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1. **Apologies**

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

4. **Confirmation of Minutes (Pages 4 to 10)**

5. **New Zealand Transport Agency Report (Pages 11 - 19)**

   Report to provide the Committee with the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Quarterly Report to 6 May 2019.


   Report to provide the Committee with information on the development of the 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

7. **Road Safety Monitor Report (Pages 22 to 35)**

   Report to update the Committee on road safety issues and trends on regional progress towards the actions outlined in national and regional road safety strategies.

8. **Regional Speed Management Approach Update (Pages 36 to 87)**

   Report to provide the Committee with an update on regional speed management and seek the Committee’s endorsement of draft regional speed management policies and preferred institutional arrangements for regional speed management.

9. **Variations to the 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045 (Pages 88 to 100)**

   Report to the Committee to consider and approve a request from the New Zealand Transport Agency to vary the operative 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015–2045.

10. **Regional Public Transport Update (Pages 101 to 109)**

    Report to provide the Committee with an update on the implementation of the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28 and key regional public transport projects.

11. **Waikato Stock Truck Effluent Disposal Programme (Pages 110 to 120)**

    Report to provide the committee with information on the progress towards the implementation of new stock truck effluent facilities in the Waikato Region.

12. **Transport Projects and Planning Report (Pages 121 to 124)**

    Report to provide the Committee with an update on current regional transport plans and projects as at 14 April 2019.
13. Submission on Matamata-Piako District Council Transport By-law Change (Pages 125 to 130)

Report to update the Committee on Matamata-Piako District Council’s Statement of Proposal ‘Shared Pathways’ Land Transport Bylaw, and to seek approval of a submission in support of the proposed by-law.

14. Regional Transport Issues Forum (Pages 131 to 135)

Report to provide the Committee with an opportunity to raise and discuss regionally significant transport issues in an open
**Waikato Regional Council**

**Regional Transport Committee**

**OPEN MINUTES**

**Date:** Monday, 1 April, 2019, 9:30 am  
**Location:** Council Chamber  
Waikato Regional Council  
401 Grey Street  
Hamilton East

**Members Present:**  
Cr H Vercoe (Chair - Waikato Regional Council)  
Cr T Adams (Hauraki District Council)  
Cr D Macpherson (Hamilton City Council)  
Mayor Baxter (Otorohanga District Council)  
Cr B Machen (South Waikato District Council)  
Cr S Christie (Thames Coromandel District Council)  
Cr D Fulton (Waikato District Council)  
Cr G Webber (Waipa District Council)  
Cr P Brodie (Alt. Waitomo District Council)  
Inspector M Lynam (New Zealand Police)  
R l’Anson (New Zealand Transport Agency)

**Staff Present:**  
M Tamura (Manager - Integration and Infrastructure)  
N King (Team Leader - Transport and Infrastructure)  
B McMaster (Special Projects Advisor - Integration and Infrastructure)  
G Dawson (Democracy Advisor)

**In Attendance:**  
Cr E Patterson (Waikato District Council)
SECTION A: UNDER DELEGATION AND FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL

1. **Apologies**
   
   Apologies were received from Cr J Thomas, Cr R Rimmington, Cr A Park, and Mayor Barnes.
   
   RTC19/13  
   Moved by: Cr Macpherson  
   Seconded by: Cr Fulton
   
   **RESOLVED**
   
   THAT the apologies of Cr J Thomas, Cr R Rimmington, Cr A Park, and Mayor Barnes be accepted.
   
   The motion was put and carried

2. **Confirmation of Agenda**
   
   The agenda was confirmed with no amendments.
   
   RTC19/14  
   Moved by: Cr Vercoe  
   Seconded by: Cr Machen
   
   **RESOLVED**
   
   THAT the agenda of the meeting of the Regional Transport Committee of 1 April 2019, as circulated, be confirmed as the business for the meeting.
   
   The motion was put and carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**
   
   There were no disclosures of interest.

4. **Confirmation of Minutes**
   
   The minutes were confirmed with no amendments requested.
   
   RTC19/15  
   Moved by: Cr Vercoe  
   Seconded by: Cr Christie
   
   **RESOLVED**
   
   THAT the minutes of the Regional Transport Committee dated 4 March 2019 (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be confirmed as a true and accurate record.
5. **New Zealand Transport Agency - Long Term View**

Report to provide the Committee with information on the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Long Term View. It was presented by the New Zealand Transport Agency (The Agency) Committee Representative and the Manager, Strategic Long Term View (K Mayes).

The following matters were raised:

- The benefit of road safety plan was discussed. It was noted that the region would benefit from increased safety through the structures and initiatives that the Plan brings.
- The funding of the Hamilton to Auckland rail project was discussed. It was noted that work was ongoing and would be reported back on in due course, and funding for the project was not part of the review.
- Funding of regional infrastructure was discussed. It was noted that there were differences in priorities between the former and current government. The change in Central Government had required the Agency to review the types of projects that are funded and this work was ongoing. More information would be reported as decisions were made.
- The role of all levels of government in relation to infrastructure planning and investment was discussed. It was noted that the Agency would work with the existing Regional Land Transport Plan process.
- It was emphasised that there was a need for the Agency to read all the report, plans, and strategies on the rationale behind the infrastructure plans completed to date.
- The need for the Agency to work with local government in a meaningful way was discussed. It was noted there was a high level of frustration on the matter of slow decision making processes at the Agency, which has caused some delays in the delivery of key infrastructure projects.
- Tools that would be helpful to the decision making process of the Committee was discussed.
- The challenges that climate change presented to future infrastructure planning and funding priorities were discussed.
- The involvement of the Agency in the Waikato flood protection scheme was discussed. It was noted the scheme protected a number of Agency assets and the Agency was queried as to whether they had considered making a contribution to its maintenance.
- Public health impacts that result due to emissions was discussed. It was emphasised that holistic approach to resolving the matter would be needed to get the best outcome possible.
RTC19/16  
Moved by: Cr Adams  
Seconded by: Cr Brodie

RESOLVED

THAT the report New Zealand Transport Agency – Long Term View (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

6. Transport Emissions

Report to provide the Committee with information on transport emissions that has been collected by the Science and Strategy Directorate of Waikato Regional Council. It was presented by the Senior Scientist, Strategy and Science (J Caldwell).

The following matters were discussed:

- The sites and types of the emissions sensors was described and discussed.
- It was noted that the emissions were tracked and assessed against World Health Organisation standards and National Environment Standards.
- Mitigation measures to reduce the negative impacts of emissions was described and discussed.
- The range of causes of emissions was described and discussed in the Hamilton context.
- The relationship between traffic counts and emissions rates was discussed. It was noted that they have not made that correlation between the two, although that piece of work may happen in the future.
- The amount of emissions discharged by buses was discussed. It was noted that testing had taken place in the past through a variety of measures included in contracts with bus service providers.

RTC19/17  
Moved by: Cr Christie  
Seconded by: Mayor Baxter

RESOLVED

THAT the report Transport Emissions (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried
Regional Resilience Strategy

Report to provide the Committee with current information on regional resilience issues. It was presented by the Team Leader Regional Hazards and Environmental Compliance (R Liefting).

The following matters were raised:

- It was noted that there was a need to identify risks and how they interconnect with each other, especially through climate change.
- The goal of building resilient communities in relation from natural hazards was discussed. It was noted that communities and government must work together to adapt and mitigate natural hazards using an appropriate risk management framework.
- It was emphasised that Regional Policy Statement provided guidance around the approach to natural hazards throughout the Waikato region.
- The online hazard portal was introduced and it was noted that it would provide the public and government agencies with information on natural hazards.
- The impacts of natural events such as king tides and flood events was discussed.
- Climate Change management on natural hazards was described and discussed.
- Models of community engagement was discussed. It was noted that there was a need for it to be meaningful and develop genuine levels of resilience, based on system wide approaches.
- The matter of managing the expectations and perceptions of what was considered a risk was discussed. It was emphasised that there is need to work with central government to look at how property buy outs, if ever required, and insurance coverage was managed in the future.

RTC19/18

Moved by: Cr Macpherson
Seconded by: Cr Machen

RESOLVED

THAT the report Regional Resilience (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be received.

The motion was put and carried

Variations to the 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045

Report to the Committee for the consideration and approval of the requests from the New Zealand Transport Agency to vary the operative 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015 – 2045. The report was taken as read by the Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure (N King).
The following matters were discussed:

- The Committee agreed that benefits to the Waikato region that may result from the variation had high levels of public benefit and support was voiced in favour of the proposed recommendations.

RTC19/19

Moved by: Cr Christie
Seconded by: Cr Macpherson

RESOLVED

1. That the report *Variations to the 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045* (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be received.

2. That the Committee vary the operative *2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045* to include a Waikato State Highway Speed Management Guide implementation activity.

The motion was put and carried

9. **Regional Transport Issues Forum**

This provided an opportunity for the Committee to raise and discuss regionally significant transport issues in an open forum.

The following matters were raised:

- It was requested that the matter of Marotiri School and the New Zealand Transport Agency could be removed from the register as the matter was being dealt with between the two organisations.
- Information on the relationship between the work of the Committee and work on Coastal Management Plans was sought.
- It was noted that the number of roadworks around the Waikato region was quite high and many sites appear to not be as safe as they could be for all motorists. It was added that brief profiles on the range of works that were being done would add clarity and understanding for all road users regarding what was being done and why.

RTC19/20

Moved by: Cr Adams
Seconded by: Cr Webber

RESOLVED

THAT the report **Regional Transport Issues Forum** (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be received.
The motion was put and carried

The meeting closed at 11.25am.
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 9 April 2019
Author: Nigel King, Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure
Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy
Subject: New Zealand Transport Agency – Quarterly Report
Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To provide the Committee with the New Zealand Transport Agency’s Quarterly Report to 6 May 2019.

Executive Summary
2. The New Zealand Transport Agency reports on a regular basis to the Regional Transport Committee to provide the Committee with key information on state highway projects as well as the wider activities of the Agency. This current report will be presented to the Committee at the meeting.

Staff Recommendation:
That the report ‘New Zealand Transport Agency – Quarterly Report’ (Regional Transport Committee 6 May 2019) be received.

Background
3. The New Zealand Transport Agency (the Agency) Waka Kotahi is a New Zealand Crown entity formed in 2008 and responsible for contributing to an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive and sustainable land transport system. The Agency Board is responsible for allocating funds from the National Land Transport Fund to land transport activities, including local roads, state highways, road safety, cycling and public transport.

4. The Agency undertakes work with a number of partners and the Agency’s Regional Relationship Director is a member of the Regional Transport Committee (RTC). The Agency reports to the Regional Transport Committee on a quarterly basis and the Agency Quarterly report to 6 May 2019 is included as Attachment 1 to this report.

5. The report will be presented by Ross l’Anson, the Agency Acting Regional Relationship Director.

Assessment of Significance
6. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002, Land Transport Management Act 2003 or any other enactment.
Conclusion
7. This report provides the RTC with information on the Agency activities over the last quarterly period. This report includes a state highway activities update as well as other activities undertaken by the Agency.

Attachments
1. New Zealand Transport Agency Quarterly report to 6 May 2019 (Doc # 14117914).
# Transport Agency Quarterly Report to Waikato Regional Transport Committee

6 May 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Targeted Enhanced Funding Assistance Rates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National Land Transport Plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long Term View</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Speed Management Update</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Waikato Business Cases</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Waikato Highway Projects</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Safe Roads</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. TARGETED ENHANCED FUNDING ASSISTANCE RATES (TEFAR)

- We received a positive response to the opportunities to deliver on the Government Policy Statement (GPS) and the Targeted Enhanced Funding Assistance Rate (TEFAR) incentive
- A large programme of projects has been put forward for each activity class and remaining unallocated funding is very limited
- We are prioritising the remaining NLTP funding to projects that best align to the GPS outcomes of safety, access, environment and value for money
- We'll advise councils which activities are eligible to receive TEFAR and work through the funding approval process together
- The initial approved funding allocation for each local government’s individual Low Cost Low Risk programme will not increase as a result of projects being eligible for TEFAR
- We have completed most of re–evaluations of potential investments on 10 state highway corridors, and the results are available on our website.

2. NATIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME (NLTP)

- Looking ahead to the next 2021–24 NLTP, we’ve begun discussing transport priorities with the Government. We’ve also started discussions with the Transport Special Interest Group
- We’re currently developing a plan and initial timeline for the next NLTP process. This includes deadlines for RLTPs, the Government Policy Statement, the NLTP assessment and prioritisation phase and final adoption of the NLTP. The plan has been developed based on what we heard from stakeholders and our staff
- From these recommendations, our areas of focus include:
  - increasing transparency and understanding of the NLTP process
  - including stakeholders early on as we develop the NLTP
  - developing systems and tools that are adaptable and easier to follow
  - strengthening relationships with our partners.
3. **LONG TERM VIEW**

- We have refined its approach to the previous version of the LTV to align with the significant shifts in the direction for planning and investment in land transport outlined in the 2018 GPS
- The new Version 2.0 will address some of the shortcomings and feedback received from sharing Version 1.0 with various key stakeholders
- From July 2019, we will engage with regions to build a shared understanding of each region’s priority challenges and opportunities. These regional views will be included in the 2019 and 2020 versions of the LTV as content is developed.

4. **SPEED MANAGEMENT UPDATE**

- The Transport Agency’s speed management programme of work is currently being assessed. The Agency has undertaken a ‘safe and appropriate’ assessment for all regions – with Auckland, Waikato and Canterbury being identified as high risk
- We are engaging with local councils to discuss speed management as part of a suite of safety interventions to be delivered as part of the Safe Network Programme
- Auckland Transport has begun public consultation on their local roads and the Transport Agency is planning to begin consultation on three corridors in the next few months
- A complementary programme of speed reviews has been completed in some regions outside Auckland, Waikato and Canterbury in response to strong community requests or where we have long standing commitments for speed changes
- We envision the planning of public and stakeholder engagement and consultation on the highest priority sites to start in the next few months
5. WAIKATO BUSINESS CASES

Piarere to Taupō (SH1)

- Work is on track to complete the draft business case by mid-2019.

Taupō to Waiouru (SH1)

- Work is on track to complete the draft business case by mid-2019.

Paeroa to Waihi (SH2)

- We have completed a Programme Business Case (Part A and B) extending from Paeroa to Waihi through the Karangahake Gorge in partnership with Hauraki District Council, iwi and the Department of Conservation
- The recommended programme looks to improve visitor spend, reduce the number and severity of crashes (improving route predictability) and improve the level of service for all customers
- The recommended programme has been endorsed by Hauraki District Council and we are currently completing the management case which will outline the next steps for the project, before going through NZ Transport Agency and Department of Conservation approvals.
6. WAIKATO HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Waikato Expressway (SH1)

- Work is continuing to progress on final three sections of the expressway:
  - Longswamp: Construction continues on north-bound lanes. The 5.9km section is expected to be completed in spring 2019.
  - Huntly: Completion is on track for early 2020. Planning is underway for end-of-project events
  - Hamilton: Completion was initially scheduled for 2020 but is under significant pressure
- Pavement problems have emerged on the Te Rapa and Ngaruawahia sections. Short-term repair works continue as required, while details of the long-term repairs are worked through with contractors.

Awakino Tunnel to Mount Messenger (SH3)

- Fulton Hogan due to start work on bypass of the Awakino Tunnel in October 2019, with completion in 2021
- Mt Messenger Bypass is at final stages of the design process. Current Environment Court appeals may put pressure on the planned construction start date in late 2019
- Safe Roads continuing to deliver corridor-wide safety and resilience improvements, including passing lanes at Ladies Mile and Rapanui, intersection improvements, and slope stability.

Cobham Drive/Cambridge Road and Wairere Drive (SH1)

- Wairere Drive intersection: Work is now underway connecting the final 400m from Wairere Drive to Cobham Drive
- Cambridge Road intersection: Likely start date early 2022.

Kirikiri Stream Bridge (SH26)

- $17 million funding has been approved, with construction still expected to begin in 2020. State date is subject to completing property purchases and planning processes.
Te Awa: Cambridge to Hamilton shared path

- A 20km path between Cambridge and Hamilton will be built in four sections, providing a continuous 60km cycling and walking route from Karapiro to Ngaruawahia
- Construction on the Transport Agency’s section expected to begin in the next few months.

Southern Links

- Preliminary design work continues in collaboration with Hamilton City Council
- Property acquisition and environmental/ecological survey work continues.

Re-evaluation of Waikato projects

- SH1 Cambridge to Piarere, SH2 Pokeno to Mangatarara Improvements, and SH29 Piarere to Tauriko were among a number of projects reviewed by the Transport Agency to evaluate whether they align with the new vision for our transport network
- The re-evaluations were completed, and the outcomes announced in October/November
- We are now considering funding and timing for these projects against funds available nationally. We expect to be able to provide an update on the next steps for these projects in the coming months.

7. SAFE ROADS

Mangawhero Stream Bridge (SH27)

- Detailed design phase is near completion and consent applications and notice of requirement have been lodged with relevant councils. Land acquisitions are being progressed
- Approval for construction will be sought following completion of detailed design phase.
SH3 Awakino to Mt Messenger safety and resilience improvements

- More extensive improvement works started in March 2019– including construction of passing lanes at Ladies Mile and Rapanui, intersection improvements in Tongaporutu Village and slope stability work in the Awakino Gorge
- The passing lane at Ladies Mile is being constructed first and is expected to be complete mid-2020, construction will pause over the winter and recommence in the spring
- Work on the northbound passing lane at Rapanui is scheduled to start next summer, subject to consents being obtained.

SH5 SH38– Warakei

- The project focuses on three high–risk sections of the highway: the northern end at Waiotapu, centrally (around Mihi and the Waikato River) and the southern end at Wairakei
- Construction at Waiotapu was scheduled to begin in April 2019 (at time report written), with the remaining sections due to start in late 2019. Improvements include roadside safety barriers, wide centre lines and shoulders, and improved signs and road markings.

Taupiri to Gordonton (SH1B)

- Safety improvements between Ballard Road and Taylor Road are now complete.

SH23 Waitetuna to Raglan (SH23) & Hamilton to Highbrook Way (SH23)

- Approved work between Waitetuna and Raglan is almost complete and further safety improvement works for the Waitetuna to Raglan section are being investigated
- The design of works between Hamilton and Highbrook Way are being reviewed.

SH1 Cambridge to Piarere safety improvements (SH1)

- Work is underway on safety improvements along the existing corridor.
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 11 April 2019
Author: Nigel King, Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure
Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy
Subject: 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport
Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To provide the Committee with information on the development of the 2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

Executive Summary
2. The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) is an important document for the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) as it provides direction from the Government on its investment priorities. The Regional Land Transport Plan prepared by the RTC must be consistent with the GPS.

3. Bryn Gandy, Deputy Chief Executive for Strategy and Investment and Danielle Bassan, Senior Policy Advisor from the Ministry of Transport will be in attendance at the RTC meeting and will present to the Committee on the development of the 2021 GPS.

Staff Recommendation:
That the report ‘2021 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport’ (Regional Transport Committee 6 May 2019) be received.

Background
4. Under Section 66 of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 the Minister of Transport must issue a GPS before the start of the first financial year to which it applies. The GPS covers a period of six financial years.

5. The GPS must include:
   • the results that the Crown wishes to achieve from the allocation of funding from the national land transport fund over a period of at least 10 consecutive financial years
   • the Crown’s land transport investment strategy
   • the Crown’s policy on borrowing for the purpose of managing the national land transport programme.

