapa). As you know, given no public consultation has occurred on the transport options and in recognition of the local government election period, it was unlikely, based on current progress, we would have reached a preferred option(s) by August. We think we should take this extra time to work up the options over the next few months.

FYI, we had our first stakeholder workshop on Monday. We had about 30 people from about 25 groups present, and a good discussion on the problems and options. We'll send you meeting notes in a week or so for your information.

Please feel free to give me a call if you would like to discuss this further.

Kind regards

Kay Baxter

Kay Baxter
Lead Adviser – Reorganisation

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Friday, 13 May 2016 4:51 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'; 'Tamsin Evans'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Gunther Wild'; Sarah Gunn

Subject: LGC transport workshops - invitation list

Afternoon

I've attached our proposed invitation list for our transport workshops in June & July. Let me know if we've missed anyone by Friday 20 May.

The dates for the workshops are below. I'm not expecting you guys will attend – but if you wanted to come, you'd be welcome. Please let me know.

Have a good weekend.

Kay

Transport Workshops

	Date	Time	Venue
Wellington	June 13	1000-1200	CAANZ Conference Centre
Greytown	June 23	1000-1200	Joe Rewi Room, Greytown Town Centre
Kāpiti	July 4	1000-1200	Kāpiti Pavilion
Hutt	July 4	1400-1600	The Dowse

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Friday, 22 April 2016 4:48 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'; Tamsin Evans

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; 'Paul Clarke'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; Gunther Wild

Subject: RE: Information requested by 22 April and 29 April - Thank you

Thank you very much to those who have provided the information we requested below – much appreciated.

Mayoral Forum today

Martin Jenkins and Doug Weir were at today's Mayoral Forum presenting their take on the problem definition, investment objectives, CSFs - building on the Castalia report & workshops, and your notes on what's working well etc. Slides attached FYI.

Joint economic case workshops – 27 April and 4 May

We look forward to seeing some of you next week at the Upper Hutt Cossie Club. Don't go to the Gray Bartlett gig by mistake. We've got a good mix of councillors and Mayors (12), CEs (5) and council officers (7) coming.

Community engagement

We are planning some community engagement for transport at the same time as our Wairarapa engagement through June and early July. We'll be doing online engagement to test the case for change and ways to address it, including CCOs.

This engagement will be more specific than "Let's get Welly moving" and will fit between that campaign's public engagement.

We also plan workshops for interested business, community and transport groups in early/mid June in Kāpiti, Wairarapa, Lower Hutt and Wellington – by invitation rather than by public advertising. If there is anyone you think we should invite, please let me know by 13 May. I'll send you the invitation lists to check over about 10 May.

Have a great long weekend.

Regards
Kay

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Monday, 11 April 2016 1:44 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; 'Wayne Heerdegen'; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay; Paul Clarke; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'

Subject: Information requested by 22 April and 29 April

Importance: High

Afternoon

Information request by 22 April and 29 April

The attachment to this email sets out information that the Commission is requesting from each council to develop the indicative business case for the transport work.

We presented the attached paper at CEs Forum on Friday and the CEs asked that I contact you directly with this information request.

There are two tranches of information: priority items requested by 22 April and secondary items requested by 29 April.

I appreciate this information will take some resource and time to put together and I thank you in advance for your cooperation. FYI, the timeline for the project is driven by the need to make substantial progress before local body electioneering takes off in earnest.

Working with council officers

Paul Clarke at MartinJenkins will also be seeking a meeting with you and your Chief Executive to test the strategic case and early stage economic case. Paul has reviewed the initial work you did in August/September for our workshops (what's working well and not well etc.), our workshops notes, as well as your council's feedback on the Castalia report. Therefore these interviews will build on the input you've already given us.

Full council workshops

Up to this point, we have been presenting the same information at the CEs Forum for input, then the Mayoral Forum and then at council workshops – the same content at each council. However, given the time it takes to get around all the councils, we will be running a slightly different approach for this next stage of work. This means that the content for discussing with councils will have evolved slightly at each council workshop. We will send you and your CE an agenda and slides before each council workshop so there are no surprises.

Joint economic case workshops

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials. Dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm, venue TBC. We'll be writing to your Mayor's Office today to invite them. I'll copy you in.

Any queries, please contact me or Paul.

Kind regards
Kay Baxter

From: Kay Baxter

Sent: Monday, 4 April 2016 1:13 p.m.

To: 'Lachlan Wallach'; 'Bruce Sherlock'; 'Stuart Parkinson'; Wayne Heerdegen; 'Anthony Wilson'; 'Geoff.Swainson@wcc.govt.nz'; 'Luke Troy'; 'Sean Mallon'; 'David Hopman'; 'Mark Allingham - Group Manager Infrastructure Services'

Cc: Sarah Gunn; 'Baz Kaufman'; Don Mackay

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Afternoon

Castalia report finalised

Just in case this didn't come through your internal system, please see email below to your Mayor/Chair.

Thanks for your input and effort to help us put this report together.

Through February and March, we presented the report at workshops with all councils except WCC and KCDC.

Councillors' response was generally muted interest. A couple commented that the framework was useful considering the options and they appreciated having a broad range of options up for discussion. Most of the questions made it clear that more specificity was needed in terms of the challenges in practice and the options to resolve them (e.g. governance arrangements).

Information request coming

The next step will involve us asking you for detailed information to support an indicative business case, which will be more specific and practical than the Castalia report. I flagged this at CEs Forum last month. The timing and specifics of the request are TBC but it will likely involve significant work for you and your people this month.

Councillor and officer workshops planned

We would like to convene two joint council workshops to develop the economic case, involving one to two interested councillors and a senior officer from each council, and one to two NZTA officials.

Tentative dates for the workshops are 27 April and 4 May, 6.30-8.30pm.

Workshop participants would work with the consultants to:

- Confirm the short list of options, including the extent to which they provide a suitably complete description
- Confirm the critical success factors
- Assess short listed options against investment objectives and critical success factors.

As preparation for the workshops, the consultants will build on Castalia's work to:

- Develop the issues identified into a clear problem statement against which the case for change can be assessed
- Draft proposed investment objectives for any change
- Ensure that the options identified are suitably complete, for example by being clear about the governance arrangements
- Propose a short list of 3 or 4 options for more detailed consideration in the workshops.

The preparation work will be tested with CEs and Mayors at upcoming Forums on 8 April and 22 April.

I'll keep you updated as the work progresses and send you any papers.

Kind regards

Kay

From: Sandra Preston

Sent: Tuesday, 29 March 2016 10:07 a.m.

To: 'raewyn.bleakley@nzta.govt.nz'; 'ray.wallace@huttcity.govt.nz'; 'Ross Church'; 'chris.laidlaw@gw.govt.nz'; 'john.booth@cdc.govt.nz'; 'lynp@mstn.govt.nz'; 'wayne.guppy@uhcc.govt.nz'; 'themayor@swdc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@wcc.govt.nz'; 'mayor@pcc.govt.nz'

Cc: 'Wira Gardiner'; Kay Baxter; 'Tony Stallinger'; 'Greg Campbell'; 'Pat Dougherty'; Sarah Gunn; Don Mackay; 'Kevin Lavery'; 'Wendy Walker'; 'Chris Upton'; 'Pim Borren'; 'Paul Crimp - CEO'; 'Jane Davis'

Subject: Final report: Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (Castalia report)

Dear Wellington Mayoral Forum and NZTA Central Region Director

We are pleased to provide you with the finalised Castalia report on options for changing transport arrangements in the Wellington region.