6. The GPS may set out national land transport objectives, policies, and measures for a period of at least 10 financial years beginning on the date that the GPS on land transport is issued.

7. The 2018 Update to the 2015 Regional Land Transport plan was prepared under the policy direction of the 2018 GPS.
8. The Ministry of Transport is in the process of preparing the 2021 GPS and is engaging with the transport sector including local government. Formal consultation will occur later, following the usual process.

**Discussion**

9. In late 2018 the MOT provided advice to the sector on any possible amendment to GPS 2018. The MOT update noted that any second-stage 2018 GPS would be limited in scope to matters needing immediate action to implement outside of the regular three-year GPS cycle – for example, investment in rail. This remains the case, and the Minister of Transport will take decisions on whether this amendment is required in early 2019. Other areas to explore in a second stage GPS will likely be addressed in GPS 2021.

10. The MOT also indicated that the Ministry had started initial work to develop GPS 2021. The Ministry is still aiming to release this in mid-2020, 12 months before it takes effect. Their initial work has included:
   - determining how the MOT will collect and analyse evidence to inform GPS 2021
   - considering options for aligning GPS 2021 with the transport outcomes framework
   - assessing whether there are changes that could be made to make the GPS 2021 more useful to the transport sector as an investment tool.

11. The Ministry is holding sector listening sessions around the country. This includes a session to inform future GPS development. A Ministry workshop to shape the future GPS and NLTP was held on 10 April in Hamilton and included a session on current and future demands for the GPS, including discussion on the role of the different sections of the GPS. The session sought input on what works well about the GPS, what could be improved, and thoughts on improvements and changes needed in GPS 2021.

12. At the RTC meeting on 6 May the MOT staff will present on the current position in regard to 2021 GPS development and opportunities for the Regional Transport Committee to help shape GPS 2021.

**Conclusion**

13. The MOT have commenced development of the 2021 GPS and is running sector listening sessions to help shape the future GPS.

14. MOT staff will present to the Committee on 6 May on 2021 GPS development.

**Assessment of significance**

15. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

---

1 The Transport Outcomes Framework is a set of inter-related outcomes that need to be met as a whole to improve intergenerational wellbeing and quality of life across New Zealand’s cities, towns and provinces. These include inclusive access, healthy and safe people, environmental sustainability, resilience and security and economic prosperity.
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 10 April 2019
Author: Rachel Cook, Senior Policy Advisor
Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy
Subject: Regional Road Safety Monitor Report
Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To update the Committee on road safety issues and trends on regional progress towards the actions outlined in national and regional road safety strategies.

Executive Summary
2. National road safety performance continues to be poor, with 375 people dying on New Zealand’s roads over the last 12 months, 64 of whom were in the Waikato region. In the year to date 21 people have died on our region’s roads.

3. The region continues to advocate for positive road safety actions and outcomes in the new national road safety strategy through sharing our regional position paper. The Northland Regional Transport Committee has written to confirm their support for the position paper. Forum members recently shared their progress on speed management initiatives and bylaw changes at the Regional Road Safety Forum.

4. The Trafinz conference will be held in Hamilton in November and elected members and regional staff are recommended to attend. The conference has a strong safety focus and the theme this year is “Smart, safe and accessible places”, which strongly aligns with the government direction for transport and the transport outcomes framework.

5. The Waikato Regional Council education team continue to support regional partners on education and behaviour change initiatives, with good evidence, joint initiatives, along with capacity and capability building in the sector.

Staff Recommendation:
That the report ‘Regional Road Safety Monitor Report – May 2019’ be received.

Issue
6. Under the national guidance of the Safer Journeys Strategy and the regional guidance of the Waikato Regional Road Safety Strategy 2017-21 (WRRSS), road safety partners are working collaboratively to reduce deaths and serious injuries (DSI’s) on the region’s roads.
National and Regional road safety statistics

7. As at 8 April 2019, 112 people have lost their lives on New Zealand’s road, with 21 in the Waikato region in the year to date\(^1\), making up 18.7% of national fatalities. This compares to 375 people who died over the last 12 months, 64 in the Waikato. A graph of the monthly rolling average of fatalities, Figure 1, shows the Waikato region is following the same trend as seen nationally, with greater variation in the Waikato numbers due to the smoothing effect on national fatality and serious injuries numbers.

Figure 1: Rolling monthly average of Waikato region versus national road deaths and serious injuries 2015-2019 year to date.

8. Figure 2 shows DSI’s occurring within each Waikato (region) District Council boundary, including local roads and state highways over the period 2014-2018. Waikato district shows the highest number of DSI’s over the period at 433, with 86 in 2018. Waikato district’s cumulative DSI between 2014-2018 is more than the DSI for the whole region in 2018 which was 408 in 2018.

Figure 2: Cumulative death and serious injury counts across Waikato region Territorial Authorities, 2014-2018.

\(^1\) Provisional Ministry of Transport Figures, deaths are not confirmed until 30 days after the fatal crash.
9. Figure 3 explores the role of heavy vehicles in DSI crashes for the region. With increasing freight movements on the network, we might expect to continue to see heavy vehicles over-represented in crash statistics, and particularly in fatal outcomes due to the effect of the mass of heavy vehicles during a crash. Over this period, 2014-2019, the average number of vehicles involved in DSI crashes was 130 and the percentage that involved heavy vehicles was ten percent.

10. A 2016 Ministry of Transport report\(^2\) found that deaths from crashes involving trucks make up around 20 percent of total road deaths (5 year average), while just over six percent of the total distance travelled on New Zealand roads is travelled by trucks. The national figures and those shown below cannot be compared directly due to different analysis methods, but give an indication of where the Waikato is tracking.

Figure 3: Number of vehicles involved in death and serious injury crashes in the Waikato region, and the percentage involving heavy vehicles, by seasonal quarter, 2014-2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seasonal Quarter</th>
<th>Number of Vehicles</th>
<th>Percentage of Heavy Vehicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-Feb 2014</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-May 2015</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-Aug 2015</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Nov 2016</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-Feb 2017</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-May 2018</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June-Aug 2018</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Nov 2019</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Seasonal quarters used are: December-February, March-May, June-August and September-November.

11. Details of each of the regional fatalities in the 2019 year to date are summarised in Attachment 1.

**Speed Management**

12. An update on speed management is provided in a separate report to this meeting.

**National Road Safety Strategy development – Waikato Region Position Paper**

13. The Regional Council has received further responses to the regional position paper for advocacy toward the development of the next national road safety. At their meeting of 13 February 2019, the Northland Regional Transport Committee (RTC) formally supported the proposals in the position paper. The Northland RTC response is attached as Attachment 2. The Hon Dr David Clark, Minister of Health has also responded to the position paper, detailing extensive involvement on the National Road Safety Committee and other initiatives the Ministry of Health is engaged in – Attachment 3.

**National Road Safety Strategy – Ministry of Transport engagement**

14. The Ministry of Transport held an engagement session with regional technical staff on 10 April at Hamilton City Council. In their national road safety strategy session, they gave feedback on key issues identified through their engagement to date:

- The need for more vision and ambition
- Clear targets and outcomes
- Greater focus on system factors

• Improving safety for all road users
• Linking to broader outcomes
• Strong evidence base
• Broad engagement and ownership.

15. As previous reported, the Ministry has had engagement with stakeholders through five reference groups: on Speed; Infrastructure, design and planning; vehicle standards and certification; road user behaviour; and vehicles as a workplace. Broader stakeholder engagement has sought to build a shared understanding of the problem and the implications of Vision Zero in order to develop and build buy in for an ambitious strategic approach and vision.

16. Feedback from the broader engagement:
• Broad support for Vision Zero – needs meaningful change to be credible
• Appetite for substantial change, but differing views on pace
• Safe System needs to be strengthened and embedded
• The need for strong leadership and effective coordination
• Challenges of collecting and understanding road safety data and trends (capacity and capability)
• Need to bring community with us.

17. An early draft framework is currently being discussed with stakeholders across New Zealand through a regional road-show and engagement sessions, with the Ministry seeking feedback to inform the strategy development process. The current schedule is for the draft strategy and action plan to continue to be developed during April-June, with formal consultation June/July and release September/October 2019.

18. The Committee will be aware that communications about road safety issues is recognised as a key challenge, and the Ministry is seeking support to help build understanding and support meaningful discussion about road safety.

Regional Road Safety Forum, 13 March 2019 report back
19. The Road Safety Forum met on 13 March 2019. Updates and presentations were given about the following matters, the presenting agencies are identified in brackets:
• Engagement using the IAP2 (International Association of Public Participation) framework. A number of road safety practitioners have subsequently expressed an interest in training in IAP2. (WRC)
• National Safer Networks – Speed Management Plan. (NZ Transport Agency, WRC)
• Waipā speed management bylaw process update and learnings. (Waipā District Council)
• Progress updates from other councils on their speed bylaw processes. (Taupō DC, Waikato DC)
• Update on national Road Safety Knowledge Partnership Workshop. (WRC)
This is a business case whose purpose is to:
1. Develop a set of road safety themes that relate to problems and difficulties that officers encounter when sharing knowledge across organizations and with colleagues, and
2. Identify enablers to gather knowledge efficiently, daylight issues when sharing knowledge and develop problem statements for the NZ Police Intelligence Team to test for validity.

Trafinz Conference 2019
20. For the first time in a number of years the Trafinz conference will be held in Hamilton, at Claudelands Events Centre, 10-13 November. The conference always has a strong emphasis on road safety and is both informative and inspirational – particularly for staff and elected members facing challenging road safety issues on a daily basis. Members are urged to attend and to support staff working in this area. It will also be a good opportunity to highlight some of the projects and programmes happening in the Waikato region. Elected members receive a discounted rate alongside staff attendance and are encouraged to place an interim booking for this ahead of the 2019 local government elections, with final attendance to be confirmed following elections.
21. The theme for this conference this year is “Smart, safe and accessible places”. There will be four ‘sub-themes’ of:
- Place making that is designed for people
- Safe systems principles and road safety outcomes for people
- Accessibility for people and wellbeing
- Smart transportation for people.

22. This theme aligns with the government direction for transport and the transport outcomes framework.

“The purpose of the transport system is to improve people’s wellbeing, and the liveability of places.”

It does this by contributing to five key outcomes, represented in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Transport Outcomes Framework, Ministry of Transport 2018.

Safe Road Use – Education and Behaviour Change
23. The WRC Education strategy was finalised in 2018 and has resulted in a change in focus for the Education team from resource-heavy road safety campaigns to growing community capacity and capability through partnerships, to educate road users and drive behaviour change. WRC has been working closely with local road safety coordinators across the region, the police and other providers and partners, to strengthen and support their road safety programmes, and support best practice using research and evidence driven investment.

24. Billboards - WRC continues to work with NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) and local Road Safety Coordinators on the placement and messaging on billboards across the region’s state highway network.

25. Motorcycles - ‘Shiny side up’ is an ACC/NZTA joint initiative, of events to inform and educate about motorcycle safety. Events are held around New Zealand, with a joint Auckland/Waikato event held at Hampton Downs on the first weekend in March 2019. Over 300 riders signed up for ‘Ride Forever’ motorcycle skills training, across a range of levels, at the event. We continue to promote and support motorcycle rider training across the region. ACC have indicated that riders who have participated in Ride Forever training have a reduced crash risk. Comparing a statistically robust sample of roughly 3,000 riders,
against an equal-size, demographically-matched control sample, taking at least one Ride Forever course reduced the incidence of having a crash by 27% and the associated claims cost by 45%. In other words, Ride Forever-trained riders crash less often, and the crashes they do have are on average less severe.

26. **Child Restraints** - At a Road Safety Forum meeting in March 2018 members agreed to investigate a regional approach to child restraint checking and education. Road safety coordinators across the region worked together to determine an agreed model and a contract is in the process of being let to Baby on the Move to carry out restraint checks working with and being guided by Road Safety Coordinators. Performance measures per district have been agreed.

27. **Heavy Vehicles** - The Road Transport Association (RTANZ - Northern) and WRC are working together to increase seatbelt wearing in the heavy vehicle industry and are utilising a successful programme from Northland of providing fluorescent seatbelt covers. The initiative has industry and Police support. Reports from Northland indicate a significant increase in seat belt wearing compliance.

28. An exercise with the Waikato District Council, Waikato Police – Commercial Vehicle Safety Team (CVST), WRC and WinTec student nurses, RTANZ and National Road Carriers took place on 9 April in Huntly. Around 40 heavy vehicles were stopped and drivers spoke with members of the above team about safety, compliance, fatigue, health issues and wellbeing, speed around corners and vehicle checks.

29. **Fleet Day** - This year we are partnering with EROAD to deliver Fleet Day on Wednesday 15 May 2019. EROAD is a fully integrated technology, tolling and services provider, based in Auckland. Early planning is underway, with the event moving to Claudelands Events Centre to increase accessibility. This year there will be a small charge for businesses to attend. Greg Murphy will be the motivational speaker and Brake-the road safety charity, will attend alongside WorkSafe. There will be a range of safety and fleet related presentations. Previous feedback on Fleet Days has shown that some attendees use this as part of their professional development. Elected members are encouraged to attend.

30. **Social Media reach** – The ‘Reduce the Risk’ Facebook page– achieved 20,641 page likes in March 2019, a significant growth from 5,500 likes in August 2016. Engagement continues to grow with a whopping 119,877 impressions in March and 262,234 year to date (how many people have interacted with the Reduce the Risk posts). Each month posts contain information about restraints, impairment, distraction, speed and other topical subjects. Interaction with the Facebook page represents the public having conversations and educating each other about the road safety issues we raise in posts. The general audience for Reduce the Risk is 63% women and 37% men, fairly evenly distributed between 18-65+ years for women and more heavily 18-34 years for men, but also for ages up to 65+.

31. Notably, over the last three years the public discourse on speed management has become more evidence informed and increasingly focused on the impact of speed on crash outcomes and the importance of having speed limits appropriate to the road.

32. Current speed management bylaw reviews in Hamilton City, Waikato District and Waipa District and the level of public support for setting safe and appropriate speed limits is evidence of the changing public attitude.

**New Zealand Police Report**

33. Inspector Marcus Lynam, Waikato Road Policing Manager, will provide the RTC with a verbal update on current road safety activities.

**Conclusion**

34. Road safety outcomes continue to be poor both nationally and regionally. Some districts within the region are more heavily impacted than others and heavy vehicles continue to be over represented in DSI crash outcomes.
35. Regional stakeholders are working together through the Regional Road Safety Forum and through education and behaviour change initiatives across a range of methods and modes to decrease risk for road users.

Assessment of significance
36. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

Attachments
1. Table of Waikato region fatal crashes year to date as at 9 April 2019 (Doc # 13661473)
2. Letter from the Northland Regional Transport Committee, dated 11 March 2019 (Doc # 13953669)
3. Letter from the Hon Dr David Clark, Minister of Health, received 9 April 2019 (Doc # 14104940).
### Attachment 1: Table of Waikato Region fatal crashes 2019 year to date, as at 9 April 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatality no.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Road/SH/Area</th>
<th>Local District</th>
<th>Crash Description</th>
<th>Sex, fatality type, age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/01/2019</td>
<td>SH1 and SH28, Putaruru</td>
<td>NZTA, South Waikato DC</td>
<td>Truck and trailer travelling southbound, driver lost control negotiating left bend over a bridge. Unit crossed centreline into path of oncoming van.</td>
<td>Female driver, aged 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17/01/2019</td>
<td>SH1, Taupiri</td>
<td>NZTA, Waikato DC</td>
<td>Southbound vehicle 1 slowed late for queueing traffic and hit tow-bar of vehicle ahead. Vehicle 2 following hit rear of vehicle 1. Vehicle 3 following vehicle 2 crossed centreline entering northbound lane in a clockwise rotation and has hit left side of vehicle 4. Vehicle 4 has hit brien barrier to left of lane.</td>
<td>Female passenger, aged 70 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>24/01/2019</td>
<td>SH4, Te Mapara</td>
<td>NZTA, Waitomo DC</td>
<td>Vehicle 1 travelling south, and Vehicle 2 travelling north. Head on collision in northbound lane near the centre line.</td>
<td>Male driver, aged 60 years, Female passenger, aged 65 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>30/01/2019</td>
<td>Peachgrove Road, Hamilton</td>
<td>Hamilton CC</td>
<td>Single rider of stolen motorbike drifted to left side of road, crossing intersection and mounting footpath and hitting obstacles.</td>
<td>Male, motorcyclist, aged 41 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31/01/2019</td>
<td>SH1, Tokoroa</td>
<td>NZTA, South Waikato DC</td>
<td>At intersection Vehicle 1 driving south failed to give way to a north bound vehicle 2 colliding with the passenger side of vehicle 2.</td>
<td>Female passenger, aged 45 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20/02/2019</td>
<td>SH3 Mahoenui</td>
<td>NZTA, Waikato DC</td>
<td>Northbound truck crossed centre line on/near the exit of a sweeping left curve into path of approaching southbound vehicle. A head on collision has occurred right headlight to right headlight.</td>
<td>Female driver, aged 27 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1/03/2019</td>
<td>SH1 Rangipo</td>
<td>NZTA, Taupo DC</td>
<td>Vehicle travelling north has swung onto the incorrect side of the road when rounding a sharp left bend and collided with southbound truck and trailer.</td>
<td>Male driver, aged 50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14/03/2019</td>
<td>SH29 Hinuera</td>
<td>NZTA, Waitomo DC</td>
<td>East bound vehicle has crossed centreline and impacted westbound unladen Heavy Truck. Truck has run off to north side of road coming to rest on northern verge.</td>
<td>Male driver, aged 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20/03/2019</td>
<td>SH27, Ngarua</td>
<td>NZTA, Waitomo DC</td>
<td>Vehicle 1 has failed to stop/give-way at stop sign controlled intersection with SH27 and driven into the path of a southbound B-train (un-laden) truck and trailer combination resulting in T-bone collision with the driver's side of vehicle 1.</td>
<td>Male driver, aged 27 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 12</td>
<td>21/03/2019</td>
<td>Waerenga, Te Kauwhata</td>
<td>Waikato DC</td>
<td>Westbound truck and trailer crossed centreline into path of eastbound Utility vehicle. Full impact right headlight to right headlight on collision in the eastbound lane. Both vehicles came to rest at the bottom of a steep bank in an adjacent paddock.</td>
<td>Male driver, aged 65 years, Male Driver, aged 26 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29/03/2019</td>
<td>SH1 Atiamuri</td>
<td>NZTA, South Waikato DC</td>
<td>Southbound truck and heavy trailer failed to enter a gentle left bend and gone straight ahead into the opposing lane. Oncoming truck and heavy trailer swerved left but right front of southbound truck has struck front of the trailer of northbound truck.</td>
<td>Male driver, aged 37 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29/03/2019</td>
<td>Wairakei Dr Taupo</td>
<td>Taupo DC</td>
<td>Motorbike travelling south on Wairakei Drive failed to take the corner, crossing northbound lane and off road and impacted with roadside objects.</td>
<td>Male motorcyclist, aged 59 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16, 17, 18, 19</td>
<td>1/04/2019</td>
<td>Atiamuri Tirohanga</td>
<td>Taupo DC</td>
<td>Southbound vehicle on Tirohanga Road has gone off the road to the right, crossed back to left and impacted trees. One surviving occupant seriously injured.</td>
<td>Male motorcyclist, aged 26 years, Female passenger, aged 44 years, Female passenger, aged 15 years, Female passenger, aged 14 years, Female passenger, aged 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5/04/2019</td>
<td>Cambridge Rd, Rotoorangi</td>
<td>Waipa DC</td>
<td>Motorcycle travelling south. Northbound Utility has moved to overtake truck and trailer unit in foggy conditions and has collided with the motorcycle.</td>
<td>Male motorcyclist, aged 42 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Provisional figures, deaths are not confirmed until 30 days after the fatal crash.
11 March 2019

Rachel Cook
Senior Policy Advisor, Transport and Infrastructure,
Waikato Regional Council,
Private Bag 3038,
Waikato Mail Centre,
Hamilton 3240

Dear Rachel

PLEASE HELP US TO REVERSE THE CURRENT GROWTH IN FATAL AND SERIOUS ROAD CRASHES

On 15 January 2019, you forwarded to the Northland Regional Transport Committee (RTC) a copy of a letter from the Waikato Regional Council’s Regional Transport Committee and their Regional Road Safety Forum to the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) INC. titled “Please help us to reverse the current growth in fatal and serious road crashes”.