The Wellington Mayoral Forum, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the LGC commissioned the transport report last year, as part of our collaborative process to investigate local government functions in the region. You will recall Castalia gave a presentation on the draft report to the Mayoral Forum meeting in December 2015. A similar presentation has also been made to most of the councils in the region. Most councils provided detailed comments on the draft report in January 2016.

We've also attached councils' comments and a version of the final report with tracked changes, showing how those comments were incorporated into the final version.

We would appreciate you sharing the final report with your councillors.

We are continuing with the next step of the transport work – to **develop an indicative business case for the options, which will also include governance options and implementation phasing**. The first step of that work is to consult with your chief executives and NZTA (at the next CEs forum next week) on a scoping report covering:

- how the business case process will be executed
- what information we would like to request from your officers, and
- how we continue to involve councillors in the development of the work.

We appreciate councils' collaboration in this project and your continued support for this work.

Kind regards,

Sandra

Sandra Preston | Chief Executive Officer | Local Government Commission

Department of Internal Affairs Te Tari Taiwhenua

Phone + 64 4 495 9326 | Mobile 027 807 9540

Luke Troy

From: Luke Troy
Sent: Tuesday, 20 September 2016 2:45 PM
To: Kay Baxter (Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz)
Subject: Transport IBC feedback
Attachments: GWRC feedback to Draft Report Wellington Region Transport Options IBC August16.docx

Importance: High

Hi Kay

Here is our feedback on the draft Transport IBC.

Let me know if you need any further information/explanation.

Thanks

Luke

Luke Troy | General Manager Strategy

GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Te Pane Matua Taiao

142 Wakefield St | PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142

T: 04 830 4155 | M: 021 456 947

www.qw.govt.nz

20 September 2016

GWRC feedback on Wellington Region Transport Indicative Business Case – Draft Report

Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft report 'Wellington Region Transport Indicative Business Case' developed by Martin Jenkins and TDG for the Local Government Commission.

We have considered the draft report and our response to the findings outlined in the report are set out below. The views of GWRC councillors have been canvassed in preparing this feedback.

Conclusions

- GWRC generally agrees with the problems identified in the draft report. However, while acknowledging that improvements are needed in the areas of alignment, integration and capability, we don't believe the current system is necessarily broken.
- We consider that worthwhile improvements can be achieved through non-structural measures involving greater use of formalised working arrangements between organisations to facilitate better coordination and collaboration in transport planning and delivery throughout the region.
- We strongly believe that a regional spatial plan is absolutely critical to the success of any council controlled organisation (CCO) option and indeed the future success of the region.
- It is not clear that the integration benefits of any CCO option would outweigh the costs and dis-benefits associated with these options.
- We have significant concerns over some of the governance and funding arrangements proposed for a Wellington Transport CCO.

Further discussion of these key areas is provided in the sections below.

Problem definition

We broadly agree with the problem definition outlined in the draft report. We note that the 'improve alignment and integration' objective relating to the first problem area is defined as including alignment with land use and urban development. This point is important when we consider the extent to which the proposed options address the problems.

Non-structural option

GWRC considers that worthwhile improvements can be achieved through non-structural measures. Greater use of formalised working arrangements between organisations would facilitate better collaboration and coordination of transport planning and delivery throughout the region. A number of collaborative transport programmes (such as Let's Get Wellington Moving) are currently underway, and we support this approach becoming a wider, more formalised way of working in future. A stronger role for the Regional Transport Committee is also supported.

We are concerned that the non-structural option assessed in the draft report does not include spatial planning. While acknowledging that spatial planning is being investigated through a separate work stream, we consider that discounting this is a significant oversight and does not provide an accurate presentation of the available options to address the wider alignment and integration problem.

Spatial planning is a vital piece of work for the region that has the potential to unlock the economic future of the region and deliver enhanced economic development outcomes over both the short and longer term. Spatial planning would contribute significantly to the identified alignment and integration objective by improving the integration of national, regional and local level transport planning and delivery, and improving integration of land use planning and transport.

Our feedback to the previous LGC Transport Options report identified spatial planning as a key 'non-structural' measure to address a number of the problems identified in that report. GWRC remains united in its support for regional spatial planning, and sees it as critical to support a strong, integrated and prosperous Wellington region.

We are also concerned to note that measures to strengthen the legislative requirement for councils and the NZ Transport Agency to 'give effect' to regional land transport plans in their respective planning and delivery of transport activities, have been discounted from the non-structural option.

Structural options (Option C, D, E)

The draft report includes three structural options. Overall, we are not convinced that any of the structural options proposed would effectively address the identified problems to the extent that the associated cost and disruption is justified.

Pooled Planning Support (option C) has some benefits, but only addresses a very narrow component of the overall problem definition. This option has close links to the Regional Transport Analytics Programme Business Case underway and we suggest that further work to progress this option should await the outcome of this process.

Wellington Roads (option D) would address the capability problem, but would have only a limited contribution to improving alignment and integration issues.

Wellington Transport (option E) option goes the furthest towards addressing the problems and the investment objectives, but will not fully address the alignment and integration issues identified. The option does not include state highway capital improvement projects, a

significant element of the region's transport network development, nor does it address the important issue of transport integration with land use and urban development planning.

Implementing Wellington Transport would involve the most significant cost and potential disruption. It has risks around complexity of governance and decision making, local voice, and misalignment with other council functions.

The impact of Wellington Transport on GWRC as an organisation would also be significant. It would involve major transfer of staff and possible changes to public transport funding, in addition to wider impacts on the council's balance sheet and financials.

Unlike Auckland, the Wellington region comprises a regional council and eight local councils and we have concerns about the likely effectiveness of the Wellington Transport option in a multi-council environment. GWRC remains unconvinced that the benefits of this option outweigh the potential cost, disruption and risks.

We note that the 'costs of transition' in the draft report are indicative only and would need to be worked through in much more detail to be fully understood.

We also note that transfer of transport-related assets to the CCO is set out in the draft report as a 'sub-option' of option E. Given the dramatically different impacts that asset transfer would have on council balance sheets, we suggest this would be better described as a new option F.

Phasing

Options D and E are described as points on a spectrum of varying regional consolidation of modes, functions, and responsibilities – with many intermediate options possible.

Our view is that options D and E are best considered as mutually exclusive options, and not options that can be phased from one to another over time. A Wellington Roads option (D) might seem like a logical first step towards a Wellington Transport option (E). However, this would have a major disadvantage because it would establish governance and funding structures that are likely to be sub-optimal for an eventual Wellington Transport option.

Governance, funding and community voice

If a Wellington Roads or Wellington Transport option is to be pursued, the details around governance, funding and local voice will be critical.

A joint governance body, as proposed in the draft report, would be crucial to reduce the complexity of decision making between the CCO and its multiple owners. We believe that this 'joint shareholder committee' should be set up to think regionally, not parochially (which would simply reinforce existing integration and local versus regional problems). This would mean attempting to vote by consensus for most issues. We consider the only appropriate constitution of a joint shareholder committee is for each owner to have one member/vote. This is very much like the current Regional Transport Committee model, a consensus body acting in the regional interest.

We generally support the proposed funding principles (fair, simple, transparent, affordable), and recommend adding to further principles – 'adaptable' and 'reflects where the benefits

fall' These are important as the funding formula should closely reflect who benefits, and needs to be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances (growth patterns, technology, etc).

We agree with the draft report findings that under the Wellington Transport option, transport would be funded on a regional basis. However, we don't consider any of the three proposed approaches for a funding formula to be appropriate. A funding formula for a complex multi-faceted activity like transport is not a good fit. It also doesn't provide well for change and the future of transport is likely to change significantly (ie autonomous vehicles) over time.

A formula based on either 'population' or 'network' is considered to be flawed and is not supported. Population has no direct link to transport spend or transport demand. A dense city might have more population than a rural district but will have less infrastructure on a per capita basis and will be more efficient in terms of transport productivity. The share of the transport network is also not a fair allocation of resourcing. A rural district like Wairarapa would be heavily penalised by a pure 'per kilometre of road' basis. Cities and larger urban areas would likewise be unfairly penalised if a 'vehicle kilometres travelled' approach was applied because while they have a high percentage of travel kilometres they are inherently much more efficient. In addition, neither of these formulas would work for public transport. Using the 'historic' expenditure formula has some merit as it reflects current spend on transport activities, but lacks adaptability to future change.

The proposal to retain a separate regional funding formula for public transport under the Wellington Transport option doesn't achieve the necessary integration across the transport network and doesn't fix the current problem of some key elements of the PT network (ie bus priority lanes and priority traffic signals, some bus stops) being delivered and funded by a separate bodies. It also retains a very complex formula for the regional targeted rate that is constantly challenged by stakeholders.

The real benefits of a regional approach to transport will only be gained by a regional multi-modal approach to funding transport. A regional rate for all transport activities (excluding NZTA maintenance) would be a much better solution. It would allow general rates for cross-network activities (avoiding the need for artificial funding formulas) and targeted rates for the actual cost of planned activities to be applied to each territorial authority area. This would allow for annual budgets to reflect actual costs and be adaptable to change and be fair and transparent. It would allow a much simpler public transport funding approach based on service level, zones or a similar approach. We believe that this alternative approach would best meet the identified funding principles.

We agree with the findings in the draft report that steps should be taken under options D and E to strengthen responsiveness to community views. In addition to the suggested mechanisms (ie Statement of Intent and Letter of Expectation), we believe that a comprehensive community engagement process to develop the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan should be led by councils via the Regional Transport Committee. We also suggest that some form of Annual Network Implementation Plan should be developed by the CCO, either in addition to or combined with the proposed Annual Community Engagement Plan, to show what project programming proposed in the year ahead and how the community will be consulted about these projects.

Wayne O'Donnell
Acting Chief Executive
Greater Wellington Regional Council

Transport issues

The Commission has been working with Wellington councils (through the Wellington Regional Mayoral Forum) and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to jointly look at transport in the region.

Progress Update – December 2016

The Local Government Commission has continued working with Wellington councils and the New Zealand Transport Agency to explore whether the region's transport system is governed and delivered in the best way to meet future challenges.

The Commission has produced a summary document of the now finalised Martin Jenkins Indicative Business Case report, which tests a range of options to improve the current system. The summary document and full report can be read at:

[Wellington Transport Indicative Business Case Summary \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Wellington-Transport-Indicative-Business-Case-Summary-23112016.pdf\)](#) PDF, 2.9MB

[Martin Jenkins Wellington Transport Indicative Business Case \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Martin-Jenkins-Wellington-Transport-Indicative-Business-Case-23112016.pdf\)](#) PDF, 2.3MB

The Commission and councils are now considering the next steps for this work. If there is support for change from councils, we will commission a further detailed business case and carry out public consultation.

Progress update – July 2016

Work on transport is still at too early a stage for the Commission to make decisions on possible future arrangements. We will continue to work with councils, including finalising the Indicative Business Case on a targeted set of five options for transport. The Commission will then set out the process and timeframe for identifying a preferred option, including public consultation.

You can read the full Strengthening the Wellington region – progress update:

- [Strengthening the Wellington region - progress update \(July 2016\) \(/assets/Wellington-Reorganisation/Strengthening-the-Wellington-region-29-July-2016-PDF.pdf\)](#) PDF, 813KB

Wellington Transport workshops

A series of workshops was held around the region, with invited groups that have an interest in transport, during June and July 2016. Notes from those workshops can be found here:

Wellington workshop

- [Notes from Wellington transport workshop 13 June 2016 - WORD \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Wellington-transport-workshop-13-June-2016-summary-of-discussion.docx\)](#) DOCX, 33KB
- [Notes from Wellington transport workshop 13 June 2016 - PDF \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Wellington-transport-workshop-13-June-2016-summary-of-discussion-PDF.pdf\)](#) PDF, 86KB

Wairarapa workshop

- [Notes from Wairarapa transport workshop 23 June 2016 - WORD \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Wairarapa-transport-workshop-23-June-2016-summary-of-discussion.docx\)](#) DOCX, 32KB
- [Notes from Wairarapa transport workshop 23 June 2016 - PDF \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Wairarapa-transport-workshop-23-June-2016-summary-of-discussion-PDF.pdf\)](#) PDF, 99KB

Lower Hutt workshop

- [Notes from Lower Hutt transport workshop 4 July 2016 - WORD \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Lower-Hutt-transport-workshop-4-July-2016-summary-of-discussion.docx\)](#) DOCX, 34KB
- [Notes from Lower Hutt transport workshop 4 July 2016 - PDF \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Lower-Hutt-transport-workshop-4-July-2016-summary-of-discussion-PDF.pdf\)](#) PDF, 84KB

Kapiti workshop

- [Notes from Kapiti transport workshop 4 July 2016 - WORD \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Kapiti-transport-workshop-4-July-2016-summary-of-discussion.docx\)](#) DOCX, 30KB
- [Notes from Kapiti transport workshop 4 July 2016 - PDF \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Kapiti-transport-workshop-4-July-2016-summary-of-discussion-PDF.pdf\)](#) PDF, 110KB

Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change (March 2016)

The following initial report was prepared by Castalia Strategic Advisors to start the consideration of transport options.

- [Wellington Regional Transport: Options for Change \(March 2016\) \(/assets/Wellington-Transport/Wellington-Regional-Transport-Report-March-2016.pdf\)](#) PDF, 1.3MB
Report to the Local Government Commission by Castalia Limited

Luke Troy

From: Luke Troy
Sent: Monday, 1 February 2016 11:54 AM
To: Kay Baxter (Kay.Baxter@dia.govt.nz)
Cc: Don Mackay; sandra.preston@dia.govt.nz
Subject: GWRC Comments on draft Transport Options Report
Attachments: LGC Transport Report GWRC submission.docx

Importance: High

Dear Kay

Thankyou for the opportunity to comment on the draft Castelia report. Attached are GWRC's comments.

Whilst our comments are lengthy they reflect the importance of these issues for the region. You will see we have identified some further non-structural options which we believe may provide a preferable path and which we strongly believe should form part of the suite of options to be further considered. We have put a lot of thought into the options and their analysis which we hope will be of assistance through the next steps of the process.

Please let me know if you need any further information or assistance.

Regards

Luke

Luke Troy | General Manager Strategy

GREATER WELLINGTON REGIONAL COUNCIL

Te Pane Matua Taiao

142 Wakefield St | PO Box 11646, Manners St, Wellington 6142

T: 04 830 4155 | M: 021 456 947

www.gw.govt.nz

ATTENTION: This correspondence is confidential and intended for the named recipient(s) only. If you are not the named recipient and receive this correspondence in error, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it and you should delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Unless otherwise stated, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author, and do not represent those of the organisation.