This letter requested regional transport committees to support a call for the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) INC. and to encourage their members to get involved in the development of the upcoming National Road Safety Strategy 2020-2030 and support a new approach to road safety principles and action in an effort to reduce the current increases in fatal and serious road crashes.

In their meeting of 13 February 2019, the RTC formally approved:

1. That the Regional Transport Committee support the proposals as contained in the letter to the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) INC by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee and Regional Road Safety Forum.

2. That the Chairman of the Regional Transport Committee write to the Waikato Regional Transport Committee and Regional Road Safety Forum advising them of this support.

As Chairman, I can assure you that our RTC takes road safety very seriously and applauds any, and all efforts to reduce deaths and serious on our regions and nation’s roads.

Should you require any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Councillor John Bain
Chairman Regional Transport Committee.

0800 002 004
www.nrc.govt.nz
info@erc.govt.nz

Private Bag 9021, Whangārei 0148
Attachment 3: Letter from the Hon Dr David Clark, Minister of Health, received 9 April 2019, in response to the National Road Safety Strategy – Waikato Region Position Paper.

Hon Dr David Clark
MP for Dunedin North
Minister of Health
Associate Minister of Finance

9 APR 2019

Ms Rachel Cook
Waikato Regional Council
transport@waikatoregion.govt.nz

Dear Ms Cook,

Thank you for your correspondence of 15 January 2019 regarding the National Road Safety Strategy 2020-2030. I appreciate you sharing the position paper developed by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee and Waikato Regional Road Safety Forum with me. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

As you are aware, the Ministry of Transport is leading the Government’s approach to reducing road deaths and serious injuries through development and implementation of the National Road Safety Strategy. I sit on a Ministerial Road Safety Committee that sets the strategic direction for this work.

The Ministry of Health participates in two reference groups helping develop the Strategy, on ‘vehicles, vehicle standards and certification’ and ‘infrastructure, design and planning’. These groups will ensure the Strategy considers vulnerable road users such as people on bikes and pedestrians, as well as reduces inequalities for those of lower incomes and Māori and Pacific communities. The Ministry also participates in the National Road Safety Committee and the National Road Safety Management Group.


As you will be aware, the GPS on Land Transport, which took effect on 1 July 2018, is the key document guiding the Government’s priorities for expenditure over the next ten years. Safety is outlined as a key strategic transport priority in the GPS, along with environment, access and value for money. You can read the full GPS on the Ministry of Transport’s website (www.transport.govt.nz) by searching ‘Government Policy Statement on Land Transport’.

The position paper notes post-crash response emergency response as a priority. The National Ambulance Sector Office (NASO) is a joint business unit between the Ministry of Health and ACC. NASO is leading a ten-year programme of work to increase the safety and effectiveness of air ambulance helicopter services. A significant portion of this work has a sector-wide perspective and therefore relates to road ambulances and road trauma.

NASO is also working with:

- the Major Trauma Network to improve patient outcomes through improved destination pathways and shared clinical records
the Next Generation Critical Communications project to improve communications capabilities between emergency services (including ambulances), enabling the transmission of data as well as voice.

In addition, the Government is committed to encouraging more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling to improve our public health. There is significant collaborative work currently underway and planned between the Ministry of Health, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the Ministry of Transport. The areas of walking and cycling, environmental sustainability, noise, mental health and access have been identified as common interests shared by all three agencies.

I am also advised that public sector officials have established a knowledge hub, which provides a mechanism for researchers from the transport and health sectors to connect with each other and prioritise data and research needs which shape broader transport policy.

Thank you again for writing and sharing the position paper with me. I hope you find this information useful.

Yours sincerely,

Hon Dr David Clark
Minister of Health
11 March 2019

Rachel Cook  
Senior Policy Advisor, Transport and Infrastructure,  
Waikato Regional Council,  
Private Bag 3038,  
Waikato Mail Centre,  
Hamilton 3240  

Dear Rachel

PLEASE HELP US TO REVERSE THE CURRENT GROWTH IN FATAL AND SERIOUS ROAD CRASHES

On 15 January 2019, you forwarded to the Northland Regional Transport Committee (RTC) a copy of a letter from the Waikato Regional Council’s Regional Transport Committee and their Regional Road Safety Forum to the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) INC. titled “Please help us to reverse the current growth in fatal and serious road crashes”.

This letter requested regional transport committees to support a call for the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) INC. and to encourage their members to get involved in the development of the upcoming National Road Safety Strategy 2020-2030 and support a new approach to road safety principles and action in an effort to reduce the current increases in fatal and serious road crashes.

In their meeting of 13 February 2019, the RTC formally approved:

1. That the Regional Transport Committee support the proposals as contained in the letter to the Road Controlling Authorities Forum (NZ) INC. by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee and Regional Road Safety Forum.

2. That the Chairman of the Regional Transport Committee write to the Waikato Regional Transport Committee and Regional Road Safety Forum advising them of this support.

As Chairman, I can assure you that our RTC takes road safety very seriously and applauds any, and all efforts to reduce deaths and serious on our region’s and nation’s roads.

Should you require any further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

[Signature]

Councillor John Bain  
Chairman Regional Transport Committee.
Ms Rachel Cook
Waikato Regional Council
transport@waikatoregion.govt.nz

Dear Ms Cook

Thank you for your correspondence of 15 January 2019 regarding the National Road Safety Strategy 2020-2030. I appreciate you sharing the position paper developed by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee and Waikato Regional Road Safety Forum with me. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

As you are aware, the Ministry of Transport is leading the Government’s approach to reducing road deaths and serious injuries through development and implementation of the National Road Safety Strategy. I sit on a Ministerial Road Safety Committee that sets the strategic direction for this work.

The Ministry of Health participates in two reference groups helping develop the Strategy, on ‘vehicles, vehicle standards and certification’ and ‘infrastructure, design and planning’. These groups will ensure the Strategy considers vulnerable road users such as people on bikes and pedestrians, as well as reduces inequalities for those of lower incomes and Māori and Pacific communities. The Ministry also participates in the National Road Safety Committee and the National Road Safety Management Group.


As you will be aware, the GPS on Land Transport, which took effect on 1 July 2018, is the key document guiding the Government’s priorities for expenditure over the next ten years. Safety is outlined as a key strategic transport priority in the GPS, along with environment, access and value for money. You can read the full GPS on the Ministry of Transport’s website (www.transport.govt.nz) by searching ‘Government Policy Statement on Land Transport’.

The position paper notes post-crash response emergency response as a priority. The National Ambulance Sector Office (NASO) is a joint business unit between the Ministry of Health and ACC. NASO is leading a ten-year programme of work to increase the safety and effectiveness of air ambulance helicopter services. A significant portion of this work has a sector-wide perspective and therefore relates to road ambulances and road trauma.

NASO is also working with:

- the Major Trauma Network to improve patient outcomes through improved destination pathways and shared clinical records
- the Next Generation Critical Communications project to improve communications capabilities between emergency services (including ambulances), enabling the transmission of data as well as voice.

In addition, the Government is committed to encouraging more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, walking and cycling to improve our public health. There is significant collaborative work currently underway and planned between the Ministry of Health, the New Zealand Transport Agency and the Ministry of Transport. The areas of walking and cycling, environmental sustainability, noise, mental health and access have been identified as common interests shared by all three agencies.

I am also advised that public sector officials have established a knowledge hub, which provides a mechanism for researchers from the transport and health sectors to connect with each other and prioritise data and research needs which shape broader transport policy.

Thank you again for writing and sharing the position paper with me. I hope you find this information useful.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Hon Dr David Clark
Minister of Health
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 15 April 2019
Author: Bill McMaster, Special Projects Advisor
Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy
Subject: Regional Speed Management Update
Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To provide the Committee with an update on regional speed management and seek the Committee’s endorsement of:
   • draft regional speed management policies and principles
   • preferred institutional arrangements for regional speed management.
   for discussion and feedback from Territorial Authorities and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA).
2. The Committee is also asked to approve a Regional Transport Committee (RTC) submission to Hamilton City Council’s’ Speed Management Plan.

Executive Summary
3. On 1 April 2019 a workshop was held with the RTC where the Committee considered the draft principles and policies for the Regional Speed Management Plan. The Committee gave initial feedback on the principles and policies for further rework by the project team.

4. Following the workshop the Regional Safe Network Programme Working Group has considered the revised principles and policies and at their meeting on 11 April endorsed the revised version for reporting back to the Committee (refer Attachment 1). The Regional Advisory Group (RAG) also endorsed the revised draft principles and policies at their meeting on 1 April.

5. Work has continued on the Regional Speed Management Institutional Arrangements Options project with stakeholder interviews completed and the ‘Challenge’ workshop undertaken. The consultants Morrison Low have prepared a draft report (refer Attachment 2) with options for the Committee’s consideration. Representatives from Morrison Low and their sub-consultants Opus WSP will be in attendance at the meeting to present the report.

6. At the last workshop NZTA presented maps showing the Top 10% High Benefit Speed Management Safe and Appropriate Speeds and secondly the Long Term View for Safe and Appropriate Speeds on the State Highway network in the region. NZTA are continuing to work on these maps which will form a component of the Regional Speed Management Plan. NZTA are also progressing a catchment approach to speed management in the region incorporating both local roads and state highways for defined areas.

7. The next steps in the regional speed management project is to undertake a series of roadshows to each of the territorial authorities in the region. At these roadshows the project team will present the draft principles and policies, the RTC preferred options for speed management institutional arrangements as well as the maps showing safe and appropriate speeds on the State Highway network. These workshops
will be run over May and June and are designed to inform and seek feedback from the territorial authorities. Feedback from these roadshows will be reported back to the RTC and will feed into the draft Regional Speed Management Plan.

8. The RTC is asked to establish a reference group to provide a sounding board to the project team as they prepare the draft regional speed management plan.

9. The draft regional speed management plan will be presented to the RTC at the 1 July 2019 meeting seeking the Committee’s endorsement.

10. Hamilton City Council is currently consulting on its Speed Management Plan and a draft RTC submission has been prepared and is attached as Attachment 3 (Doc # 14097614) for the Committee’s consideration and endorsement prior to it being submitted by 8 May closing date.

**Staff Recommendation:**

1. That the report ‘Regional Speed Management Update’ (Regional Transport Committee 6 May 2019) be received.
2. That the Committee receives the report ‘Regional Speed Management – Institutional Arrangement Options’ (Attachment 2).
3. That the Committee endorses the draft regional principles and policies for discussion and feedback from the ten territorial authorities in the region and key stakeholders (Attachment 1).
4. That the Committee endorses preferred options for speed management institutional arrangements for discussion and feedback from the territorial authorities in the region and the New Zealand Transport Agency.
5. That the Committee note that the speed management project team will hold a series of roadshows with the territorial authorities in May and June 2019.
6. That the Committee nominate a reference group of no less than three of its members, including the Chair, to provide a sounding-board for the speed management project team as they develop the draft Regional Speed Management Plan following engagement with territorial authorities and key stakeholders.
7. That the Committee notes that the draft Regional Speed Management Plan and recommended institutional arrangement will be brought to the 1 July 2019 meeting for endorsement.
8. That the Committee approves the RTC submission on the Hamilton Speed Management Plan (Doc # 14097614) for lodging with Hamilton City Council by 8 May 2019.

**Background**

9. Speed or driving too fast for the conditions continues to be a significant contributor in fatal and serious crashes in the Waikato region and shows an increasing five year trend accounting for 24% of high severity crashes in the region. Each year approximately 100 people are killed or seriously injured in speed related crashes in the region¹.

10. The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 (GPS) supports investment in state highways and local roads to accelerate the implementation of the New Zealand Speed Management Guide focusing on treating the top 10 per cent of the network which will result in the greatest reduction in death and serious injury as quickly as possible.

11. To make traction on national speed management three regions have been identified in the 2018 National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) for accelerated speed management work (Waikato, Auckland and

¹ Waikato region road safety analysis, Opus, September 2016
Christchurch) as they have the greatest potential to reduce deaths and serious injuries through targeted speed management interventions.

12. Safe Speed and Speed Management is a key priority in the Waikato Regional Road Safety Strategy 2017-2021. The Strategy has a number of actions to progress initiatives and advocate for funding support for implementation measures over the next 10 years.

13. The Committee has recognised the significance of speed management on the region’s road toll and has been overseeing the work of the Regional Safe Network Programme Working Group including the preparation of a Regional Speed Management Plan.

14. The Regional Safe Network Programme Working Group, comprises a range of stakeholders including Waikato Regional Council, NZTA, territorial authorities, New Zealand Police and health representatives. The role of the working group includes developing the draft Regional Speed Management Plan for recommendation to the Committee.

Discussion

15. A key component of the Regional Speed Management Plan (RSMP) is the inclusion of principles and policies to guide speed management activities being undertaken by road controlling authorities in the region. At the 1 April 2019 workshop the Committee provided feedback on the draft principles and policies and in summary this feedback was:

- The speed management principles and policies P1 to P8 were generally supported
- There was a desire from the RTC to make Policy 9 and Policy 10 simpler and to reduce the number of specific speed limits
- The issue of 30km/h around schools in urban areas was discussed and Hamilton City Council advised that they are moving to a 30km/h speed regime around urban schools in Hamilton
- There was a desire by the RTC to be clear that the speed on rural local roads should be 80km/h.
- There was support for a One Network approach to speed management covering both state highways and local roads.

16. This feedback resulted in changes being made to the draft principles and policies and these have been run past the Safe Network Programme Working Group (RSNP WG) for consideration. The RSNP WG endorsed these revised principles and policies at their meeting on 11 April for recommendation to the RTC. The revised principles and policies were also considered and endorsed by the Regional Advisory Group (RAG) on 12 April for recommendation to the RTC.

17. The revised draft principles and policies as endorsed by the RSNP WG and RAG are now reported back to the RTC (Attachment 1) for endorsement for initial discussion and feedback from the territorial authorities in the region and the NZTA.

18. The second important component of the RSMP is investigating institutional arrangement options for speed management in the region. This work arose from a desire of the RTC to identify ways of streamlining the speed management process and taking the ‘politics’ out of the process. Waikato Regional Council engaged Morrison Low to undertake this work and it is now completed in draft form to present to the RTC (Attachment 2). Representatives from Morrison Low will be in attendance at the RTC meeting to present their findings. The RTC is asked to endorse preferred options to take out to the territorial authorities for discussion as part of the roadshows.

19. The Institutional arrangements work looked at options for both service delivery and decision-making.

20. In respect to service delivery the following options have been considered:
- Status Quo (delivery in-house by each Council as per present practice)
- Enhanced Status Quo (delivery in-house with centralised templates and support)
• Delivery by Joint Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) - Waikato Local Authority Shared Services (WLASS) via a new workstream for Regional Asset Technical Accord (RATA)
• Delivery by Joint CCO (WLASS new workstream)
• Delivery by another local authority e.g. Waikato Regional Council
• Delivery by another agency - NZTA.

21. In respect to Decision making the following options have been considered:
   • Separate Decision Making
     o Status Quo (by each Council via a new bylaw as per present practice)
     o Enhanced Status quo (by each Council via resolution process).
   • Joint Decision making
     o Transfer bylaw making power to another local authority e.g. Waikato Regional Council
     o Transfer bylaw making power to WRC with speed limit changes made by RTC
     o Other joint Committee options.
   • The report also undertook an assessment of decision making options under future legislative changes and looks at three options:
     o Powers to make bylaw and individual changes transferred to RTC
     o NZTA to make decisions on local roads and state highways (practice as prior to 2003)
     o Decision making powers transferred to an independent body (similar to a District Licensing Committee).

22. Each service delivery and decision-making option was assessed-scored against 12 criteria including improved consistency, accelerating progress, cost effectiveness, streamlined consultation and other factors.

23. Morrison Low staff will outline the options, including the highest scoring options, and a possible pathway forward for speed management in the region. The RTC is asked to confirm preferred options for discussion and feedback from the territorial authorities in the region via the May/June roadshows.

24. In respect to national speed management work, the project team is waiting for the next stage from the Ministry of Transport (MOT) team leading the new national approach to speed management. It is clear however that regional speed management plans are part of the mix of recommendations going to Cabinet and the work that the RTC is undertaking is consistent with this approach. We expect the MOT to report back to the Waikato stakeholders once the Cabinet paper has been considered and released by Government.

25. Speed management is also expected to feature in the National Road Safety Strategy (NRSS) engagement document and Action plan which are expected to be released in mid-2019. In a workshop with the MOT on 10 April 2019 it was advised that the current Rules review work will likely come through as an action in the NRSS Action plan.

26. The NZTA is continuing to refine the regional speed management maps for the state highway network and this will be reported back to the Committee in July.

27. The project team will be preparing the draft RSMP for consideration by the RTC at their meeting on 1 July 2019 with the aim to seek endorsement by the RTC.

28. Staff have prepared a draft RTC submission on Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan (Refer Attachment 3) which is currently out for consultation. The RTC submission is a supportive submission which acknowledges that Hamilton City Council is taking a lead role in advancing speed management work in the region and their Plan is very consistent with the regional speed management planning currently underway. The submissions supports Hamilton City Council’s Vision Zero approach and the principles and policies that have been developed to guide speed management in Hamilton City. The RTC is asked to approve the submission and lodgement with Hamilton City Council by 8 May 2019.
Conclusion

29. Speed management continues to be a high priority for the region due to the high deaths and serious injury record related to speed in the region.

30. The Waikato region has been identified in the 2018 NLTP as one of three regions to accelerate speed management as it will achieve a high reduction in deaths and serious injuries.

31. The Regional Safe Network Programme Working Group is tasked with overseeing the development of a draft regional speed management plan for recommendation to the RTC.

32. The RTC is asked to endorse the draft principles and policies (Attachment 1) for initial discussion and feedback from the territorial authorities via a series of roadshows across the region in May and June 2019.

33. The RTC is asked to consider the Morrison Low regional speed management institutional arrangements options report (Attachment 2) and identify preferred options for discussion and feedback from the territorial authorities via the roadshows.

34. The RTC is asked to establish a reference group to act as a sounding board for the speed management team as they prepare the draft regional speed management plan.