Comments on LGC Draft Report on Transport Options for the Wellington Region

Executive Summary

GWRC has undertaken an assessment of the identified structural options as well as a range of non-structural options against the problems and issues. The benefits arising from the structural options increase as more functions are integrated together into the one entity, however at the same time the range of dis-benefits also increases. The more integrated the option the more complexity and cost is involved in the transitional arrangements and the greater the scale of consequential impacts to the local authorities. The potential complexity of any governance arrangements, with up to nine local authorities, is also a significant issue, as well as the need for appropriate public accountability.

Our view is that none of the structural options identified appear to provide an obvious way forward and changes to structures should only be considered where there are significant benefits that outweigh any dis-benefits.

However we have also identified a range of “non-structural” options. These should be included and considered in the draft report. A package of non-structural options (some involving amendments to legislation) would form a realistic alternative to structural change and avoid the considerable transitional costs of some of the structural options. We note that on their own no structural options achieve significantly improved integration between land use planning and transport in fact most of them worsen integration in this area, despite this being one of the most important issues determining the long term economic success of the region. A regional spatial plan would address this issue and should be considered a high priority and an essential part of any package of options to provide a strategic context for transport planning and project prioritisation.

Option A (Status Quo) should not be discounted. Whilst there are clearly inefficiencies and additional joint working arrangements are needed to ensure integrated outcomes, the system is not broken. Non-structural solutions could be found to address many of the identified integration and efficiency issues.

Options B and C (Wellington Roads etc) provide an obvious quick win of creating an integrated service delivery agency/road controlling authority for local roads that has already been initiated by four of the councils. However the benefits of these options are limited to economies of scale and capacity and do not address the other identified issues; in addition there are some transactional inefficiencies created for public transport.

Of the more integrated options, Option D adds further benefits by integrating service delivery functions across modes, but results in a complex and unwieldy ownership, funding and governance structure, and also doesn't address many of the other identified issues. We believe that for Option E to work effectively, it would need to be a road controlling authority with regulatory powers and should be an 'approved organisation' able to apply for NLTF funding. This would enable it to function in a similar way as Auckland Transport but would require new legislation. This option provides many benefits but also has high dis-benefits, including substantial consequential impacts on the local authorities from which functions are removed, and complex governance arrangements between up to nine authorities plus NZTA (unlike Auckland Transport which has only one governing council). A simpler and less costly alternative to Option E would be to enhance the role of the RTC to give it delegated powers as part of a combined road controlling authority (sitting within the regional council).

Options that integrate the state highways functions into a transport authority (C1, D1 and F) provide some additional integration benefits but are considered very unlikely to be supported by the Government. They also raise the risk of local and even regional issues being subsumed by national perspectives.

If any option involving significant structural changes to Public Transport delivery were to be implemented, measures to avoid adverse impacts on the operational functions should be considered. Over the next few years there are significant changes proposed to the delivery of PT services through the PTOM process and the related transformation programme. Additional structural change could increase risks relating to the smooth transition of services to the new regime.

The draft report forms the equivalent of a Strategic Case and elements of a Programme Business Case (using the Treasury and NZTA business case process). It identifies the problem, some of the benefits of addressing this and some high-level options. However further work is required to formalise these, including an assessment of options against the identified problems. A next logical step is to develop an Indicative or Detailed Business Case, which would seek to examine the costs and benefits of the options in more detail. Considerable further work will be necessary to flesh out the detail of any options chosen for further consideration and their implications. Analysis should include a robust assessment of the implications of options both in terms of delivering on the identified transport problems as well as other consequential impacts. We do not believe that the information currently available in the draft report is robust enough to make firm decisions. We would be happy to work with the LGC's consultant to assist in this process.

1. Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to make comments on the draft LGC report on Transport Options for the Wellington Region.

This is an important process to determine the best options for delivering transport in the Wellington region. GWRC has been an active participant in the process so far, with participation in the working group, at the CE Group and Mayoral Forum.

Overall we believe the report is a helpful overview of the issues and options. It presents the issues and potential options in a clear and plain English manner. Our comments are around providing more detailed information, identifying some additional considerations, further comment on the evaluation of the options and identification of additional non-structural options. Comments are structured around the following headings:

1. Introduction
2. Assessment of options
3. Non-structural options

2. Assessment of proposed options

2.1 Current situation

We agree with the draft report that the current system is not broken. One of the key factors coming out of the draft report is that no structure on its own is perfect and that given the complex nature of the transport network and its inter-relationships with other urban networks and functions there will always be a necessity for some joint working arrangements to bridge gaps.

We note that a number of transport functions are already planned and delivered regionally, including: regional transport planning and major project prioritisation; public transport planning and service delivery; and, state highways planning and implementation. We believe these functions are already delivered at the appropriate scale, with a reasonable degree of effectiveness and efficiency. The identified issues with these functions relate more to their interactions with other aspects of the transport network – for instance how local road planning and delivery integrates with state highways and public transport and the fact that some service delivery performance (for example bus service speed and reliability) is very much a function of local road planning and delivery.

2.2 Problems and issues

The problem statements outlined in the draft report are generally supported. However, there are some more specific but important points that need to be drawn out under some of the generic headings. One overriding issue that the report needs to consider in greater depth is the extent to which the options enable the economic growth and development of the region.

The draft report makes initial reference to the expectations of the general public as customers of the planning and service delivery functions provided by the various organisations, yet analysis of the

how the options serve the public is lacking in the draft report. We believe that it is important to consider the problems and proposed options from the user and customer view point as well as from a network management and economics perspective – to this end we suggest some additional problem statements under ‘User/Customer perspective’ below.

GWRC’s believes the key problems can be summarised as follows:

Enabling economic development

- Transport, as a core part of the region’s infrastructure, plays an important part in enabling economic growth. The current lack of alignment in planning and delivery across all the various roles and responsibilities, may mean that the region is not delivering the right transport to the right places at the right time to support economic development and related land use development objectives. This is an overriding issue that is underpinned by the more detailed issues outlined below.

Scale

- Planning and delivery of local road functions have issues associated with capacity and expertise and don’t take advantage of potential economies of scale and improved consistency. The practical delivery of local road functions generally have a good track record however staff resource is limited and succession planning for staff is a potential issue. Conversely the planning function is generally focused on the delivery aspects rather than longer term strategic planning reflecting limited staff and the specialist nature of this skill set.

Integrated planning

Lack of aligned decision making due to:

- Lack of alignment between regional and local transport planning processes (for example between the RLTP and local transport plans), and a range of decision makers.
- Lack of integration between strategic transport planning and land use planning and economic development strategies (for example between the RLTP, District Plans and regional/local growth strategies).
- Absence of a regional spatial plan to provide strategic context and direction on future economic development and related land use development throughout the region that strategic transport infrastructure should support.
- Key transport data (especially from transport models) being analysed inconsistently by different agencies.

Delivery

- The successful delivery of some large transport infrastructure projects is impacted by overlapping jurisdictions. This leads to a lack of multi-modal thinking, the need for complex working arrangements and potential conflict. Further benefits could be achieved from the coordination and better phasing of projects as part of a wider regional transport programme. Decisions on major infrastructure typically involve considerable capital expenditure and long lead times that rely on consistency over time and between organisations for successful delivery.

- The issue of overlapping boundaries of ownership, artificial geographic council boundaries and complex funding rules also extends to the non-infrastructure issues around travel demand management. Here it is often the case that this can result in inefficient travel demand management programmes and activities that fail to capture the truly intra-regional scale of travel in the region.