35. That the RTC note that the draft regional speed management plan will be presented to the RTC on 1 July 2019.

36. The RTC is asked to approve the draft RTC submission to the Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan.

Assessment of significance

37. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

Attachments

1. Revised regional speed management Principles and Policies
3. Draft RTC submission to Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan (Doc # 14097614).
Attachment 1: Revised Draft Regional Speed Management Principles and Policies

Revised draft speed management principles

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>We will work with stakeholders in partnership to engage with our communities to implement positive speed management outcomes across the region and influence positive behaviour change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>We will use the Safe System approach, focusing on the three pillars of safe speeds, safe road use, and safe roads and roadsides, working towards zero deaths and serious injuries on the region’s roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>We will work together to ensure consistent and accelerated implementation of safe and appropriate speeds across the region, prioritising the highest risk parts of our roading network that deliver the highest benefits in death and serious injuries savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>We will address wider parts of the roading network where appropriate, taking a logical area wide approach to speed management which is self-explaining to road users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>We will manage speeds that are safe and appropriate to rural and urban environments and safe and appropriate for all users of the roading network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>We will implement speed management in accordance with legislative requirements and in line with best practice guidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised draft speed management policies

| P1 | Speed management across the Waikato region will be coordinated by Waikato Regional Council and the NZ Transport Agency, in partnership with territorial authorities and the NZ Police, via the Waikato Regional Speed Management Plan. |
| P2 | The speed management component of the NZ Transport Agency’s Safe Network Programme will be implemented in the Waikato region through the Waikato Regional Speed Management Plan. |
| P3 | A holistic approach to speed management will be applied, supplementing speed limit changes with other speed management tools including engineering interventions where appropriate. |
| P4 | An area or catchment based approach incorporating both state highways and local roads (One Network Approach) will be used when addressing the top 10 percent benefit sites to ensure we get the highest benefit from speed management interventions. |
| P5 | Speed management will be coordinated via a [to be determined] approach that improves decision making and saves both costs and time. [Note: holding policy for outcome of institutional arrangement review] |
| P6 | The region will use a consistent communications and engagement approach, as outlined in the Waikato Regional Speed Management Plan. |
The approach to speed management in the Waikato region, as outlined in the Waikato Regional Speed Management Plan, is flexible and responsive to incorporate changes to national policy on speed management.

A consistent speed management regime will be applied across the region that is self-explaining to road users.

Speed Limits will be set in accordance with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits (Rule 54001/2017) and the NZ Speed Management Guide (November 2016). For the Waikato region the following speed limit regimes are recommended to ensure a consistent speed management approach across the region:

- A 30km/h speed limit for CBD/town centres with high concentrations of pedestrians and/or cyclists.
- A 40km/h speed limit for urban residential areas.
- An 80km/h or 60 km/h speed limit regime on local roads in rural areas [depending on their function, safety and infrastructure risk profiles].
- Roads should not have speed limits higher than 80km/h without physical separation

Speed limits around schools will be set in accordance with the Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits (Rule 54001/2017), the NZ Speed Management Guide (November 2016) and Traffic Note 37. For the Waikato region the following speed limit regimes are recommended to ensure a consistent speed management approach around schools in the region:

- A permanent or variable 40km/h speed limit for schools in urban residential areas.
- A permanent or variable 60 km/h speed limit for schools in rural areas.

---

2 The 40km/h variable speeds apply at times of greatest risk (before and after school) and have general approval by NZTA (conditions apply). Current national policy is for 40km/h speed around schools in urban areas but 30km/h is under active consideration at national and regional level.

3 The 60 km/h variable speed limit applies at times of greatest risk (before and after school) and only applies where there is turning traffic risk. 60 km/h variable speed limits require specific site approval by NZTA.

4 Road controlling authorities must aim to achieve mean operating speeds less than 10% (ie 44km/h for 40km/z speed limits and 66 km/h for 60km/h speed limits) above permanent speed limits at all times, and variable speed limits while operating (clause 4.4(2)(c) of the Rule).
Attachment 2: Morrison Low report on Regional Speed Management Institutional Arrangement Options
Dear Sir/Madam

Waikato Regional Transport Committee Submission to Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan

Thank you for presenting the opportunity to provide feedback to Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan. This submission is made by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee (RTC), which is made up of representatives from the ten territorial authorities in the region, the NZ Transport Agency and the NZ Police.

The RTC has prioritised planning and implementation of speed management across the region in the 2018 update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045 (RLTP). Under this priority, Road Controlling Authorities are specifically tasked with developing and implementing district speed management plans.

The RTC commends Hamilton City Council (HCC) for leading speed management work and developing a speed management plan for the City. The RTC is currently overseeing the development of a regional speed management plan and has looked to the work HCC has undertaken to help shape high-level regional principles and policies.

In particular, the RTC commends HCC for:

- adopting Vision Zero as the philosophy for road safety in the City – this is consistent with national thinking behind the upcoming national road safety strategy and is also consistent with the RLTP’s objective for road safety: “land transport in the Waikato region is a Safe System, working towards zero deaths and serious injuries”;
- the excellent pre-engagement work that has been undertaken with the community prior to developing a speed management plan for consultation – including the use of a multi-stakeholder working group that defined the draft principles and prioritisation tools;
- the robustness behind the speed management plan – sound principles and evidence based mapping of safe and appropriate speeds which has led to a realistic vision for speed management in Hamilton;
- taking an holistic ‘whole toolbox’ approach – speed limits, road engineering and infrastructure, education, community engagement, and enforcement. This is important so the community can see the whole picture;
- the approach to consult on down-stream speed limit changes with stakeholders and the community in conjunction with consultation on physical infrastructure changes.
Speed management principles and priorities

In general, the RTC supports the principles and priorities that have been developed to guide speed management decision-making for Hamilton City. In particular, the RTC notes:

- support for the 30km/h speed environment where there are high numbers of people walking, biking and crossing the road - this is consistent with the NZ Speed Management Guide 2016 and developing regional policy. The RTC also supports the strong focus in the Speed Management Plan on protecting children and vulnerable users.

- support for residential local roads to be constructed for a 40km/h speed environment – and notes that the speed management map visions a largely 40km/h speed environment for residential areas. This is also supported and is consistent with developing regional policy for urban residential areas.

- qualified support for the principle to set the speed environment around schools at school times at the start and end of the school day at 30km/h – noting however, that the current legal framework does not provide for this and changes would need to be made at the national level to bring in 30km/h speed limits outside schools (it is currently 40km/h). The RTC understands that the Ministry of Transport is currently considering a 30km/h policy. In the meantime, a 40km/h permanent or variable speed limit for schools in urban areas is being mooted for the developing regional speed management plan, acknowledging that this could be lowered to 30km/h as a result of Government policy change.

- with respect to the above, the RTC notes the acknowledgement in the Speed Management Plan that ‘how’ and ‘when’ the vision for speed management for Hamilton is delivered will be contingent (amongst other factors) on the outcomes of national speed management work. This also applies to the development of the regional speed management plan.

- support the principles to use a logical, area-based approach for the implementation of speed management and working with partnering Road Controlling Authorities to provide a consistent approach – this is what the developing regional speed management plan is aiming to achieve.

- support the priorities to guide implementation - high benefit routes that deliver maximum benefit in reducing deaths and serious injuries, places where there is strong community demand for change, supporting consistent and logical implementation, and where lots of people walk or bike (or will in the future). Once again, the RTC congratulates HCC for advancing positive speed management outcomes for the City; a key priority for our region. The RTC is looking for a regionally consistent approach to speed management with early development of a regional speed management plan underway. HCC’s speed management work has been instrumental in shaping early thinking around the regional speed management plan.

This submission was formally endorsed by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee at the Committee meeting on the 6 May 2019.

Yours faithfully

Councillor Hugh Vercoe
Chair of Waikato Regional Transport Committee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Approving Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2434</td>
<td>Ewen Skinner</td>
<td>11-04-2019</td>
</tr>
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<td>Ewen Skinner</td>
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Executive Summary

This report assesses a range of speed management institutional arrangement options which could be used in the Waikato region. These include options for the speed limit setting service delivery, including the technical review of speed limit setting, engagement, bylaw drafting and consultation; and the decision making. Potential entities who have been considered for either the service delivery or the decision making include the Territorial Authorities (TAs) in their capacity as Road Controlling Authorities, the Waikato Regional Council (WRC), Waikato Regional Transport Committee (RTC), Waikato Local Authority Shared Services (Waikato LASS), and the New Zealand Transport Agency.

The methodology used to assess these options firstly considers the objectives for any change to the status quo and then assesses a long list of potential options against those objectives.

There are three key recommendations from this report. These are presented below, along with the next steps required for implementation.

1. For the service delivery aspect, including reviewing the safe and appropriate speeds, engagement with national stakeholders, bylaw drafting and consultation preparation, it is recommended that a shared service is developed. Three potential options have been identified for RTC consideration and further investigation through a business case process. These are: delivery by the Waikato LASS within the Regional Asset Technical Accord (RATA), an enhanced status quo with delivery in-house and centralised support, and delivery by the Waikato Regional Council. Any of these options can be implemented in the short term and should accelerate progress in speed limit reviews, decrease costs to individual TAs and increase regional consistency.

2. For the decision making, all the alternatives to the status quo would require a legal opinion to be provided regarding their validity before they can be considered for progressing to implementation planning. Any change would need to be made with a view to the likely future regulatory regime. The benefits of making a change would need to be substantial to outweigh the costs and drawbacks, given that the decision making process will likely change again within a two to three year period.

Transferring decision making power to the WRC or to a combination of the RTC and WRC would only be worthwhile in the short to medium term if a significant majority (or ideally all) TAs within the Waikato region were willing to transfer this power. As part of the RTC roadshow on the Regional Speed Management Plan, this option can be presented to each of the territorial authorities to understand the likely appetite for progressing these options. If agreement on a joint approach cannot be reached, individual TAs could consider shifting to a ‘speed limit setting by resolution’ approach, subject to receiving legal advice on the validity this approach.

3. Finally, this report has identified three different decision making models which could be implemented under a future regulatory regime which all provide a significant improvement over the status quo. They involve transferring the decision making power to the RTC, NZ Transport Agency or an independent body. WRC should promote a holistic review of the national speed management process including the development of national and regional speed management plans and decision making processes to be used when making speed limit changes.

It is recommended that the findings of this review are presented to the Ministry of Transport (MOT) to show the Region’s view of desired changes to the regulatory framework.
1. Introduction

Morrison Low and WSP Opus have been commissioned by the Waikato Regional Council (WRC) to investigate and report on the speed management institutional arrangement options which could be used in the Waikato region. This includes various institutional options to review, consult and make decisions on speed limit setting for state highways and local roads in the Waikato region.

Institutional arrangements refers to the entity or entities that are responsible for the delivery and decision making for speed limit setting. The entities considered in this report include the Territorial Authorities (TAs), in their capacity as Road Controlling Authorities (RCAs), the Waikato Regional Council (WRC), Waikato Regional Transport Committee (RTC), Waikato Local Authority Shared Services (Waikato LASS), and the New Zealand Transport Agency (Transport Agency/NZTA) in its role as an RCA or a regulatory authority.

Waikato has been chosen as one of three regions to accelerate work on speed management. The WRC is currently developing a Regional Speed Management Plan which includes a new regional speed management policy framework. The intent of this is to engage and consult on a regional level for the Regional Speed Management Plan, providing a clear framework for the TAs to implement specific speed limit changes. This will provide an improvement on the status quo whereby each TA is left to drive its own speed management process, however the RTC believes that there are opportunities to accelerate this work through changes to the institutional arrangements associated with speed limit setting.

1.1. Service delivery review process

This review has made use of Morrison Low’s Section 17A service delivery review process that has been used for the successful review of a range of local authority services and functions. This process is based on a collaborative approach with a wide range of stakeholders involved in interviews and a workshop.

The first task is to determine the objectives for any change to the current institutional arrangements. A longlist of potential delivery options is then considered, including options for service delivery, funding and governance. These are then assessed against the agreed objectives to identify which options are most likely to achieve the objectives. This produces a shortlist for more detailed consideration.

Additional options were identified by WRC post the workshop and have now been included in the option assessment.

1.2. Report structure and recommendations

This report firstly outlines the current state for speed limit setting in the Waikato region. It then considers the objectives for any change to the status quo and identifies possible options for change. The options for the service delivery and the decision making are then assessed and scored separately. Recommendations are then made for each.

This report provides recommendations under two scenarios:

- Firstly, options that can be fully implemented under the current regulatory framework and Speed Limit Setting Rule (‘the Rule’).¹

¹ Local Government Act (2002), Section 17A
² Land Transport Rule, Setting of Speed Limits 2018, Rule 54001/2017
• Secondly, options that could be implemented if the regulations change. The purpose of presenting these options is to assist WRC and the RTC to engage with the Ministry of Transport (MOT) about the preferred outcome of the regulatory change for the Waikato region and to enable the Waikato region to take steps to prepare itself for future regulatory change.

Finally, the next steps required to progress the recommended options are outlined. The list of individuals who have participated in stakeholder interviews and the workshop is presented in Appendix A. A glossary of terms and acronyms used in this report is presented in Appendix B.

2. Current state

The stakeholder interviews were used to understand and document the current state for speed limit setting in the Waikato region. The key findings are set out below. Note that not all Waikato TAs were involved in the interviews and that there are significant differences in speed limit setting progress between the individual TAs.

Both the TAs and the Transport Agency are RCAs and the term territorial authority is used throughout this report to refer to the RCAs who are territorial authorities only. The Transport Agency has a different speed limit setting process to the TAs.

2.1. Current state – speed limit setting

The NZ Transport Agency’s Speed Management Guide\(^3\) sets out a process for the review of safe and appropriate speeds as well as engagement with the community.

Progress towards reviewing the safe and appropriate speeds varies between the individual TAs. Some have been working on this for a number of years and have completed one, or in some cases two, bylaw reviews. None of the TAs interviewed considered that they had reached a goal of addressing the top 10% of roads that had the greatest potential for a reduction in death and serious injury crashes.

The Transport Agency has been involved in developing draft speed management maps for the whole region but has not yet progressed to the implementation stage. Once the Transport Agency does this, it will have a flow on effect for all TAs as the speed limits on local roads in close proximity to state highways will need to be reviewed. The Transport Agency is proposing a ‘catchment based’ approach which will require strong collaboration between the Transport Agency and the TAs to agree the safe and appropriate speeds and then implement changes either at, or close to, the same time.

The primary reasons cited for TAs not having started reviewing their local roads for the safe and appropriate speed are:

- Capacity issues within the roading/transportation team
- A lack of political interest in the process
- Delays in the Transport Agency review of speed limits for adjacent state highways (although progress is now being made in this space and the TAs will need to act to meet the Transport Agency programme).

The TAs who had progressed their speed limit bylaw reviews provided examples of ‘lessons learnt’ that would be useful to share with TAs who were still starting on this process. This included timing of engagement with stakeholders, and particularly the Transport Agency, and also consideration of other related bylaws such as the engine braking bylaw where reviews would be triggered by a review of the speed limit bylaw.

The estimated timeframe to have reviewed all roads within each district and to have made the necessary changes varied from three years to more than ten years. Beyond that point, assuming the regulatory framework remained unchanged, the workload associated with speed limit review would reduce so that only areas that had changed or changing characteristics such as land use or traffic movements would need review.

Anticipation of ongoing regulatory change in this area is high, based on future changes in vehicle technology, data and evidence on the impact of speeding on crash outcomes.

A number of the TAs were willing to share information on the cost to date to review the safe and appropriate speeds, go through the bylaw review process, and implement the physical works. The minimum cost for one ‘cycle’ of review was considered to be $100,000 excluding physical works and this could cost $250,000 including physical works. To complete the process for a whole district was estimated to be in the order of $1 million including physical works. It should be noted that these are high level estimates only as none of the TAs have completed this process. Hamilton City Council has a different approach to speed management as set out in Section 3.2 and considers its costs will be less than this.

Based on this estimate, to review all local roads in the Waikato region for the safe and appropriate speed in accordance with the Speed Management Guide, using the current process and institutional arrangements, could potentially be in the order of $10 million.

2.2. Speed limit setting progress

The progress of speed limit reviews varied amongst the TAs, however at a high level the figure below shows the general progress as described by the TAs interviewed. None of the TAs had addressed all their state highway catchments as this process needs to be completed in conjunction with the Transport Agency and is only now commencing. Even the TAs who have made the greatest progress in reviewing their roads are still in the early stages of the overall process.

The process and progress is different for Hamilton City Council (HCC) as it is using a different approach.

![Figure 1: Speed limit setting – typical steps taken to review all roads within each district](image-url)
2.3. Current state – interfaces

The speed limit review process involves a wide range of contributors and stakeholders. Key relationships are presented in the figure below. With a regional approach, the interface with external stakeholders is likely to be made more efficient and effective. However, the interface with internal stakeholders within the TAs may not have many efficiency gains as a centralised body will, for example, still have to liaise individually with each TA’s bylaw, communications and GIS teams.

Some of the smaller TAs do not have specific roles assigned in-house (e.g. legal, communications) meaning that external support needs to be provided in these areas.

Figure 2: Interfaces for the speed limit review process
2.4. Existing regional collaboration entities

The Waikato region has a number of well-established collaboration arrangements, as shown in Figure 3 below. The Waikato Local Authority Shared Services (WLASS) is a joint Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) owned by the twelve local authorities in the Waikato region. The majority of WLASS expenditure is on a user pays basis with an opt-in and opt-out mechanism. WLASS is governed by a Board comprising senior executives (predominantly CEOs) from the participating local authorities.

In the transport space, the Waikato Regional Asset Technical Accord (RATA) is a collaboration between nine Waikato TAs, with the support of the Transport Agency. It employs approximately 3.5 full time equivalent staff and is located in Waipa District Council (WDC) offices with overhead support provided by WDC. RATA’s current focus is on collecting timely, consistent data sets for asset management, establishing a regional pavement deterioration model to develop forward works programmes, and supporting councils to implement the One Network Road Classification (ONRC)\(^4\). RATA is one workstream within the Waikato LASS and is governed through the WLASS’ Board of Directors.

The Waikato Regional Transport Model (WRTM) is a separate initiative under WLASS which is managed by RATA. It provides strategic transport modelling resource and currently has six of the Waikato TAs as participating organisations as well as the Transport Agency as a 40% shareholder.

In addition, the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) is proactive in the speed management space and is currently developing a Regional Speed Management Plan. The RTC’s scope includes advocating for regional land transport strategic priorities including road safety, and it has the power to prepare and approve the Regional Road Safety Strategy. The RTC is comprised of elected members from the TAs and the WRC as well as a representative of the Transport Agency and the New Zealand Police (Police).

The RTC is supported by a Regional Advisory Group (RAG) comprised of technical (transport) representatives from WRC, each of the region’s TAs and the Transport Agency. This group provides advice to the RTC on regional land transport plan development and regional transport matters.

The RTC has also convened a Safe Network Programme Working Group to focus on road safety issues. The purpose of the working group is to provide leadership and insight to support the implementation of activities that deliver the Safe Network Programme within the Waikato region. The group oversees the development of the Regional Speed Management Plan for recommendation to the RTC.

The Police are involved in the speed limit setting process, providing input and data to the TAs as part of the speed limit reviews and as a group that must be formally consulted with under the Rule. A Police representative sits on the Regional Transport Committee as a non-voting advisor and there is Police representation on the Safe Network Programme Working Group.

\(^4\) http://waikatolass.co.nz/shared-services/waikato-road-asset-technical-accord-rata/
Figure 3: Waikato roading – entities and collaboration groups
3. Legal framework

Speed limit setting is guided by a number of pieces of legislation including the Local Government Act (2002) and the Land Transport Act (1998), as well as the Setting of Speed Limits Rule (2017) (‘Rule’). This requires an RCA to make a Speed Limit Bylaw to set the speed limit for its local roads.

At a regional and local level, it is currently optional to produce a speed management plan or speed management policy although in the Waikato region it is recognised as an implementation measure in the 2018 update to the 2015 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP), which has been endorsed by the RTC. The RTC is currently in the process of developing a Regional Speed Management Plan for the Waikato region.

The New Zealand Speed Management Guide provides tools and guidance for RCAs to use when setting speed limits.

The current regulatory framework is summarised in Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>• Land Transport Rule Setting of Speed Limits 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Zealand Speed Management Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>• Regional Speed Management Plan (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (RCA)</td>
<td>• Local Speed Limits Bylaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Speed Management Plan (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Speed Management Policy (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Current regulatory framework

There are different interpretations of the Rule by different TAs in the region. This is partly based on conflicting legal advice received by the TAs regarding the ability to transfer and delegate the speed limit setting process. If the Waikato region looks to implement a new approach, based on delegation of the speed limit setting process, specific legal advice will need to be sought.

The different approaches are set out in the sections below.

3.1. Standard speed limit setting by bylaw approach

The standard approach to set each individual speed limit (as set out in the Rule) is to make an amendment to the TA’s Speed Limit Bylaw. This approach is used by the majority of the TAs in New Zealand including all the TAs in the Waikato except Hamilton City Council (HCC). HCC also has a Speed Limit Bylaw, but its approach to the setting of individual speed limits is different, as set out in Section 3.2 below.

The consultation and decision making requirements are set out in the Rule and the Local Government Act. The Rule requires consultation with a specific list of persons and groups prior to setting a new speed limit. The Local Government Act requires a Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) to be carried out prior to making or amending a bylaw if:

(i) “the bylaw concerns a matter identified in the local authority’s policy under section 76AA as being of significant interest to the public; or,

(ii) the local authority considers that there is, or is likely to be, a significant impact on the public due
to the proposed bylaw or changes to, or revocation of, the bylaw.”

This generally requires an SCP to be used for changes to speed limit bylaws.

This process, as set out in the Rule, is shown in Figure 5 below.

![Figure 5: Speed Limit Bylaw making process](image)

### 3.2. Hamilton City Council ‘speed limit setting by resolution’ approach

HCC has recently adopted a new Speed Limit Bylaw (2018) which allows the Council to amend speed limits by resolution without amending its Speed Limit Bylaw. This is achieved by putting individual speed limits in a register to the bylaw, which can then be changed by resolution of Council.

There are differing legal opinions about the legality of this approach. It has been adopted by other TAs including Wellington City Council and Tauranga City Council. Auckland Transport was also an early adopter of this approach, however it has now stopped using this process following internal legal advice.

Any TAs considering the use of this approach would need to commission their own legal opinion on this.

HCC’s report to Council on the proposed bylaw change noted that: “this will provide Council with the ability to respond more efficiently and quickly to speed limit change requests to improve safety on the roads”.

To enable this approach, HCC has developed a Hamilton Speed Management Plan showing the safe and appropriate speed for all local roads and state highways in the City (refer to Figure 6 below). HCC is in the process of formally consulting with the community on this Speed Management Plan.

---

5 Local Government Act (2002), Section 156 (1)(a)

6 This figure has been reproduced from a Hamilton City Council report

7 “Deliberation and Adoption of the Hamilton City Speed Limit Bylaw 2018”, Report to Hamilton City Council, 06 September 2018
3.2.1. Consultation requirements

Under Hamilton City Council’s approach, a full Special Consultative Procedure is required when the Bylaw is made and the Speed Management Plan is developed but not when individual speed limits are changed. This process does not change the consultation requirements set out under the Rule, which still need to be followed and includes consultation with ‘any local communities that the road controlling authority considers to be affected by the proposed speed limit’.

HCC’s approach to community consultation at the point of changing an individual speed limit is to notify the affected part of the community (for residential streets this may be limited to residents on the street, for arterial routes would require a broader approach) and provide them the opportunity to submit feedback and/or to speak at the Committee meeting. This approach significantly reduces the lead-time and cost associated with making individual and area-wide speed limit changes.

The revised process is set out in the figure below, showing that the engagement and problem definition only need to be carried out once for the development of the Speed Management Plan.

---

8 HCC, Draft Speed Management Plan, released for public consultation 2 April 2019
9 Land Transport Rule, Setting of Speed Limits 2018, Rule 54001/2017
The streamlined process is estimated to be several months faster than the traditional process.

3.2.2. Delegation to committee

In HCC’s approach, because the registers are being changed when setting individual speed limits, rather than the Bylaw itself, this allows HCC to delegate this power to the Regulatory and Hearings Committee, rather than the full Council. Figure 8 illustrates the structure used by HCC.

Figure 8: Hamilton City Council Speed Limit Bylaw general approach

---

10 This figure has been reproduced from a Hamilton City Council report
3.3. **MOT’s proposed regulatory changes**

MOT is currently considering a new regulatory framework under its ‘Tackling Unsafe Speeds Programme’. This will require development of a national speed management plan as well as regional speed management plans incorporating both local roads and state highways. Initial communications from MOT suggest that this could include removal of the bylaw process, some changes to the current consultation approach and promotion of a regional approach. The primary vehicle for community consultation and engagement would be the regional speed management plan and the decision makers for this would be the Regional Council, followed by approval by the Transport Agency. Implementation and roll out of speed limit changes in accordance with the plan would still be delivered individually by RCAs.

These changes will need to go through the central government legislative process and may take two or more years to implement.

Feedback from the Waikato region to MOT has stated that the proposed process does not appear to reduce the speed limit setting workload or the number of documents and plans. It creates a three-tier approach with a national and regional speed management plan required, but with consultation and decision making still at a local RCA level. The proposed regulatory framework is summarised in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Transport Rule Setting of Speed Limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Zealand Speed Management Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Speed Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional Speed Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (RCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Speed Limits decision making instrument (TBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Speed Management Plan (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Speed Management Policy (optional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9: Proposed regulatory framework**
4. Objectives

The participants in the challenge workshop\textsuperscript{11} held at Waipa District Council on 29 March 2019 agreed that the following objectives should be used to evaluate potential changes to the speed limit setting institutional arrangements.

The primary objective of any change is to achieve better speed management outcomes. This is interpreted to mean that it:

1. Improves consistency of speed limit setting across region
2. Accelerates progress in reviewing speed limits across region
3. Provides greater access to speed limit setting expertise
4. Enables higher level engagement with local stakeholders
5. Enables higher level engagement with regional/national stakeholders
6. Improves the cost effectiveness of the speed limit setting process
7. Delivers the One Network approach (including state highways, local roads and across boundaries for both)
8. Streamlines consultation process and requirements
9. Accommodates opt-in/opt-out choices for individual TAs
10. Able to be implemented within the legal framework
11. Encourages evidence-based decision making (for assessing decision making options only)

There was discussion about whether accommodating opt-in/opt-out choices for individual TAs (objective 9) should be included. However, it was decided to retain this so that one individual TA could not hold back progress for the rest of the region in the short term. In the medium term the objective would be to include all Waikato TAs as well as the Transport Agency.

When looking at objective 10, options that can be implemented in the short term have been assessed based on whether they can be implemented within the current legal framework. The options that could be possible under future legislative change have been assumed to be possible under future legislation for that scenario.

\textsuperscript{11} Refer to Appendix A for a list of workshop participants
5. Option identification

5.1. Overview

Section 17A of the Local Government Act sets out a range of service delivery options to be considered for the governance, funding, and delivery of infrastructure, services, and regulatory functions, as follows:

(a) responsibility for governance, funding, and delivery is exercised by the local authority

(b) responsibility for governance and funding is exercised by the local authority, and responsibility for delivery is exercised by—
   (i) a council-controlled organisation of the local authority; or
   (ii) a council-controlled organisation in which the local authority is one of several shareholders; or
   (iii) another local authority; or
   (iv) another person or agency

(c) responsibility for governance and funding is delegated to a joint committee or other shared governance arrangement, and responsibility for delivery is exercised by an entity or a person listed in paragraph (b)(i) to (iv)."^{12}

This review is not a formal Section 17A review, however it sets out a useful range of options for consideration.

As this review is being undertaken from the regional perspective, arrangements that may be implemented individually by each council, such as a council-controlled organisation owned by one local authority, are not considered.

Similarly, delivery by the private sector is not considered, although there may be elements that are outsourced to the private sector via professional services and physical works contracts.

Generally, the best outcomes are achieved by aligning the delivery and decision making structure so that all aspects are delivered either independently or jointly. However due to the restrictions in place under the current Rule, this report also considers options that include shared service delivery and individual decision making.

^{12} Local Government Act (2002) S17A (4)
5.2. Options for shared service

There are a number of different ‘break points’ between individual and joint delivery.

The options set out below represent a number of these. As discussed above, including more of the process as a shared service makes it more efficient and effective to engage with external stakeholders. However, the internal touch points become more complicated when there is shared service delivery and individual decision making.

![Figure 10: Split between individual and shared services](image)

Workshop participants noted that there was an additional implementation step after the decision making and suggested that this could be efficiently delivered through a shared service or a joint contract. While the implementation is outside the scope of this report, this should be considered as part of any of the overall changes to the status quo.

![Figure 11: Approach used in this report to consider shared and joint service delivery and decision making options](image)
6. Assessment of service delivery options

6.1. Possible models – service delivery

The following service delivery options have been considered and are scored in Section 6.8. These options focus on the first three steps in Figure 10 which collectively form the service delivery element.

Options associated with the decision making steps are considered in Section 7: Assessment of decision making options under current Rule.

- Separate service delivery:
  - Status quo: delivery in-house
  - Enhanced status quo: delivery in-house with centralised support

- Shared service delivery:
  - Delivery by Joint Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) (WLASS – RATA)
  - Delivery by Joint CCO (WLASS – new workstream)
  - Delivery by another Local Authority (WRC)
  - Delivery by another agency (Transport Agency).

6.2. Status quo: delivery in-house

This would continue the current approach and would continue with the current issues regarding inconsistencies and uneven progress between TAs. This is not likely to result in the Waikato region addressing the top 10% high benefit opportunities to reduce deaths and serious injuries on its roads within a reasonable time period.

6.3. Enhanced status quo: delivery in-house with centralised support

This option is based on draft proposals for supporting the Regional Speed Management Plan (RSMP), with the WRC or the Safe Network Programme Working Group (S NPWG) working to:

- Establish an online ‘infohub’ of speed limit setting documents including:
  - Model speed limit bylaw template
  - Model Statement of Proposal (SOP)
  - Model reports to Council
  - Step by step process for changing speed limits
  - Process of changing speeds by Council resolution
  - Best practice examples
  - Model Speed Management Plan

- Co-ordinate a ‘flying squad’ of experts to assist RCAs in the region in preparing speed limit changes

- Co-ordinate a series of roadshows to all councils in the region to present on good practice process for setting speed limits

- Prepare a regional engagement plan outlining how the region will engage with stakeholders
• Prepare a model good practice document for RCAs to follow when undertaking community engagement
• Develop a Communications Plan containing:
  − Consistent regional good practice messaging for communicating speed limit changes to communities
  − Best practice process for early engagement with stakeholders and communities
  − Visual, mapping and associated tools and material forming part of communications strategy.

This option will reduce cost and increase consistency of outcomes for TAs. It would not generate any new overhead or governance costs to TAs. There would be costs associated with the ‘flying squad’ members and the cost recovery mechanism would need to be determined for TAs who were providing resources to allow them to back-fill their business as usual roles. This approach was trialled when RATA was first established and it proved difficult to provide appropriate resourcing to back-fill roles, resulting in the TAs being reluctant to provide resources.

The funding mechanism would need to be agreed with either a ‘fee for use’ or funded centrally through the WRC. The costs to WRC or the SNPWG to implement this option have not been determined. It is anticipated that there would be a moderate package of upfront work to develop the infohub of documents, templates and communications examples. It is difficult to estimate the costs associated with this, but it could cost in the order of $100,000 to $500,000 depending on the extent and complexity of the documents and the level of consultation with the participating TAs. In addition to WRC and/or SNPWG time, there would also be internal officer time costs for the TAs to engage with this process and provide feedback.

It would be expected that these costs would be rapidly offset through the increased efficiencies as the individual TAs work through the speed limit review process.

Any centralised system that relies on IT changes would be an additional cost and would depend on:
  • the current level of commonality of IT platforms across the councils
  • whether it would interface with the Transport Agency’s systems
  • the extent to which it was just an enhancement of the status quo versus a new platform.

This option would improve the status quo and is recommended if a more formal collaboration option is not agreed. It would smooth the way for TAs to start reviewing speed limits but does not provide a formal mandate and therefore implementation progress is still likely to be driven by local political priorities, RCA capacity and Transport Agency progress in rolling out state highway changes in each TA area.

It is recommended that this option is taken forward for RTC consideration as a potential service delivery option to be assessed as part of a future business case for change.

6.4. Delivery by Joint CCO: Waikato LASS - RATA

This option would create a new regional speed management team within the existing Regional Asset Technical Accord (RATA) for speed limit setting. It would need to be a new cost centre within RATA to allow individual RCAs and the Transport Agency to opt-in or opt-out, and to provide funding accordingly.

RATA is a well-established and respected part of the technical delivery of roading solutions in the Waikato region. The flexible opt-in/opt-out approach with different cost centres for different workstreams has allowed RATA to deliver services to participating TAs. Governance and management structures are already in place and it is not envisaged that these would need to increase as a result of hosting a regional speed
management team. RATA has a relationship with the Transport Agency through Transport Agency membership of the RATA Advisory Group which oversees the work of RATA on behalf of the WLASS Board.

RATA has recently taken on a speed management role with the responsibility for facilitating the Waikato region’s uptake of the National Speed Limit Register.

The main difficulty with any formalised shared service is managing the interface with stakeholders within the individual TAs – for example the bylaw, legal and communications teams. The extent of services to be provided through the shared service versus individually by the TAs would need to be considered so that the shared service was only doing activities that were more efficient to do centrally versus locally.

The other challenge would be to determine the prioritisation of activities as the speed limit review process would have to gradually work its way around the region over a period of several years. Without an agreed prioritisation process this could be considered inequitable by participating RCAs and communities and not responsive to their specific needs.

The costs to operate the regional speed management team would depend on:

- The number of participating TAs
- The extent of work to be transferred (technical, engagement, communications etc)
- The target timeframe to review the top 10% priority roads and then all roads in the participating districts.

In particular the target timeframe will be critical for determining resource requirements and could result in a smaller, permanent workforce or a larger workforce with some individuals on short-term contracts or provided through consultancy services. It is possible that approximately 3-5 full-time equivalent staff would be required in the short term if a review was to be made of the whole region in a reasonable time frame. Speed management team costs could be in the same order of magnitude as current RATA costs.

The following skill sets will need to be covered (noting some individuals may bring more than one skill set to the team):

- Transportation safety engineering
- GIS/mapping skills
- Communications
- Bylaw/policy skills.

It is recommended that this option is taken forward for RTC consideration as a potential service delivery option to be assessed as part of a future business case for change.
6.5. **Delivery by Joint CCO: Waikato LASS – new workstream**

If it was not possible to host the regional speed management team within RATA, it could be set up as a new workstream within the Waikato LASS. However, this will be less cost-effective than RATA as there will not be the same opportunity to share management and administrative costs.

This option would still provide an improvement on the status quo however is only recommended for further consideration if RATA is not an option.

6.6. **Delivery by another Local Authority: Waikato Regional Council**

The individual TAs could contract WRC to provide the technical service delivery support associated with speed limit setting.

WRC is not a road controlling authority and although it has a role in regional transportation through the development of the Regional Land Transport Plan, it does not participate directly in any of the RCA functions and would need to establish and scale up its internal technical capability to review and recommend speed limits. Once it had done so, this option would provide access to greater regional expertise as each individual TA would not need to learn the process of speed limit setting. This would result in greater consistency across the region.

This option could be relatively cost-efficient as there would be no new governance costs and minimal management costs. Participating TAs could be invoiced based on actual expenditure.

The RCAs would not have any input into the governance of this delivery in the way that they do through the Waikato LASS Board of Directors. The Transport Agency involvement would be more difficult than under the RATA model where there is the precedent for local road and state highway collaboration.

The workshop participants were generally of the view that this would be seen by both officers and elected members as a less attractive option than RATA.

It is recommended that this option is taken forward for RTC consideration as a potential service delivery option to be assessed as part of a future business case for change.

6.7. **Delivery by another agency: NZ Transport Agency**

The service delivery could also be outsourced to the Transport Agency. This would provide the best outcome in terms of regional consistency across boundaries and between the state highway network and the local roads.

However, there is not a clear service delivery or funding mechanism for this to happen. It would require the Transport Agency to significantly scale up its existing resources, which may mean that it does not result in faster progress for speed limit review. The Transport Agency may decide not to offer this service to any one TA without being able to offer it throughout the country, which would delay the implementation.

If the ability to transfer decision making was shifted to the Transport Agency in future, it would be efficient to also have the service delivery sitting with the same entity. However, with local or regional decision making (as required under the current Rule), national service delivery is unlikely to be the most efficient option.

It is not recommended that this option be taken forward for RTC consideration.
### 6.8. Option assessment

The results of the assessment against the stated objectives is shown below. The scoring was moderated by Morrison Low, WSP Opus, and WRC. Both of the Waikato LASS options (RATA or a new workstream) have been considered as one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment against options</th>
<th>Service delivery options</th>
<th>Status Quo: by own Council</th>
<th>Enhanced Status Quo: centralised support</th>
<th>WRC</th>
<th>Waikato LASS</th>
<th>NZTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves consistency of speed limit setting across region</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerates progress in reviewing speed limits across region</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides greater access to speed limit setting expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables higher level engagement with local stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables higher level engagement with regional/national stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the cost effectiveness of the speed limit setting process</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers the One Network approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlines consultation process and requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates opt-in/opt-out choices for individual RCAs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to be implemented within the legal framework</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- 4-5: High level of benefit
- 3: Medium level of benefit
- 1-2: Low level of benefit
6.9. **Recommendations**

Based on both the qualitative analysis (through the stakeholder interviews and workshop) and the scoring exercise, the preferred options for further investigation are:

- Delivery by Joint CCO: part of the Waikato LASS within RATA
- The enhanced status quo: delivery in-house with centralised support
- Delivery by another Local Authority: Waikato Regional Council.

Issues still to be considered include:

- Specific tasks that would be carried out by the new service delivery entity
- Establishment costs, particularly if IT elements are involved
- Operational structure and reporting mechanisms
- Governance arrangements
- Operational costs
- Funding mechanism from TAs
- Funding avenues from the Transport Agency
- Opt-in/opt-out mechanism if appropriate
- Whether the shared service would include state highways and how the local road/state highway interface will be dealt with to support the Safe Network Programme
- Indicative commitments to participate from a number of TAs.