Regional effectiveness

- Regionally important projects can be stalled by conflicting priorities held by the delivery agencies with no mechanism to resolve this.
- Current investment in relation to the region's transport network is largely driven by an investment decision making process that places greater value on the delivery of national priorities and a locally created programme of projects. Both of which place less emphasis on the strategic requirements of the region.
- Significant projects are sometimes considered in isolation rather than as part of wider integrated transport network and urban system leading to potential inefficiency and ineffectiveness. Some decisions are made from a relatively narrow frame of reference, without due weight given to regional perspectives and priorities.

User/Customer perspective

- Responsibility for parts of the transport network is fragmented, lacks transparency and can be confusing.
- There is an inconsistent level of service for road users.

2.3 Specific Public Transport Considerations

For public transport, there are existing mechanisms (e.g. the RLTP and RPTP) that deal with the high level objectives and planning across the region and planning is undertaken at an appropriate regional level reflecting the inter-connectedness of the network. Therefore the issues are at a more operational level, where the current structure allocates control of the road corridor to agencies that are not responsible for public transport outcomes. As a result, decision makers who are not familiar with the operational realities of public transport are incentivised to optimise the roading corridor rather than to achieve the overall transport outcomes.

In a typical example, road controlling authorities are faced with regulatory decisions that weigh up improving the safety, convenience, cost effectiveness, or the speed of public transport against other uses of the road corridor space such as parking or amenity improvements. The public transport benefits (convenience, operational cost savings and increased revenue) are experienced by the passengers, bus companies, and the Regional Council. However the costs are borne by the road controlling authority, which fund the capital and maintenance costs of road works and may also face political pressure relating to any changes in local parking or public space. It is therefore hardly surprising that negotiations to relocate bus stops make bus routes more direct, or introduce bus priority measures are difficult and progress slowly.

In another example, the use of high capacity buses (such as double decker buses) on major routes can significantly reduce public transport operating costs while increasing customer service levels, but the heavier buses increase the wear on the pavement which increases maintenance costs. In

Auckland, Auckland Transport identified corridors where the benefits outweighed the costs and made a swift decision to introduce double decker buses. In Wellington the benefits and costs accrue to different organisations, and progress in introducing high capacity buses has unsurprisingly been much slower. As a result, the overall cost to the public sector of the Wellington transport network is higher than necessary.

In the same way, TLAs considering urban development are not informed or incentivised to consider the practicality or cost effectiveness of servicing green field developments with public transport, although at a strategic level all parties agree that public transport mode share should be maintained or grow. Some developers proactively engage with the Regional Council to understand potential bus routes, ensure that their subdivisions are designed so that buses can navigate corners and that road space is allocated for stops; however this is voluntary. A more typical example involves an approach from the community or local council requesting services be provided to a newly developed area, but on subsequent investigation public transport services prove to be impossible or very expensive to provide.

More integrated planning and delivery would assist in addressing these operational issues, and ensure that decision making on transport corridors consider costs and benefits across all modes, including public transport.

2.4 Process for assessment

It is recommended that a more systematic analysis of the range of structural options as well as non-structural options is undertaken against the defined problems. An example of this evaluation is attached as Appendix 1.

This analysis will help to determine a shortlist of potential options for further detailed investigation. This should include consideration of affordability and the practicality of implementation of the proposed options and any consequential impacts.

The draft report forms the equivalent of a Strategic Case and elements of a Programme Business Case (using the Treasury and NZTA business case process). It identifies the problem, some of the benefits of addressing this and some high-level options. However further work is required to formalise these, including an assessment of options against the identified problems. A next logical step is to develop an Indicative or Detailed Business Case, which would seek to examine the costs and benefits of the options in more detail. Considerable further work will be necessary to flesh out the detail of any options chosen for further consideration and their implications. Analysis should include a robust assessment of the implications of options both in terms of delivering on the identified transport problems as well as other consequential impacts.

2.5 Comments on structural options

GWRC has the following comments on the identified structural options:

We have undertaken an assessment of the identified structural options as well as a range of non-structural options against the problems/issues. The benefits arising from the options increase as

more functions are integrated together into the one entity. However the more integrated the option the more complexity is involved in the transitional arrangements and the greater the scale of consequential impacts to the local authorities. We believe that changes to structures should only be considered where there are significant benefits that out-weight any dis-benefits.

Option A (Status Quo) should not be discounted. Whilst there are clearly inefficiencies and additional joint working arrangements are needed to ensure integrated outcomes, the system is not broken. Non-structural solutions could be found to address many of the identified integration and efficiency issues.

Options B and C (Wellington Roads etc) provide an obvious quick win of creating an integrated service delivery agency/road controlling authority for local roads that has already been initiated by four of the councils. However the benefits of these options are limited to economies of scale and capacity and do not address the other identified issues. There are some transactional inefficiencies created for public transport by this option. In many cases implementing major bus service improvements will require decisions from road controlling authorities that are essentially regulatory (i.e. they cannot be delegated to a CCO). We note that the establishment of any transport CCO that does not include public transport will increase the number of parties that need to reach agreement on any given issue and will further slow the decision making process. Consideration also needs to be given to how the role of roads as important public spaces and as an integral part of the urban fabric will be taken into account in this new structure. It has been noted by a number of organisations that the current age profile of roading staff in this region is high compared to other councils in the country. This raises issues of succession planning, however any structural changes may in fact quicken the pace of staff turnover and retirement undermining the ability of any new organisation to deliver high quality services in the short to medium term. Nevertheless if this option is supported by the relevant territorial authorities, GWRC would not object.

One suggestion has been to start with Option B and over-time progress through to the more integrated structural options. Whilst this view seems attractive on the surface, we question whether in fact there is a logical progression through the options, as the setup and governance structure for each is quite distinct.

Of the more integrated options, Option D (Wellington Transport) adds further benefits by integrating service delivery functions across modes, but results in a complex and unwieldy ownership and funding structure, and also doesn't address many of the other identified issues.

We believe that for Option E (Wellington Transport with enhanced powers) to work effectively, it would need to be a road controlling authority with regulatory powers and should be an 'approved organisation' able to apply for NLTF funding. This would enable it to function in the same way as Auckland Transport but would require new legislation. This option provides many benefits but also has high dis-benefits, including substantial consequential impacts on the local authorities from which functions are removed and complex governance arrangements between multiple authorities. A governance board representing up to nine local authorities could be cumbersome and ineffective, unlike Auckland Transport which has only one governing council.

Options that integrate the state highways functions into a transport authority (C1, D1 and F) provide some additional integration benefits but are considered very unlikely to be supported by the

Government. They also raise the risk of local and even regional issues being subsumed by national perspectives.

If any option involving significant structural changes to Public Transport delivery were to be implemented, measures to avoid adverse impacts on the operational functions should be considered. Over the next few years there are significant changes proposed to the delivery of PT services through the PTOM process and the related transformation programme. Additional structural change could increase risks relating to the smooth transition of services to the new regime.

2.6 Dis-benefits of options

Consideration must also be given to any undesirable impacts from the implementation of the options. This will be an important factor in deciding whether the pros outweigh the cons. We note that several of the structural options have potential dis-benefits or have aspects that appear not to have been considered.

One consistent dis-benefit across all of the structural options is the creation of a fracture between local decision making on transport and other matters (including land use planning, urban design and community issues). Roads fulfil a critical public space function, they are not just transport corridors consequently decisions on use of road-space and design have widespread impacts on local communities and other urban planning objectives. Separating these functions from one another would necessitate additional joint working relationship and decision-making frameworks to be established.