The costs and benefits of these options should be considered against the status quo through the development of a business case.
7. Assessment of decision making options under current Rule

As well as institutional arrangements for the service delivery, WRC also wishes to assess what institutional arrangements for decision making could be used to improve the current process.

The current Rule states that an RCA must set a speed limit by making a bylaw. The general ability to transfer bylaw making powers is provided for under Section 161 and Section 17 of the LGA. A legal opinion on whether it is possible to transfer the ability to make a speed limit bylaw would be required.

It is assumed that joint decision making would only be implemented if there was also a shared service for the service delivery element.

7.1. Possible models – decision making

The possible decision making models that have been considered are as follows:

- Separate decision making:
  - Status quo: own Council via new bylaw
  - Enhanced status quo: own Council via resolution

- Joint decision making:
  - Transfer bylaw making power to WRC
  - Transfer bylaw making power to WRC with speed limit changes made by RTC.

7.2. Status quo: own Council via new bylaw

Making a new bylaw for all speed limit changes is the status quo decision making process for all the territorial authorities in the region except Hamilton City Council. This generally requires the TAs to go through a full Special Consultative Procedure (SCP) including developing a Statement of Proposal and holding hearings as well as fulfilling the consultation requirements of the Rule.

The time to complete, cost, and time demands on Council have all been cited by some TAs as being the reason they have not made significant progress on the speed limit review process. This process is not suited to making a small number of changes, due to the high costs, and is not suited to making too many changes, due to the magnitude of submissions and the time associated with hearings. Most of the TAs who had progressed speed limit bylaw reviews had selected a moderate portion of their network to focus on in each bylaw review. This means that speed limit reviews will continue to occupy officer and decision maker time over an extended period.

7.3. Enhanced status quo: own Council via resolution

This option follows the process currently in place at Hamilton City Council whereby speed limits are held in registers to the Speed Limit Bylaw and can be changed by resolution of the Council (or a nominated committee) without the need to amend the Bylaw or go through a Special Consultative Procedure.

As mentioned in Section 3.2, a legal opinion on this option would need to be sought before progressing further with implementation.

HCC’s approach is set out in Section 3.2 and provides significant efficiencies over the status quo. The new
Speed Limit Bylaw could either be supported by a speed management plan or by a set of speed management principles.

HCC has chosen to support this approach by adopting a detailed Speed Management Plan, including a map that sets out the safe and appropriate speeds on all local roads within its boundaries. Following this approach would be more difficult and time-consuming for the other TAs in the region due to the extent of their network and the interfaces with the state highway network on both urban and rural roads. The TAs would need to review the safe and appropriate speeds for all of their network as part of the Speed Management Plan and then consult with the community on changes to the whole network at once.

The alternative is to adopt a Speed Management Plan that contains the principles for speed limit setting on each district’s roads. The technical work to progress this would be less onerous and the consultation would be more straightforward as feedback on each individual change would not be required.

Under either approach, actual changes to speed limits which were within the general principles, or in line with the district wide safe and appropriate speed map, would not need a Special Consultative Procedure and would only have to follow the consultation requirements of the Rule. Changes that were not within the general principles would still require more formal consultation.

The technical work, engagement, Speed Management Plan development, bylaw drafting, and consultation preparation associated with this option could be outsourced to a regional speed management team in the Waikato LASS (either RATA or as a new workstream) as set out in Sections 6.4 and 6.5 above.

This option, subject to a legal opinion regarding its validity and proper implementation, would streamline the decision making process. It is a good approach for councils who are actively seeking to review and set the speed limits in their district. However, the initial work required to implement this option would be relatively significant and this may not be a suitable option for all districts in the region.

It is recommended that this option is taken forward for RTC consideration as a potential decision making option, subject to a legal opinion, feedback and indicative interest from the TAs.

7.4. Transfer bylaw making power to WRC

Under the current legislation, the only way to have a regional approach is to transfer the bylaw making process from a district to a regional council in accordance with Section 161 of the LGA. A legal opinion on whether this is allowed for under the provisions of Section 17 of the LGA would be required.

If this was possible, it would be more efficient than the status quo. Ideally, all the TAs in the region would need to voluntarily opt-in, or at the least a significant majority. There is no central mandate for the TAs to transfer this power and they would need to choose to do so on the basis of being able to see that it would provide better outcomes at a lower cost than the current model.

It would be challenging for WRC to be deciding speed limits for some parts of its region and not others. There would be issues regarding funding and equity for non-participating districts and a targeted rate or direct charge back mechanism to cover the speed limit setting costs may need to be considered.

The Regional Council’s role in transportation is presently limited to approving the regional land transport plans and assessing the programme against the Government Policy Statement (GPS) on Land Transport (2018). Speed limit setting would be outside the existing skill set of both officers and Councillors.

The benefits would be a reduction in the number of decision making bodies, from 10 (or 11 if Rotorua Lakes Council was included) down to one. This would provide for more consistent speed limit setting across the
local roads in the region. There would likely be a constant cycle of speed limit changes across the region and, over time, the decision makers would become more familiar with the process and the benefits associated with speed limit changes.

By looking across a broader area, the Regional Councillors would be more likely to focus on high level principles than delve into detail of specific sites. This could be considered either a positive or negative feature as political drivers may be less likely to dictate results, however there would be less local knowledge used in the decision making process. It would be more difficult for submitters to be heard in person by decision makers and the time taken to listen to submissions from across the whole region may be too high given that speed limit setting is not a core function of the Regional Council.

It is not considered practicable to include the state highways under this model as there is no Transport Agency representation on the Regional Council.

It is recommended that this option is taken forward for RTC consideration as a potential decision making option once the proposed regulatory framework has become clearer, subject to a legal opinion, feedback and indicative interest from the TAs.

7.5. **Transfer bylaw making power to WRC with speed limit changes made by RTC**

The ability to make bylaws cannot be delegated to a committee in accordance with Section 161 (4) of the Local Government Act.

However, it may be possible to transfer some of the decision making power to the Regional Transport Committee. This would still require WRC to make the speed limit bylaw, but the work required to develop the bylaw, including the hearings process, could be delegated to the RTC. The bylaw could potentially include a provision for changes to the bylaw registers by resolution of the RTC. The power to make these resolutions could then be delegated to the RTC, as shown in the figure below.

This option is based on the existing HCC model and the RLTP process and would need to be subject to specific legal advice.

Even if this approach is possible under legislation, there is still a key risk associated with having two tiers of decision makers. The WRC would remain the decision maker for the bylaw and could choose not to make the bylaw as drafted by the RTC. Section 18B of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 provides a mechanism for the Transport Agency to provide a final decision in the event of the RTC and the Regional Council not being able to agree on one or more aspects of the Regional Land Transport Plan. There would be no such safeguard for a Speed Limit Bylaw.
This option would reduce the number of decision making bodies from 10 down to two (WRC and RTC). The RTC already has a road safety mandate and is involved in developing the Regional Speed Management Plan. Across the region, there would likely be a constant cycle of speed limit changes, allowing the RTC members to develop understanding and expertise. As the RTC also includes Transport Agency representatives, it would promote closer alignment with Transport Agency speed limit setting priorities and activities. As the RTC is responsible for a larger area than just one district, members are more likely to focus on high level principles than details of each individual proposed change.

This option also has the drawbacks associated with the WRC decision making model, namely that:

- All, or at least a significant majority of, TAs would need to voluntarily participate
- If only some TAs were participating there would be issues associated with funding and equity
- There would be a significant additional workload for the RTC members, on top of existing RTC and Council commitments
- It would be more difficult for submitters to be heard in person for specific speed limit changes
- There would be a reduction in the local knowledge utilised as part of the decision making process.

It is recommended that this option is taken forward for RTC consideration as a potential decision making option once the proposed regulatory framework has become clearer, subject to a legal opinion, feedback and indicative interest from the TAs.

### 7.5.1. Other Joint Committee options

It would not be recommended to transfer powers to a Joint Committee other than the RTC. Although the RTC is not the preferred option, it is still preferable to a new Joint Committee. The RTC is established under legislation, already has a safety mandate, and membership includes both local and regional Councillors, Transport Agency appointees and Police.

It is not recommended that this option be taken forward for RTC consideration.
### 7.6. Option assessment

The results of the assessment against the stated objectives is shown below. The scoring was moderated by Morrison Low, WSP Opus and WRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment against criteria</th>
<th>Decision making options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status Quo: Own Council by bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves consistency of speed limit setting across region</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerates progress in reviewing speed limits across region</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides greater access to speed limit setting expertise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables higher level engagement with local stakeholders</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables higher level engagement with regional/national stakeholders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the cost effectiveness of the speed limit setting process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers the One Network approach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlines consultation process and requirements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates opt-in/opt-out choices for individual RCAs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to be implemented within the legal framework</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages evidence based decision making</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- 4-5: High level of benefit
- 3: Medium level of benefit
- 1-2: Low level of benefit

Scoring for decision-making that could be enabled through legislative change is included in Section 8.4 of this report.
7.7. **Recommendation**

The scoring exercise shows that all three options for decision making change provide significant benefits over the status quo. All the alternatives to the status quo would require a legal opinion to confirm their validity prior to progressing to implementation planning.

Any change would need to be made with a view to the likely future regulatory regime. The benefits of making a change would need to be substantial to outweigh the costs and drawbacks, given that the decision making process will likely change again within a two to three year period.

Transferring decision making power to the WRC or to a combination of the RTC and WRC would only be worthwhile in the short to medium term if a significant majority (or ideally all) TAs within the Waikato region were willing to transfer this power. In the long run, it is likely these options may provide greater benefits and, as soon as the future regulatory framework becomes clearer, progressing with the likely future option would allow the Waikato region to start to realise these.

If agreement on a joint approach cannot be reached prior to the regulatory change, individual TAs could consider shifting to a ‘speed limit setting by resolution’ approach. Moving to decision making by resolution can be implemented in a short time frame by individual TAs and does not require a consensus regarding the way forward. It does however require a legal opinion to test its validity.
8. Assessment of decision making options under future legislative change

This section sets out additional decision making options that could be implemented under a new regulatory regime. The purpose of presenting these options is firstly to assist WRC and the RTC to engage with MOT about the Waikato region’s preferred outcome of the regulatory change. Secondly, it is to enable the Waikato region to be prepared for any future regulatory change and potentially move to the future model in advance of the legislation being enacted.

The possible decision making models that have been considered are as follows:

- WRC
- RTC
- Transport Agency
- Independent commissioners similar to a District Licensing Committee

8.1. WRC

The current MOT proposal envisages the Regional Council as the primary decision maker for speed limit setting within each region. The Regional Council would be able to have a much stronger role as the decision maker empowered under legislation, than it would under any short-term transfer of speed limit setting powers from the TAs.

If the MOT proposals advance to a more detailed stage and the regional councils are still envisaged to be the decision makers, then the Waikato region could prepare for this by the TAs voluntarily transferring the decision making power to the Waikato Regional Council. This would allow the Waikato region to benefit from the future legislation even before it was enacted. However, there would be a risk that the proposed legislation was subsequently amended or was not passed with this approach.

8.2. Regional Transport Committee

This option is different to Option 7.5 above which involves two tiers of decision makers as the power to make all decisions related to speed limit changes would be transferred to the RTC. This is a substantial improvement on Option 7.5 as it only involves one decision making body.

WRC could potentially also be involved in this option with the same limited decision making powers that it has for the Regional Land Transport Plan.

The issues associated with distance to submitters and the workload associated with speed limit setting for the whole region would remain, however these could be mitigated through other aspects of the regulatory change.

This option would provide a better outcome than all decision making by the Regional Council alone. By aligning the speed management plan process and the Regional Land Transport Plan process, the roles and responsibilities of each set of decision makers would be clear. Stakeholders and the community would be able to engage with this process in the same way that they currently engage with the regional land transport planning process.

This would not represent a significant change to the current MOT proposal and would be a positive enhancement that the Waikato region could advocate for.
8.3. Transport Agency

This is similar to the decision making process prior to 2003 when decision making power was transferred to the RCAs. The Transport Agency would be responsible for making decisions on all local roads and state highways. If delivered through the Transport Agency’s national office it would provide national consistency and would de-politicise the decision making.

While there are national and regional consistency advantages with the Transport Agency providing speed limit setting service delivery, it is likely that this would result in reduced local level political influence and may result in amended consultation criteria that do not require the same level of local consultation as under the existing process. This may result in the Transport Agency not being the preferred option at either the local or national level.

The current MOT proposal involves the Transport Agency having final decision making power over the speed management plans put forward by the regional councils. This is presumably to balance local decision making with a centralised approval process to provide national consistency.

This option could only be implemented through legislative change for the whole country.

8.4. Independent body

Any change to the legislation could also contemplate the opportunity to transfer decision making to an independent decision making body similar to a District Licensing Committee. This could be done on a district or regional level.

People with specific skills could be recruited to form this body, providing better access to technical expertise. There would also be the possibility of decision making for the state highways speed limits to be included within this body’s mandate.

There would be additional costs associated with this approach as the decision makers would need to be selected, receive some training, and be remunerated for their time. This would add another set of decision makers to the road transport area, on top of the TAs, regional councils, RTCs and the Transport Agency. This may not be a popular approach with the public as the decision makers would not be elected and therefore would have less incentive to be responsive to community views.

It could include an opt-in/opt-out approach however is less likely to result in consistency across the region or country.
### 8.5. Option assessment

The results of the assessment are shown below, as moderated by Morrison Low, WSP Opus, and WRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment against criteria</th>
<th>Decision making options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under future legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves consistency of speed limit setting across region</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerates progress in reviewing speed limits across region</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides greater access to speed limit setting expertise</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables higher level engagement with local stakeholders</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enables higher level engagement with regional/national stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves the cost effectiveness of the speed limit setting process</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers the One Network approach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlines consultation process and requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodates opt-in/opt-out choices for individual RCAs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to be implemented within the legal framework</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages evidence based decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

4-5: High level of benefit  
3: Medium level of benefit  
1-2: Low level of benefit

*Note this option assessment is based on future legislative change and therefore all options are assumed to be able to be implemented within a future legal framework.
8.6. Recommendation

All four of the additional decision making options presented in this section (WRC, RTC, NZTA and an independent body) score significantly higher than the options available under the current legislation. It would be beneficial to consider a change to decision making arrangements as part of the MOT’s review of the legislation. A request for this to be included in the legislative review should form part of the Waikato region’s engagement with MOT.

Based on this high level assessment, none of the four ‘future’ options scores significantly higher than the others and each have different benefits and drawbacks. If MOT was to consider changes to the decision making part of the legislation, it would need to investigate all of these options in more detail, taking into account the national context, constraints and drivers as well as those of the Waikato region.

9. Recommendations

There are three key recommendations from this report.

1. For the service delivery aspect, including reviewing the safe and appropriate speeds, engagement with national stakeholders, bylaw drafting and consultation preparation, it is recommended that a shared service is developed. Three potential options have been identified for RTC consideration and further investigation through a business case process. These are: delivery by the Waikato LASS within RATA, an enhanced status quo with delivery in-house and centralised support, and delivery by the Waikato Regional Council. Any of these options can be implemented in the short term and will accelerate progress in speed limit reviews, decrease costs to individual TAs and increase regional consistency.

2. For the decision making, all the alternatives to the status quo would require a legal opinion prior to progressing to implementation planning. Any change would need to be made with a view to the likely future regulatory regime. The benefits of making a change would need to be substantial to outweigh the costs and drawbacks, given that the decision making process will likely change again within a two to three year period.

Transferring decision making power to the WRC or to a combination of the RTC and WRC would only be worthwhile in the short to medium term if a significant majority (or ideally all) TAs within the Waikato region were willing to transfer this power. If agreement on a joint approach cannot be reached, individual TAs could consider shifting to a ‘speed limit setting by resolution’ approach, subject to receiving legal advice on the validity of this approach.

3. Finally, it is recommended that WRC continues to engage with MOT regarding proposed national speed management process changes. This report has identified four decision making models which provide a significant improvement over the status quo. WRC should promote a holistic review of the national speed management process including the development of national and regional speed management plans and decision making processes to be used when making speed limit changes.
10. Next steps

10.1. Business case for a regional speed management shared service

A business case is recommended to further investigate and document the case for a regional speed management shared service.

The three short-listed options for consideration in the business case are:

- Delivery by Joint CCO: part of the Waikato LASS within RATA
- The enhanced status quo: delivery in-house with centralised support
- Delivery by another Local Authority: Waikato Regional Council.

The business case will need to provide details on the:

- Specific tasks that would be carried out as a shared service
- Establishment costs, particularly if IT elements are involved
- Operational structure and reporting mechanisms
- Governance arrangements
- Operational costs
- Funding mechanism from TAs
- Funding avenues from the Transport Agency
- Opt-in/opt-out mechanism if appropriate
- Whether the shared service would include state highways and how the local road/state highway interface will be dealt with to support the Safe Network Programme
- Indicative commitments to participate from a number of TAs.

This business case would need to be approved by the RTC as well as other stakeholders depending on the preferred option.

The interface with the wider speed management programme of work will also need to be considered and it may be possible to include other speed management workstreams within a wider Business Case.

10.2. Investigate speed limit setting by resolution and transfer of decision making power

A legal opinion should firstly be commissioned on the possibilities available to transfer and delegate the speed limit setting power. All of the options assessed for decision making (other than the status quo) would need a legal opinion to confirm their legality prior to further investigating the implementation.

As part of the RTC roadshow on the Regional Speed Management Plan, these options can be presented to each of the territorial authorities to understand the likely appetite for changes to the decision making process. If there is sufficient interest, this could be incorporated into the shared service business case.
10.3. Engagement with MOT over future regulatory change

WRC and the RTC have offered to engage further with MOT on its proposed regulatory changes for speed management. It is recommended that the findings of this review are presented to MOT to show the region’s view of desired future changes to institutional arrangements and the regulatory framework. This review could also support individual TAs to engage with MOT to provide a strong regional view from many sources.

Feedback received from interview and workshop participants suggests that changes to the Rule and the introduction of national and regional speed management plans should provide a more prescriptive approach to speed limit setting.

This would:

- Support the implementation of changes that have been shown to be required from a sense checked safe and appropriate speed map derived from MegaMaps
- Accelerate the speed limit review process through a more straightforward process
- Reduce inconsistent outcomes based on differing political environments
- Reduce consultation workload for individual speed limit changes as the purpose of community engagement would shift from ‘consult’ to ‘inform’.

The more prescriptive approach could include:

- Clear rules for determining the safe and appropriate speeds on the network (based on the tables in the Speed Management Guide and use of MegaMaps). This would reduce the scope for differing interpretation of the guide
- Specific timeframes for the review of high priority, and subsequently all roads, within each district. This would require all RCAs to take action within the specified timeframe
- Targeted financial support to achieve this roll-out.
# Appendix A  Interview and workshop participants

## Interview participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill McMaster</td>
<td>Waikato RC</td>
<td>Special Projects Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Alderton</td>
<td>Waikato RC</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Bell</td>
<td>Waikato RC</td>
<td>Student Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Hudson</td>
<td>Waipa DC</td>
<td>Roading Corridor Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinghao Chen</td>
<td>Waipa DC</td>
<td>Transport Planning Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye Clark</td>
<td>NZ Transport Agency</td>
<td>Advisor Safety and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junine Stewart</td>
<td>NZ Transport Agency</td>
<td>Area Manager – Safe Network Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gareth Bellamy</td>
<td>Waikato DC</td>
<td>Safety Engineer Roading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Short</td>
<td>Matamata Piako DC</td>
<td>Roading Asset Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Kampshof</td>
<td>Matamata Piako DC</td>
<td>Asset Manager Strategy and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Sharland</td>
<td>Taupo DC</td>
<td>Roading Transport Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Harrison</td>
<td>Taupo DC</td>
<td>Road Safety Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Denton</td>
<td>Hamilton City Council</td>
<td>Transportation Unit Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Bunting</td>
<td>NZ Transport Agency</td>
<td>Manager Network Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Inglis</td>
<td>Regional Asset Technical Accord</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Workshop participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill McMaster</td>
<td>Waikato RC</td>
<td>Special Projects Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine Alderton</td>
<td>Waikato RC</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Hudson</td>
<td>Waipa DC</td>
<td>Roading Corridor Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junine Stewart</td>
<td>NZ Transport Agency</td>
<td>Area Manager – Safe Network Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Short</td>
<td>Matamata Piako DC</td>
<td>Roading Asset Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Sharland</td>
<td>Taupo DC</td>
<td>Roading Transport Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukas de Haast</td>
<td>Hauraki DC</td>
<td>Transport Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Stubbs</td>
<td>Otorohanga DC</td>
<td>Road Safety Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B  Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Automobile Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCO</td>
<td>Council Controlled Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA/Transport Agency</td>
<td>New Zealand Transport Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONRC</td>
<td>One Network Road Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATA</td>
<td>Regional Asset Technical Accord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Road Controlling Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSMP</td>
<td>Regional Speed Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Regional Transport Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTF</td>
<td>Road Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>Special Consultative Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNPWG</td>
<td>Safe Network Programme Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Statement of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Territorial Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLASS</td>
<td>Waikato Local Authority Shared Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>Waikato Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRTM</td>
<td>Waikato Regional Transportation Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir/Madam

Waikato Regional Transport Committee Submission to Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan

Thank you for presenting the opportunity to provide feedback to Hamilton City Council’s Speed Management Plan. This submission is made by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee (RTC), which is made up of representatives from the ten territorial authorities in the region, the NZ Transport Agency and the NZ Police.

The RTC has prioritised planning and implementation of speed management across the region in the 2018 update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045 (RLTP). Under this priority, Road Controlling Authorities are specifically tasked with developing and implementing district speed management plans.

The RTC commends Hamilton City Council (HCC) for leading speed management work and developing a speed management plan for the City. The RTC is currently overseeing the development of a regional speed management plan and has looked to the work HCC has undertaken to help shape high-level regional principles and policies.

In particular, the RTC commends HCC for:

- adopting Vision Zero as the philosophy for road safety in the City – this is consistent with national thinking behind the upcoming national road safety strategy and is also consistent with the RLTP’S objective for road safety: “land transport in the Waikato region is a Safe System, working towards zero deaths and serious injuries”.

- the excellent pre-engagement work that has been undertaken with the community prior to developing a speed management plan for consultation – including the use of a multi-stakeholder working group that defined the draft principles and prioritisation tools.

- the robustness behind the speed management plan – sound principles and evidence based mapping of safe and appropriate speeds which has led to a realistic vision for speed management in Hamilton.
• taking an holistic ‘whole toolbox’ approach – speed limits, road engineering and infrastructure, education, community engagement, and enforcement. This is important so the community can see the whole picture.

• the approach to consult on down-stream speed limit changes with stakeholders and the community in conjunction with consultation on physical infrastructure changes.

**Speed management principles and priorities**

In general, the RTC supports the principles and priorities that have been developed to guide speed management decision-making for Hamilton City. In particular, the RTC notes:

• support for the 30km/h speed environment where there are high numbers of people walking, biking and crossing the road - this is consistent with the NZ Speed Management Guide 2016 and developing regional policy. The RTC also supports the strong focus in the Speed Management Plan on protecting children and vulnerable users.

• support for residential local roads to be constructed for a 40km/h speed environment – and notes that the speed management map visions a largely 40km/h speed environment for residential areas. This is also supported and is consistent with developing regional policy for urban residential areas.

• qualified support for the principle to set the speed environment around schools at school times at the start and end of the school day at 30km/h – noting however, that the current legal framework does not provide for this and changes would need to be made at the national level to bring in 30km/h speed limits outside schools (it is currently 40km/h). The RTC understands that the Ministry of Transport is currently considering a 30km/h policy. In the meantime, a 40km/h permanent or variable speed limit for schools in urban areas is being mooted for the developing regional speed management plan, acknowledging that this could be lowered to 30km/h as a result of Government policy change.

• with respect to the above, the RTC notes the acknowledgement in the Speed Management Plan that ‘how’ and ‘when’ the vision for speed management for Hamilton is delivered will be contingent (amongst other factors) on the outcomes of national speed management work. This also applies to the development of the regional speed management plan.

• support the principles to use a logical, area-based approach for the implementation of speed management and working with partnering Road Controlling Authorities to provide a consistent approach – this is what the developing regional speed management plan is aiming to achieve.

• support the priorities to guide implementation - high benefit routes that deliver maximum benefit in reducing deaths and serious injuries, places where there is strong community demand for change, supporting consistent and logical implementation, and where lots of people walk or bike (or will in the future).
Once again, the RTC congratulates HCC for advancing positive speed management outcomes for the City; a key priority for our region. The RTC is looking for a regionally consistent approach to speed management with early development of a regional speed management plan underway. HCC’s speed management work has been instrumental in shaping early thinking around the regional speed management plan.

This submission was formally endorsed by the Waikato Regional Transport Committee at the Committee meeting on the 6 May 2019.

Yours faithfully

Councillor Hugh Vercoe
Chair of Waikato Regional Transport Committee
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 8 April 2019

Author: Nigel King, Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure

Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy

Subject: Variations to the 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045

Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. Committee to consider and approve a request from the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) to vary the operative 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015–2045 (RLTP) for the inclusion of:
   - New public transport activities arising from the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28
   - Te Awa Cycleway Construction Cambridge to Hamilton – Waipa Section.

Executive Summary
2. A variation to the RLTP is required to bring in a number of new projects to implement the Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28 (RPTP). The proposed projects include the development of business case projects to advance the Waipa public transport network review, targeted mode shift improvement in Hamilton, as well as to bring in a new service improvement activity in the North Waikato area.

3. Additionally a variation is required to bring in a new construction activity to support the delivery of the Cambridge to Hamilton section of the Te Awa Cycleway. Waipa District Council are seeking funding to deliver the portion of the cycleway from the Cambridge Velodrome to the Waipa District Council boundary near Hooker Road.

4. These variations have been considered and endorsed by the Regional Advisory Group (RAG) and recommended to the Regional Transport Committee for approval.

Staff Recommendation:
1. That the report ‘Variations to the 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045’ (Regional Transport Committee 6 May 2019) be received.

2. That the Committee vary the operative 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045 to include four new activities being:
   - Waipa Public Transport Network Review Business Case
   - Hamilton PT Targeted Mode Shift Business Case
   - North Waikato public transport service improvement
   - Te Awa Cycleway Construction Cambridge to Hamilton – Waipa Section.
Background

5. The Committee’s Terms of Reference gives the Committee the power (on behalf of Waikato Regional Council) to authorise variations to the RLTP in accordance with the approved RLTP significance policy.

6. In order for an activity to be included in the RLTP, it must first be endorsed by the RTC. The majority of activities included in the RLTP have been assessed during the development of the three-year plan and have been subject to public consultation. During the operative period of the RLTP, changes to existing activities or the introduction of new activities may be proposed by submitting organisations. In these cases, the inclusion of the proposed activity may be assessed against the objectives and priorities of the RLTP, and qualifying activities may be endorsed by the committee.

Issue
RPTP Implementation

7. The final RPTP was formally adopted by the Waikato Regional Council on 12 December 2018 and became operative on 16 January 2019 following an extensive public consultation process. The RPTP has anchored a new network structure and aspirational network concepts to guide the improvement and evolution of the public transport system overtime.

8. Additionally, the RPTP has also identified a number of new activities that will be implemented over the next three years, to support the achievement of RLTP objectives and priorities. Some of these activities were not included in the RLTP, due to the RLTP being developed in advance of the RPTP.

9. Staff are seeking RTC approval of the following activities for inclusion in the RLTP via these variations. These activities have been included in the RPTP and consulted with the community and key stakeholders. A brief description of the proposed activities is presented below:

   a) Waipa Public Transport Service Review Business Case – A single stage business case will be developed for the improvement of public transport in the Waipa district. The business case will investigate the best way in which improved bus mode share into Hamilton can be delivered as well as looking at PT connectivity within Waipa district. Early work has been undertaken, including data collection, household survey and stakeholder workshops to confirm the project scope. This project is being put forward for the targeted enhanced funding assistance rate (TEFAR) from NZTA.

   b) Public Transport Targeted Mode Shift Business Case - This business case is to investigate potential interventions to significantly increase the uptake of public transport for school aged children and reduce car-based journey to/from school in Hamilton. As part of the business case, a youth fare concession along with service enhancement opportunities and parking policy and pricing changes will be investigated, as a means to incentivise modal shift and reduce congestions on the network. This project is being put forward for the TEFAR funding from NZTA.

   c) North Waikato Public Transport Improvement – A new public transport improvement activity is required to be included in the RLTP to allow the implementation of a new bus service connecting Pokeno and Tuakau with Pukekohe/Auckland. The proposed service will provide improved connectivity for local residents to access employment, education and social opportunities, and is designed to integrate with train services from Pukekohe to Auckland. This service is planned for implementation in late-2019.
10. The memo from Waikato Regional Council to the RAG outlining additional detail for this variation request is included as an attachment to this report (Attachment 1).

**Te Awa Cycleway Cambridge to Hamilton – Waipa Section**

11. Waipa District Council are seeking a variation to the RLTP to include a new activity to support the construction of the Waipa section of the Te Awa Cycleway extending from the Cambridge Velodrome to the Waipa District Council Boundary near Hooker Road.

12. Work undertaken by Waipa District Council in the last 12 months has completed the route design and consents have been obtained.

13. This portion of the cycleway is 4.5kms long and will be a three metre wide concrete cycleway with some sections of boardwalk and bridge structures. Total cost for this section is $5 million for all phases from design through to completion.

14. This variation is complementary to work on three other sections of the Te Awa Cycleway from Cambridge to Hamilton being undertaken by NZTA, Waikato District Council and Hamilton City Council.

15. The memo from Waikato Regional Council to the RAG outlining additional detail for this variation request is included as an attachment to this report (Attachment 2).

**Regional Advisory Group Consultation**

16. The variations put forward for consideration by the committee and proposed for inclusion in the RLTP have been reviewed and endorsed by members of the RAG at their meeting on 12 April 2019.

17. The RAG have considered the merits of these activities and determined that the variations align with the objectives and priorities of the RLTP and that the inclusion of the activities will not impact on the delivery of other activities contained in the plan.

18. The variations proposed were assessed according to the significance policy contained in the RLTP and considered to be minor variations that do not require additional public consultation.

**Assessment of Significance**

19. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002, Land Transport Management Act 2003 or any other enactment.

**Conclusion**

20. The projects subject to these variations align with the objectives and priorities of the RLTP, RPTP and GPS and are considered minor variations under the significance policy and do not require public consultation.

21. The variations proposed in this report have been endorsed by the RAG and are recommended to RTC for approval.

**Attachments**

1. Memo from Waikato Regional Council for the RLTP variation request on the RPTP implementation activities (Doc # 14106342)

Regional Land Transport Plan Variation – RPTP implementation activities

TO: Regional Advisory Group
FROM: Nigel King, Waikato Regional Council

10 April 2019

Memorandum

Summary

The Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28 (RPTP) was adopted by Waikato Regional Council on 12 December 2018 following an extensive public consultation process. The RPTP has anchored a new network structure and aspirational network concepts to guide the improvement and evolution of the public transport system overtime.

In addition to the new network concepts, the RPTP has identified a number of new activities that will be implemented over the next 3 years, to support the achievement of RLTP objectives and priorities. Some of these activities were not included in the RLTP due to the RLTP was developed in advance of the RPTP.

A variation to the RLTP is requested to bring in a number of new projects to implement the RPTP. The proposed projects include the development of business cases to advance the Waipa public transport network review and targeted PT mode shift improvement in Hamilton, as well as to bring in a new service improvement activity in North Waikato.

These projects have been consulted with the community as part of the RPTP development process, and are closely linked to a number of business case projects such as Access Hamilton Programme Business Case and North Waikato Integrated Growth Management Programme Business Case.

1. Recommendation

That the Regional Advisory Group (RAG) recommends to the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) that a variation to the 2018 Update to the 2015 Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan (WRLTP) be approved for the inclusion of the following activities:

- Waipa Public Transport Service Review Business Case
- Public Transport Targeted Mode Shift Business Case
- North Waikato Public Transport Improvement

2. Background

The final RPTP was formally adopted by the Waikato Regional Council on 12 December 2018 and became operative on 16 January 2019, following a full public consultation process. The new RPTP includes aspirational network concepts and layered service levels for the region, including Hamilton and its immediate surrounds. The concepts and layered service levels are intended to serve as ‘blueprints’ to guide the development and evolution of public transport overtime.

Additionally, the RPTP has also identified a number of new activities that will be implemented over the next 3 years, to support the achievement of RLTP objectives and priorities. Some of these activities
were subject to further consultation with the community and key stakeholders, and were unable to be included in the RLTP prior to its adoption.

To support the implementation of the RPTP it is requested that the following activities be approved by RAG for inclusion in the RLTP via the variation:

- Waipa Public Transport Service Review Business Case
- Public Transport Targeted Mode Shift Business Case
- North Waikato Public Transport Improvement

A detailed description of each activity is provided below.

3. Waipa Public Transport Network Review - Single Stage Business Case

**Overview**
The recently adopted Waikato RPTP 2018-28 (RPTP) has identified a need to improve public transport connections between Hamilton and surround towns, in response to the increased population growth and addressing congestion issues on regionally significant corridors such as SH1 and SH3.

A point of entry has been developed by WRC and NZTA, and it was agreed that a single stage business case (SSBC) will be developed for the improvement of public transport in Waipa District. The business case will investigate the best way in which improved bus mode share into Hamilton can be delivered as well as looking at PT connectivity within Waipa District.

Based on early advice from NZTA, this project is qualified for the targeted enhanced funding assistance rate (TEFAR), subject to its inclusion in the RLTP/NLTP.

**Strategic context**
As part of the 2018 RPTP review, a Strategic Case was developed following the NZTA Business Case approach to outline the strategic context and the case for investment in region’s public transport system. The RPTP Strategic Case has identified three key problems relating to public transport that need to be addressed by regional partners, and these are:

- **Problem 1:** High population growth and increasing dependency on cars is causing congestion in our towns and city, hampering economic development and community wellbeing.
- **Problem 2:** Lack of suitable transport options is limiting access to essential services and employment, impacting on economic and social viability of communities.
- **Problem 3:** Poor perceptions and journey experiences are a barrier to growing Public transport patronage, resulting in reduced value for money spent on transport infrastructure and services.

In the Waipa context, these problems relate to a number of issues that the district is currently facing in relation to public transport.

Waipa district has a limited passenger transport service that runs from Hamilton to Te Awamutu and from Hamilton to Cambridge. There are no return services after 5:15pm from Hamilton on a weekday which means that bus use will not be an option for many employees who cannot get to the Transport centre before that time. Limited evening and weekend services between Waipa towns and Hamilton also restrict the appeal of public transport.

The patronage on the Waipa services has performed strongly over the last few years and the number of boardings has increased by 10% over the last 12 months. With a growing population projected in
Waipa district and an increase in older residents, this is likely to put significant pressure on the existing network, particularly during peak times where the services are in full capacity.

Travel in and around Hamilton is dominated by low occupancy private vehicles, and both SH1 and SH3 at the Waipa-Hamilton boundary are experiencing significant travel time delays and congestion during peak hours. Providing attractive and reliable PT service is a key intervention to enable mode shift on the congested corridors.

Through the Waipa LTP and RPTP consultations in 2018, the community has requested improved service levels, and a new PT improvement activity ('Enhancement of Waipa bus services) has been included in the RLTP (via an variation in November 2018). In addition, the current contract ends in 2019 and there is opportunity to review services provided.

It is expected that a single stage business case will be developed in the early part of 2019. The outcomes of the business case will confirm the future service improvement options in Waipa, which will help to inform the retendering of the Wapia bus contract in late 2019.

Alignment with national and regional policy
Providing for the access and mobility needs of our diverse communities in the Waikato region is a key priority contained in the RLTP and RPTP. This is also a key priority area for the GPS that seeks to improve access to economic and social opportunities and encourage modal shift from private vehicles to walking, cycling and public transport modes.

Public transport availability and frequency is a significant determinant of access to social and economic opportunities. It is essential for Waipa residents to have access to attractive travel choices. The provision of high quality, reliable, and timely services to travel between urban centres will encourage greater use of PT, and reduce traffic congestion on key inter-regional routes such as SH1 and SH3.

The development of the single stage business case will investigate the best way in which improved bus mode share into Hamilton can be delivered as well as looking at PT connectivity within the Waipa district. This will align with a number of key result areas in the GPS 2018-21, and in particular:
- Addresses a significant gap in level of service in accessing social or economic opportunities;
- Improves journey time reliability on key inter-regional routes;
- Supports agreed integrated land use, multi-modal plans and mode shift in major centres;
- Makes best use of the public transport operations and connection to other services.

Financial implications
It is expected that this project will put forward for the TEFAR funding from NZTA, and the local share will be provided by Waipa District Council. The service delivery component is also incorporated in the SSBC, and this funding is subject to the completion of the business case and approval by NZTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waipa Public Transport Network Review - Single Stage Business Case</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>Total cost (3 years)</th>
<th>FAR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business case development</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>75.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service improvement**</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to final approval by NZTA
**Indicative budget per annum, subject to the confirmation of business case
4. Public Transport Targeted Mode Shift - Single Stage Business Case

**Overview**
The 2018 refresh of the Access Hamilton Integrated Transport Strategy has highlighted a need to focus on short-term transformational activities to significantly improve public transport mode share and reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles in Hamilton.

The purpose of this business case is to investigate potential interventions to significantly increase the uptake of PT for school aged persons and reduce car-based journey to/from school in Hamilton. This in turn will provide increased mobility for youth and reduce peak congestion on the road network.

Based on early advice from NZTA, this project is qualified for the targeted enhanced funding assistance rate (TEFAR), subject to its inclusion in the RLTP/NLTP.

**Strategic context**
The 2018 Access Hamilton Strategy has been developed following the NZTA Business Case approach, and provides the overall strategic context for this business case activity. The key transport problems as identified in the Access Hamilton strategy are: ‘System failures from network characteristics, user behaviour and increasing demand result in deaths and serious injuries’; and ‘Our transport system has focused on cars resulting in low use of other modes and higher future cost for transport’.

Evidence supporting these problems has shown that Hamilton is experiencing a high rate of population growth and has resulted in increased traffic volumes and declining levels of service on the roading network throughout Hamilton. Many intersections throughout the city are approaching saturation beyond which traffic flows break down resulting in severe congestion and travel delays. In the absence of something changing, continued population growth alongside high rates of low occupancy vehicle use will result in Hamilton’s transport system becoming increasingly inefficient.