Another dis-benefit which is likely to arise for some of the structural options is the potential for ineffective governance arrangements with nine local authorities (and in some cases a Government agency) involved in joint decision-making. Without further detail on the precise nature of proposed governance arrangements it is difficult to assess this. It is however clear that some options will increase transaction costs. Auckland Transport has only one council to coordinate with, whereas a similar Wellington Transport agency could have nine.

The current legislative framework places regulatory functions with local councils for such activities as setting speed limits, parking controls etc. Options B and C do not address this and in fact create a new layer of complexity in dealing with service providers and regulatory bodies given transport operators could have to deal separately with a regional scale road controlling authority as well as the regulatory function of each council.

A further issue that is likely to arise is the tension between effective decision-making in a separate transport authority and local accountability. It is unclear at this stage what processes would be in place for community involvement in Board decisions.

2.7 Consequential Financial impacts

Some of the more substantive structural options (Options D, E and F) will have consequential financial impacts on GWRC as well as the territorial authorities. GWRC has done a preliminary analysis of the financial impacts of removing public transport and regional transport planning functions from the regional council, using assumptions based on the draft LGC Report options. This shows the following:

Option D

- Minor financial impacts on GWRC.
- The new entity Greater Wellington Transport will develop some of its own systems and corporate functionality over a period of time and some charges may no longer be passed on, however this can be phased.

Option E and F

- Major financial impacts on GWRC due to 'stranded' corporate overheads, internal charges and taxation losses for which charges cannot be passed on, as the new entity Greater Wellington Transport will develop its own corporate resources and systems.
- Initial estimates show a potentially substantial impact on regional rates and affordability. Whilst some costs will be able to be reduced, it is estimated that a majority will remain. The increased costs could result in a significant increase in regional rates of around 5-9%; this would be on top of the projected rates increase of around 8% in 2016/17 and 9% in 2017/18.
- Mitigating projected rates increases through cost reductions could impact on service levels affecting other core GWRC activities.
- A potential further impact on a new entity has also been identified. Currently GWRC borrows for public transport capital expenditure through the LGFA, of which it is a founding member. A CCO (ie GWT) is unable to access funds through the LGFA under current structure. The implications of this could be a potentially significantly increased cost of borrowing for capex.

2.8 Further Information Required for Decision-Making

We do not believe that the information currently available in the draft report is robust enough to make firm decisions. Before decisions can be made it is essential that further information on the benefits, impacts and consequential impacts of the options are obtained. This will require additional work by the consultant and relevant agencies. Whilst some of this information may be able to be resolved during any implementation phase, part of it is needed to inform strategic decision making.

The draft report forms the equivalent of a Strategic Case and elements of a Programme Business Case (using the Treasury and NZTA business case process). It identifies the problem, some of the benefits of addressing this and some high-level options. However further work is required to formalise these, including an assessment of options against the problem/criteria. A next logical step is to develop an Indicative or Detailed Business Case, which would seek to examine the costs and benefits of the options in more detail. Considerable further work will be necessary to flesh out the detail of any options chosen for further consideration and their implications. Analysis should include a robust assessment of the implications of options both in terms of delivering on the identified transport problems as well as other consequential impacts.

It is suggested that the following additional information be provided:

- An assessment of the options (both structural and non-structural) against the identified problems
 - Identification of benefits and dis-benefits
 - Development of an Indicative/Detailed Business Case

- Detailed outline of the shape of the governance body for each option, including:
 - Proposed representation on any joint committee or board
 - Functions to be delegated/transferred to any joint committee/board
 - Limitations on functions that can be delegated/transferred
 - Public input to decision-making by any joint committee/board
- Financial impacts
 - Consequential financial and other impacts on the remaining organisations (GWRC, TA's, NZTA) from the proposed options
 - Likely costs/savings arising from any of the options
 - Transitional costs and issues
- Dispute resolution
 - Consideration of how differences of opinion will be resolved between (a) rating agencies and a transport authority on budgets; (b) transport authority and territorial authorities on urban roads.
- An understanding on what aspects of all the options require legislative changes
 - Timelines
 - Consideration at a high level of likely Regulatory Impact Statement issues
 - Any alternatives to legislation

We have also noted areas where the draft report could be clarified, where there may be minor errors or where we feel the report presents information based upon inaccurate assumptions in Appendix 2.

3. Non-Structural Options

Amalgamation of councils in the region could have provided an effective means to resolve many of the problems of integration identified in the draft report. With this option now off the table, the structural solutions that have been identified in the draft report provide an alternative but less effective structural means to resolving these issues. Our analysis indicates that none of these provide an obvious solution.

The draft report also touches on some non-structural options, but does not analyse or discuss these in further depth. We believe that the non-structural options may have just as much validity (if not more) than the structural options and need to be drawn out into a specific section of the report and evaluated as part of the overall set of options.

Some of the non-structural options are critical to resolving one or more of the identified problems which, in some cases, the structural solutions do not achieve or indeed worsen. Non-structural options build on the existing governance arrangements in the region and avoid the political and organisational upheaval that would be associated with some of the proposed structural options.

Each non-structural option can also be seen as a standalone improvement option to the current process or can be seen as a set of inter-related improvements where the sum of the parts is far greater than each part in isolation.

The key non-structural options are as follows:

1. **Integrated planning** – one of the identified problems is the lack of alignment between planning processes. There are several options that could be considered to address this:
 - (a) *Integrated regional scale spatial planning* – The RLTP is currently prepared without a corresponding regional scale plan for future land use and growth. The Regional Policy Statement is a statutory plan under the RMA which provides a policy framework for integrated management of the region’s natural and physical resources. It does not provide a spatial framework for future growth. This creates difficulties in determining what the preferred land use allocation is across the region and how economic development may drive patterns of activity. Currently, the RLTP references the land use and growth aspirations of each local council, taken from a variety of non-statutory urban development strategies and plans. This is not ideal and results in potentially ‘competing’ development aspirations. This approach means there is a risk that major transport infrastructure decisions either end up leading land use development and investment decisions or that transport is unable to accurately plan and respond to emerging demands due to a lack of integrated direction. This can lead to inefficient and ineffective regional decision-making. The development of a statutory Spatial Plan would be a suitable mechanism to overcome this issue – allowing the RLTP to focus on effective delivery of transport solutions to achieve the overall goals. This is mentioned in the draft report as a separate work stream (section 4.2 footnote 31 page 18) however we believe it is fundamental to the effectiveness of regional transport planning and as such needs to be specifically addressed in this work stream.
 - **Recommended Non-structural option (II) – Regional Spatial Plan**
 - (b) *Integrated regional and local planning* – there is currently no formal mechanism for the RLTP to be taken into account in local land use planning. This creates uncertainty in the delivery of regional priorities and does not appropriately reflect the close inter-relationship between land use and transport planning. The recent Board of Inquiry decision on the Basin Reserve Bridge highlighted the very low weight given to the statutory RLTP (regional land transport strategy as it was then) in making a decision under the RMA.

The RMA already has a requirement for District Plans to “have regard to” a Regional Policy Statement or other Regional Plans prepared by a regional council under the RMA in s74(2)(a). This could be broadened to include a Regional Land Transport Plan prepared under the LTMA. We understand that in previous assessments this statutory link may have been rejected by the Ministry for the Environment on the basis that the RLTP process does not have a further submissions process. This would essentially rule out any statutory link to plans and policy prepared under the Local Government Act or LTMA. Given the importance of linking transport and land use planning in achieving successful outcomes for both processes, it is essential that some mechanism be found to work around this constraint.

- **Recommended Non-structural option (III) – statutory requirement in RMA to “have regard to” a Regional Land Transport Plan prepared under the LTMA**

Under the LTMA, there is no requirement for local authorities to prepare a local transport plan. In practice many local authorities do prepare some sort of local transport plan, however, due to the lack of statutory specification these are very varied in nature and include: multi-modal transport strategies/plans, plans for individual modes (i.e. cycling, walking) and integrated transport and urban development strategies. These transport plans often form the foundations of the RLTP programme of projects and activities. There is no requirement for any of these plans to be consistent with the statutory RLTP or to seek to deliver the strategic objectives set out in the RLTP. This can result in conflicting priorities and a lack of implementation of regional priorities identified in the RLTP.

One option would be to amend the provisions in the LTMA to add the requirement for all road controlling authorities to submit (to the RTC as part of the RLTP development) a statement/assessment of how their overall proposed programme of transport activities will ‘give effect to’ the objectives and policies in the RLTP. This would go beyond the current requirement for organisations to identify the strategic objective that a proposed individual activity would deliver upon. This would provide a specific mechanism for the RTC to discuss alignment and any gaps between draft local transport programmes (and NZTA HNO programmes) with regionally agreed transport priorities as part of developing the RLTP and prior to councils finalising their LTPs. This would address some concerns voiced by the Ministry and NZTA about the lack of alignment from national down to local transport plans and ensure joined-up planning.

- **Recommended Non-structural Option (IV) – statutory requirement in the LTMA for each Approved Organisation to submit a statement of how their proposed RLTP programme of activities seeks to give effect to the objectives and policies of the Regional Land Transport Plan.**

2. **Formalised working arrangements** – one of the barriers to improved integration and delivery of major projects is the lack of formalised working arrangements between the parties. Instead programme/project-specific arrangements are constituted on an as-needs basis, often following emerging issues and conflict being identified. An example of this is the recently developed Ngauranga to Airport programme. This constitutes working arrangements between three agencies (GWRC, WCC and NZTA) at a political and officer level. A more formalised and consistent working arrangement for major transport projects in the region, put in place at the beginning of a project, would assist in minimising conflict and increase integration and alignment, although with the potential to add transaction costs. This could take the form of a MoU between the relevant parties. This might even be developed into a form of charter with region’s population in order to ensure the delivery of better working arrangements.

- **Non-structural option (V) – formalised working arrangements between transport authorities for major regional projects.**

3. **Enhancing the role of the Regional Transport Committee** – currently the RTC role is limited to developing the RLTP (which in this region includes detailed sub-regional Corridor Strategies), monitoring its implementation and prioritising transport projects submitted to it by the respective agencies across the region for submission to the NLTP process managed by NZTA that determines NLTF funding approvals. The role and function of RTC could be enhanced to include:
 - (a) a stronger role in requesting agencies to consider the development and delivery of particular programmes or projects to deliver agreed regional priorities;
 - (b) a stronger role in monitor the implementation and delivery of agreed regional projects;
 - (c) a stronger role in reporting to Council meetings on RTC policy, regional priorities and the regional transport programme in order to better integrate with local decision making.

A further option would be to enhance the role of the RTC to give it delegated powers as part of a combined road controlling authority (sitting within the regional council). This would be a simpler, less complex and less costly alternative to Option E. This would bring together the road controlling functions of the local authorities providing economies of scale and capacity benefits, as well as allowing for integration of planning, decision-making and project delivery between the multiple transport modes. It would also ensure public accountability through the committee process.

- **Non-structural option (VI) – Enhance the role of the Regional Transport Committee.**
4. **Establishing regional outcomes as part of the NLTP decision making process** - There is evidence that the current “Investment assessment Framework” strategic fit element takes a very national level view and the application of strategic fit is not wholly transparent at a lower level, indeed the influence of regional outcomes and priorities currently appears largely absent. There is a need to consider the transport network system at a spatial level with a 30 – 40 year view of outcomes both inter-regional and regional. Amending the definition of strategic fit would reinforce the need to demonstrate the ability of local transport projects in explicitly delivering regional objectives and give the RLTP more status. The RTC and RLTP are best placed to define regional outcomes and provide this strategic function. In addition this would not only enable better investment outcomes but provide better alignment between the GPS and RLTP.
 - **Non-structural option (VII) – NZTA amends the definition of strategic fit to recognise national and regional (short and long term) outcomes.**
 5. **Establishment of an integrated data, analytics and modelling function** – currently key transport data and transport model analysis is undertaken by a range of different agencies. GWRC manages the regional strategic transport and public transport models (WTSM and WPTM), NZTA in conjunction with some of the territorial authorities have built and maintained a range of area-based transport models (SATURN) for parts of the region and more detailed analysis models (PARAMICS) for parts of the Wellington central city. Many of the area-based models are maintained by a specific consultancy on behalf of the agency.

Whilst the common base of information from the regional strategic models, feeding down to the more detailed models, has ensured a level of consistency, the range of agencies providing information and analysis of key transport data has resulted in some issues around differences of

interpretation and accuracy between the various transport agencies. Models do not provide 'the answer' and the results flowing from them need to be carefully analysed in the light of the assumptions underlying them and other influencing factors. This is made more difficult where the analysis is undertaken some distance removed from the original model assumptions. This has created the impression of a lack of alignment and results in a lack of confidence in the results.

There are a range of options from creating an oversight mechanism for the existing GWRC modelling team to a more structural change. This could range from a direct report to the RTC or a board of transport managers from all relevant agencies through to the creation of a fully independent transport modelling and data analysis team or unit that could work on behalf of the transport sector accompanied by an agreement that all transport modelling is overseen through that unit.

- **Recommended Non-structural option (VII) –Investigation of options to establish a more integrated data, analytics and modelling function.**
6. **Establishment of an integrated regional travel demand management function** – travel demand measures are critical to helping create a more economical and resource-efficient transport system. Behaviour change programmes or pricing mechanisms should provide a first step, reducing the peaks of congestion and smoothing travel times across the network without the need to invest large sums of capital in infrastructure. Travel demand activities are also vital to ensure maximum value is extracted from any new infrastructure that is constructed. The current scale and scope of programmes in this region is limited both by legislative mandate and by their incremental delivery by multiple agencies. This requires complex relationships between agencies to achieve integration, but even with this lacks sufficient scale and influence. Forming an integrated travel demand management function for the region could improve efficiency and effectiveness in delivery within this set of activities and has the potential to significantly improve value for money in the overall transport programme within the region.
- **Recommended Non-structural option (IX) –Investigation of options to establish a more integrated travel demand management function.**
7. **Implementing all the non-structural option I through to VIII** –Whilst the non-structural option numbers 1 to 6 can be considered as separate standalone improvements in reality their power and value comes from implementing them as an entire suite of improvements such that the effect is multiplied through economies of scale and the agglomeration of benefits. As a package of non-structural options these are likely to be as effective (if not more) than any of the structural options at addressing the identified issues/problems. Their implementation also avoids the considerable transitional costs of some of the structural options.
- **Recommended Non-structural option (I) – Implement all the non-structural options as an improvement package.**

Appendix 1: Preliminary assessment of options against problems and issues

Key: scale of overall benefit rated from + to +++, with greater overall benefits accrued by +++ compared to +

Assessment criteria	Structural Options							Non-Structural Options								
	Option B	Option C	Option C1	Option D	Option D1	Option E	Option F	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.	IX.
	Wellington Roads / Wairarapa Roads	Greater Wellington Roads	Greater Wellington Roads + State Highways	Greater Wellington Transport	Greater Wellington Transport + State Highways	Greater Wellington Transport Authority	Greater Wellington Transport Authority + State Highways	Implement all the non-structural options as an improvement package	Spatial Plan	Statutory link to RMA	Amend LTMA to require RCAs to demonstrate overall alignment of programmes with RLTP policy framework	Formalised working arrangements	Enhanced RTC role	Amended definition of strategic fit.	Establish an integrated data, analytics and modelling function	Establish an integrated travel demand function
Enabling economic development				+	+	+	++	+++	+++	+	+		++	+		+
Scale - insufficient scale, capacity and expertise for local roads	+	++	+++	++	+++	++	+++	+++					+++			
Integrated planning - alignment between regional and local transport planning processes		+	+	+	+	+++	+++	+++	+++	+	++	+	++	++	+	+
Integrated planning - alignment between transport and land use planning								+++	+++	+++	+	+	+			+
Integrated planning - Lack of a regional spatial plan								+++	+++	+						
Integrated planning - Inconsistent analysis of key transport data						++	+++	+++				+++	+	+	+++	+
Delivery - inefficient and ineffective delivery caused by overlapping jurisdictions			+	+	+++	++	+++	++	+		+	++	++	+	+	+
Delivery – impact on transaction costs																
Regional effectiveness - Insufficient priority for regionally important projects			+	+	++	+++	+++	+++	+++		++	+	+++	+++	+	+
Regional effectiveness - Isolated planning and delivery of significant projects		+	+	++	++	++	+++	+++	+		+	++	+++	++	++	++

Assessment criteria	Structural Options							Non-Structural Options								
	Option B	Option C	Option C1	Option D	Option D1	Option E	Option F	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.	VII.	VIII.	IX.
	Wellington Roads / Wairarapa Roads	Greater Wellington Roads	Greater Wellington Roads + State Highways	Greater Wellington Transport	Greater Wellington Transport + State Highways	Greater Wellington Transport Authority	Greater Wellington Transport Authority + State Highways	Implement all the non-structural options as an improvement package	Spatial Plan	Statutory link to RMA	Amend LTMA to require RCAs to demonstrate overall alignment of programmes with RLTP policy framework	Formalised working arrangements	Enhanced RTC role	Amended definition of strategic fit.	Establish an integrated data, analytics and modelling function	Establish an integrated travel demand function
Customer/User perspective - Disjointed/confusing responsibility for parts of the transport network			+	++	+++	++	+++	++	+		++	+	+++			+
Customer/User perspective - Lack of accountability to implement agreed regional policy						++	++	+++	++	+	++	+	+++	++	+	+
Customer/User perspective - Inconsistent standards and level of service	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	+		+		++	+		

Appendix 2: Areas for clarification or correction in draft report

Report reference	Comment (suggested changes in italics)
Executive Summary Para 2 under heading “the current system is complex	<p>“Funding comes from local rates, from regional rates, and from the central funding <i>sources</i> of the National Land Transport Fund <i>or other Government funding</i>”.</p> <p>KiwiRail receives direct Government funding for some rail capital projects to enable the operation of public transport services</p>
Section 2.3 Para 3	The “wider objective for Greater Wellington: to encourage regional economic growth” is not correct – as it reads it appears that this is an overarching objective instead of one objective among a number
Section 3.1 Figure 3.1	Rail planning (for both infrastructure and services) also occurs at the regional level (eg see Wellington Regional Rail Plan 2010 – 2035 available at www.gw.govt.nz) and this should be reflected in figure 3.1.
Section 3.1 Para 3 under “Different stakeholders ...”	<p>“... while the GWRC owns <i>and manages</i> the rolling stock, <i>most stations, maintenance depot, pedestrian bridges and underpasses etc.</i></p> <p>The GWRC cleans and maintains infrastructure, which is not privately owned, at bus stops (shelters, signage etc.) across the region. GWRC also owns the majority of the bus stop infrastructure across the region with private companies and TLAs owning the remaining. TLAs control the location and regulation of the stops. GWRC owns all railway stations except Wellington Station, and park and ride facilities may be owned by GWRC or other parties.</p>
Section 3.1 Para 3 under “Planning responsibilities ...”	<p>“The main decision-maker (a local authority) plans the roads in the respective district through their <i>District Plan, transport plan or asset management plan</i>”</p> <p>Note that a transport plan is not a statutory requirement and some TLAs do not have a plan that is separate from the district plan or AMP.</p>
Section 3.1 Final para under “Co-funding models...”	<p>“Public transport support infrastructure is mostly funded by the owners of the assets – e.g. local councils for footpaths [delete and bus stops]</p> <p>Local authorities have regulatory control of the stops and own the roads. GWRC funds and manages the cleaning and maintenance of all public transport bus stop infrastructure across the region which is not privately owned. Over the last 5 years ownership of public transport infrastructure has been transferring from TLAs to GWRC. The current situation being that there are very few shelters outside of Wellington City still in TLA ownership. In Wellington City when shelters are replaced the ownership transfers to GWRC.</p>

Report reference	Comment (suggested changes in italics)
Section 3.1 Para 4 under “Service delivery ...”	<p>“These include <i>multiple contracts with public transport operators who operate bus, ferry, and rail services</i>”</p> <p>As written this is unclear - the 45 bus contracts referred to are with a limited number of operators i.e. the 8 public transport operators include the bus companies, and TranzMetro is part of KiwiRail but is the only part that operates public transport services.</p>
Section 3.2	<p>The following could usefully be added to the list of collaborations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation and collaboration between the GWRC sustainable transport team and TLAs on behaviour change programmes to increase active transport (particularly cycling and walking)
Section 4.1 Para 3	<p>The example given is inappropriate and should be removed (“For example, the reasoning not to prioritise”). While the RTC has on occasions not supported particular roading projects it has not been on the basis that the project will reduce public transport use, although that may be one of the factors taken into account along with issues such as whether the project was cost effective (i.e. had a positive cost benefit ratio), the effect on congestion etc.</p>
Section 4.2 Para 4	<p>“There are risks of national investment priorities and regional [delete <i>public</i>] transport planning undermining each other”.</p> <p>The following sentence references the GPS and RLTPs, which is correct – the regional priorities could be any area of transport, not just public transport.</p>
Section 5.2 Option B	<p>The report doesn’t make clear whether Option B (or Option C) would be purely a service delivery agency for local roads, or whether it would be the Road Controlling Authority. In the former the relevant TA would still be required to process and approve bylaws, road stopping notices and traffic resolutions, so introducing transactional complexity. Changes to legislation are likely to be required to transfer road controlling authority functions to a CCO.</p>
Section 5.2 Options D and E	<p>The report is unclear on whether GWT is an ‘approved organisation’ and able to claim its own funding directly from NZTA (similar to Auckland Transport). This needs to be clarified.</p>
Section 6.3 Para 2 under “Additional scale or scope ...”	<p>“The GWRC would achieve benefits in the form of savings for a single <i>additional</i> touch point for the delivery of public transport on local roads”.</p> <p>As outlined in the main body of the submission, many of the decisions required for the delivery of public transport on local roads will be retained by councils (either because they are unable to delegate many RCA functions or because they are determining service levels) and the impact of creating Wellington Roads or Greater Wellington Roads will be to increase the number of organisations that must reach agreement.</p>