In order to accommodate current and projected population growth, it is essential that the transport network is able to move people and goods more efficiently. Central to this efficiency is the need to reduce reliance on low occupancy vehicles and increase the mode shift to public transport, walking and cycling.

Within Hamilton a significant portion of network capacity during peak travel periods is occupied by school related travel. This is evidenced by the notable difference in vehicle movements recorded at intersections during school holidays vs non-school holiday periods. The difference in traffic volumes varies by location and time of day. By way of example, mean traffic volumes for the city as a whole during AM peak periods (8am to 9am) is 20% lower during school holidays. Whereas mean volumes at specific locations (e.g. Peachgrove Road) can be up to 58% lower.

The 2010 to 2014 school travel information from the Ministry of Transport Household Travel Survey data estimates the mode share for Youths travelling is 48% car passenger, 29% walking, 3% cycling, 2% driving their own car and 18% using buses. Incentivising modal shift from cars to public transport and active modes for school aged persons has the potential to deliver transport benefits across the entire city.

As part of this business case, a youth fare concession along with service enhancement opportunities and parking policy and pricing changes will be investigated, as a means to incentivise a greater proportion of school related travel occurring on public transport within Hamilton. This in turn will provide increased mobility for youth and reduce peak congestion on the road network.
**Alignment with national and regional policy**

Increased mode shift from private vehicle trips to walking, cycling and public transport is a key result area identified in the 2018-21 GPS. This business case will explore potential interventions to influence travel behaviour change and increase PT mode for youth and children. This has the potential to significantly reduce car-based travel to schools and in turn reduce peak period congestions on the road network. This will also provide for increased mobility for youth and influence a positive change in public transport culture and public perceptions by retaining customers and growing public transport usage.

This work has a strong alignment with the RLTP objectives and GPS results areas, including:

- increasing the proportion of journeys made using public transport (including children travelling to and from school)
- Providing transport choices for people with less or limited access to transport;
- Improving the resilience and efficiency of the network; and
- Making the best use of existing network and services to deliver value for money

**Financial implications**

It is expected that this project will put forward for the TEFAR funding from NZTA, and the local share will be provided by Hamilton City Council and Waikato Regional Council jointly. An implementation component is also incorporated in the SSBC, and this funding is subject to the completion of the business case and approval by NZTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Transport Targeted Mode Shift - Single Stage Business Case</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>Total cost (3 years)</th>
<th>FAR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business case development</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>75.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation**</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$5,750,000</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subject to final approval by NZTA
**Indicative budget, subject to the confirmation of business case

---

5. North Waikato Public Transport Improvement

**Overview**

A new public transport improvement activity is requested for inclusion in the RLTP to allow the implementation of a new bus service connecting Pokeno and Tuakau with Pukekohe/Auckland (as illustrated in the diagram below). The proposed service will provide improved connectivity for local residents to access employment, education and social opportunities, and is designed to integrate with train services from Pukekohe to Auckland. This service is planned for implementation in late 2019.
PT Options – POKENO TO PUKEKOHE

Improvement Concepts

Service levels
- Weekdays - 40-min peak and 2 hourly off-peak – 6am to 8pm
- Weekends - 2 hourly all day - 7am to 8pm

Estimated cost and funding
- Total cost - $646,500 p.a.
- WDC contributions - $252,500

Strategic context
Through the work on the North Waikato Public Transport Review and the North Waikato Integrated Growth Management Programme Business Case (NW IGM PBC), two high-level problem statements have been identified and agreed by key transport partners through a facilitated Investment Logic Mapping exercise, and these are:

- Problem 1 – Ad hoc responses to growth pressure is creating communities disconnected from services, amenities and employment (60%)
- Problem 2 – Current and future demand on the transport network is impacting on safety, commercial activity and service reliability (40%)

The North Waikato is experiencing high population growth and this is expected to continue more rapidly than previous predictions due to strong housing demand in Pokeno, Tuakau and Te Kauwhata. The strong link between North Waikato and the Auckland labour market means that transport is directly affected as growth occurs.

Current problems related to safety and efficiency (queuing) of State Highway 1 are likely to get worse without remedial action. This is due to both higher growth and limited public transport, leading to a lack of other choices to travel. This is currently causing safety and efficiency issues on the network, which will be exacerbated by the projected growth. These issues have the potential to have significant adverse impacts on local, regional and national productivity.

This proposed activity has been included in the NW IGM PBC as part of the preferred programme (endorsed by NZTA Board) to address the problems identified. The service proposal has also been included in the WRC and WDC LTPs and the recently adopted 2018-28 RTP as a key improvement activity that will provide improved connectivity for the North Waikato community to access employment, education and social opportunities.

Alignment with national and regional policy
The North Waikato is experiencing significant population growth and this is expected to continue more rapidly than previous predictions due to faster than expected housing demand in Pokeno and Tuakau. Without effective public transport service, people are relying on cars to access employment, education and essential services in Auckland, placing significant pressure on the road network (particularly on SH1/Southern Motorway).
The proposed service will address a significant gap in the level of service currently provided to communities in North Waikato, providing greater access to social and economic opportunities and addressing congestion issues on the roading network.

**Financial implications**

The proposed service would be co-funded by NZTA with the current financial assistance rate for bus services (51% of the net cost), with Waikato District Council funding the balance. Implementation is planned for late 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Waikato Public Transport Improvement</th>
<th>2018/19</th>
<th>2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>Total cost (3 years)</th>
<th>FAR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New bus service between Pokeno, Tuakau and Pukekohe</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$273,000</td>
<td>$546,000</td>
<td>$819,000</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Land Transport Plan Variation – Te Awa Cycleway Construction Cambridge to Hamilton - Section in Waipa District from Velodrome to District Boundary

To: Waikato Regional Advisory Group
From: Bryan Hudson, Waipa District Council

20 March 2019

Memorandum

1. **Summary**

Waipa District seeks a variation to the RLTP for the 4.5km leg of the Te Awa cycleway from where it currently ends at the Cambridge Velodrome to the boundary of Waipa District near Hooker Road. Over the last 12 months Waipa District has designed the route, obtained consents and costed the work at up to $5.0M for all phases from design through to completion.

At the time of preparing their bid for the 2018-21 NLTP, Waipa District Council signalled the intention to build the cycleway within its District but there was no finalised design or detailed costing available. Since this time the business case has been completed, NZTA has agreed to fund a portion that runs parallel to the Waikato Expressway and Waikato District and Hamilton City are also working to complete parts within their areas.

It is requested that the Regional Advisory Group consider this variation to bring this project into the RLTP as a variation and recommend it for approval by the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) if required.

2. **Recommendation**

That the Regional Advisory Group (RAG) recommends to the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) that the variation to the Regional Land Transport Programme (RLTP) for the Te Awa cycleway from where it currently ends at the Cambridge Velodrome to the boundary of Waipa District be approved for inclusion in the 2015-45 RLTP.

3. **Background**

Waipa District Council worked with the Te Awa River Ride Charitable Trust in past years to build the cycleway beside the Waikato River from Lake Karapiro through Cambridge up to
the Velodrome. This is a 3.0m wide concrete path developed to a high standard for commuter and visitor use. It was originally anticipated that the next section from the Velodrome north to the District Boundary would be delivered by the same arrangement.

Since the 2015 LTP, NZTA completed the Cambridge section of the Waikato Expressway and began building the Hamilton leg of the expressway. NZTA also established that the completed expressway would have a speed limit of 110km/hr and that cyclists should have an alternate route other than the expressway. Waipa District Council, Waikato District Council, Hamilton City Council and NZTA worked together to complete a business case in 2018 to ensure the Te Awa cycleway was extended from Hamilton to Cambridge with Government subsidy.

The leg under consideration will complete a 3.0m wide concrete cycleway with some sections of boardwalk and bridge structures largely along the Waikato River Bank to the District Boundary near Hooker Road. Here it will join the leg being designed and constructed by NZTA through Waikato District roads to Tamahere and onto the Hamilton City leg.

4. **Investment Assessment Framework**

The project will be funded from the Walking and Cycling activity class in accordance with the guidance of the NZ Transport Agency Knowledge Base.

The investment profile for the project is MH and it forms part of the wider package of works for the Hamilton to Cambridge cycleway.

5. **Alignment with GPS and Regional Policy**

The proposal gives effect to the Access and Mobility priorities in the 2018/19–2027/28 GPS.

6. **Financial implications**

The total base estimated cost to complete the project is $4.5M for the 4.5km length within Waipa District. However given recent construction cost increases a funding approval of $5.0M is sought at a funding assistance rate of 75% ($3.75M NLTF share at a Targeted Enhanced FAR).

7. **Appendices**

Map of cycleway route

Rob Bullick
Principal Investment Advisor
Planning and Investment
NZ Transport Agency
Appendix 1: Map of proposed cycleway route
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 14 April 2019

Author: Nigel King, Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure
Vincent Kuo, Senior Policy Advisor, Transport and Infrastructure
Jose Gonzalez, Policy Advisor, Transport and Infrastructure

Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy

Subject: Regional Public Transport Update

Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To provide the Committee with an update on the implementation of the Waikato Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28 and key regional public transport projects.

Executive Summary
2. Current activities include an update on the implementation of the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) and Hamilton to Auckland start-up passenger rail service.

3. The RPTP was adopted by Waikato Regional Council (WRC) on 12 December 2018 and became operative on 16 January 2019. Staff are in a process of implementing the priority projects as outlined in the RPTP and a brief summary of progress against each project is presented in this report.

4. The Hamilton to Auckland start-up passenger rail project has received funding approval from the NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) to procure and refurbish rail carriages and to complete the railway stations and other capital works to enable the service. The project is progressing as planned.

Staff Recommendation:
That the report “Regional Public Transport Projects Update” (dated 14 April 2019) be received.

Background
5. The Regional Transport Committee (RTC) provides advice to WRC in relation to the management of public transport.

6. The scope of activity of the RTC as related to public transport¹ is:
“To monitor the implementation of the Regional Public Transport Plan on matters outside of Hamilton City (where this role is delegated to the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee).”

Implementation of Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-28

RPTP overview
7. The RPTP was formally adopted by the Waikato Regional Council on 12 December 2018 and became operative on 16 January 2019, following a full public consultation process.

¹ Regional Transport Committee Terms of Reference for the 2016-19 Triennium
8. The Plan seeks to address the following problems which were jointly identified by the broad range of stakeholders who participated in RPTP development process:

- **Problem 1:** High population growth and increasing dependency on cars is causing congestion in our towns and city, hampering economic development and community wellbeing.
- **Problem 2:** Lack of suitable transport options is limiting access to essential services and employment, impacting on economic and social viability of communities.
- **Problem 3:** Poor perceptions and journey experiences are a barrier to growing Public transport patronage, resulting in reduced value for money spent on transport infrastructure and services.

**RPTP Strategic Responses**

9. Stakeholders identified and agreed on the following ‘strategic responses’ to the problems outlined above. The responses were developed in parallel with the Access Hamilton Transport Strategy and equivalent transport and growth strategies from neighbouring districts. The RPTP serves as an implementation framework for the strategic responses to the problems set out above:

10. **SR1 - Move towards a mass transit oriented network over time.**
    *Context:* Parts of our region are growing rapidly, creating transport challenges such as increasing congestion and longer travel times. Transitioning to a mass transit oriented network will provide capacity for further population growth and development. This will also help create more liveable urban areas and a healthier environment by moving significantly more people while using much less space than a car orientated system. Continually adding capacity to roads to accommodate more cars is neither practical nor affordable in the long term.

11. **SR2 - Connect our region in partnership with others to better coordinate funding and service provision.**
    *Context:* This response aims to enhance the wellbeing of our communities and strengthen our economy by expanding our public transport network to include more areas within our region, and in doing so enable better access to education, employment, healthcare and social opportunities. To achieve this, we will need to better coordinate transport solutions and funding across multiple organisations and develop new and more flexible approaches to the provision of transport solutions.

12. **SR3 - Develop an accessible public transport system that improves end-to-end journey experiences to encourage travel behaviour change.**
    *Context:* This response recognises that all steps in a journey are linked and that a journey can become impractical or impossible if any part of the journey component is broken or inadequate. Continuously seeking out and removing barriers that prevent people from accessing public transport services will ensure the system is accessible and can be used by everyone. It also recognises we need to make services faster, more reliable and easier to use to encourage uptake of public transport.

**Network Blueprints**

13. The new RPTP includes aspirational network concepts and layered service levels for the region, including Hamilton and its immediate surrounds. The network concepts and layered service levels are intended to serve as ‘blueprints’ to guide the development and evolution of public transport overtime which are included as Attachment One to this report.

**Plan Implementation**

14. The RPTP acknowledges that delivering the strategic responses and network concepts cannot be achieved over night and has adopted a phased implementation approach. The table below outlines priority initiatives included within the RPTP for implementation.
15. All of the priority initiatives outlined in the table above are being progressed and will be the subject of regular updates and consideration by the RTC and the Hamilton Public Transport Joint Committee. The following provides a brief summary of each activity and implementation progress.

a) **Improve public transport reliability and travel times via infrastructure priority measures.**
   Short-term priorities include addressing public transport delay hotspots:
   - Intersection between Pembroke St (hospital entrance), Ohaupo Road and Kahikatea Drive – Status: Project scoping phase. This work is being led by NZTA.
   - Glenview/Mahoe SH3 corridor – Status: Project scoping phase. This work is being led by NZTA.
   - Peachgrove Rd, Hukaunui Rd and Clyde St corridors – Status: School links business case process underway. This work is being led by Hamilton City Council.
   - SH1/Cambridge Road corridor – Status: Business case process underway for Cambridge Rd corridor south of Hillcrest roundabout (SH1 corridor). North of Hillcrest roundabouts currently out of scope. This work is being led by NZTA in partnership with Hamilton City Council.

b) **Develop and trial public ride-share services.**
   Project scope confirmed and anchored in new RTP. This work is being progressed by Waikato Regional Council. Staff are aiming to implement a pilot scheme in 2019/20 and a funding proposal is being put together for NZTA consideration. Short term priorities for this project include:
   - Appointing a rideshare implementation manager
   - Issuing a request for tenders for a rideshare platform provider
   - Lodging a funding bid with the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority to support utilisation of electric vehicles
   - Confirming NZTA funding for the pilot project.

c) **Develop a Mass Transit Plan**
   The Mass Transit Plan (MTP) will be developed through two workstreams delivered concurrently.

   The first workstream will be delivered with the Waikato-Hamilton Metropolitan Spatial Plan (an initiative under the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor partnership and which will replace the Hamilton Urban Growth Strategy) and will set the 100 year vision, which includes the location of key corridors, corridor function, modes and protection requirements. This workstream will also deliver the transition plan and a 30 year implementation plan to feed into future national, regional and local transport plans including the Access Hamilton Programme Business Case.
The second stream will develop a 10 year programme of works to deliver the current Access Hamilton Programme and RPTP targets of mode shift and a move towards a mass transit based transport network.

This split enables the long term MTP to be aligned with the development of the Waikato-Hamilton Metropolitan Spatial Plan, while still enabling the short term programme to be developed without being delayed by the development of the longer term plan.

d) Implement mass transit start up projects:

- **Passenger rail Hamilton to Auckland** – The project is currently in the pre-implementation phase, with a target start date in 2020. A more detailed update on the passenger rail project is presented in the next section of the report.

- **Develop high capacity, rapid and frequent bus corridors within Hamilton** - Major routes and corridors will be confirmed through development of the mass transit plan. However some network improvements can be advanced in parallel with development of the mass transit plan. Early initiatives that serve as stepping stones to the development of mass transit corridors within Hamilton are outlined below.

  - **Develop a rapid and frequent public transport service between Hamilton and Cambridge, Hamilton and Te Awamutu and Hamilton to Huntly.** A public transport review is underway with Waipa District Council. Additional funding to improve PT service levels within Waipa has been confirmed in Long Term Plans from year 2 onwards. Service level improvements for the Huntly service are planned for implementation in April 2019.
e) Expand the public transport network to include more areas within our region, including links between:

- **Tokoroa and Hamilton via south Waikato towns** – Service to be tendered this year. Implementation date to be confirmed subject to procurement process.
- **Matamata and Hamilton** – Service to be implemented this year. Implementation date to be confirmed subject to procurement process.
- **North Waikato towns and Hamilton** – A daily off-peak bus service between Hamilton and Pukekohe via north Waikato towns started in January this year. Extension of the existing Huntly bus service to Te Kauwhata for one return trip during peak periods is planned to start in April this year. A new bus service between Pokeno, Tuakau and Pukekohe is planned for implementation at the end of this year.

**Hamilton to Auckland Start-up Passenger rail Service**

16. Since the NZTA Board decision in December 2018, project co-investors have worked collaboratively to meet NZTA investment requirements and obtain NZTA Board support for construction and pre-implementation funding for the service. The NZTA Board funding decision was subject to the following conditions being met:

a. **Endorses** the Hamilton to Auckland Passenger Rail start up service Single Stage Business Case, subject to a condition subsequent that independent Stage Gate Reviews are undertaken during Pre-implementation to consider and approve: revised and updated costs (capital and operating), improved demand forecasts, robust Customer Service and Marketing Plan, updated Project Delivery and Assurance Plans, and full operational safety sign off.

b. **Approves** funding to Waikato Regional Council (fully funded Transitional Rail activity class) for purchase of rolling stock; subject to a condition precedent where the costs are agreed and signed off by the NZ Transport Agency Chief Executive.

c. **Approves** funding to Waikato Regional Council (fully funded Transitional Rail activity class) for Pre-implementation work associated with refurbishment of the rolling stock, subject to:
   i. a condition precedent where the NZ Transport Agency Chief Executive reviews and approves the proposed level of funding; and
   ii. a condition subsequent that the right of Transport Agency to re-use the asset should the start-up service not proceed, or be withdrawn during or at the end of the five year period.

d. **Approves** funding to Waikato Regional Council (funded from Public Transport infrastructure at a targeted funding assistance rate of 75.5%) for Pre-implementation work associated with the operation of the service, including integrated ticketing, subject to a condition precedent where the NZ Transport Agency Chief Executive reviews and approves the proposed level of funding.

17. The following project milestones have been achieved:

- NZTA Board approval of $12.1 million for Hamilton City Council (HCC), Waikato Regional Council and Waikato District Council (WDC) pre-implementation activities for their respective rail projects
- NZTA Chief Executive approval on the 15 of March to increase the interim funding for the carriage refurbishment works from $3.5 million to $8 million
- NZTA’s independently commissioned open book price audit and technical review work has been completed and findings/recommendations have been submitted to NZTA
- The prototyping of the carriages (3 different carriage types) is currently underway and long lead item parts have been ordered from international suppliers.
18. The Project Governance Working Group (PGWG) had their first meeting as an official governance entity on 3 April 2019. All the co-funding Councils approved the Terms of Reference and the governance structure for this group. Two documents were presented to the PGWG for their consideration and adoption:

- Delegations Paper
- Risk Reporting Framework.

19. The purpose of the delegations paper was for the PGWG to have a framework to delegate responsibilities and authority to the Technical Control Group and to officials involved in the project. The purpose of the risk reporting framework was to establish a reporting structure and clarify responsibilities/roles that will be followed across all governance levels of this project.

20. Hamilton City Council has completed most of the pre-implementation work required for the station in Rotokauri, including detailed design for their park and ride facility, platform layout, road reconfiguration and other station amenities. Waikato District Council have engaged AECOM to complete the pre-implementation work required for the Huntly station, the completion date for this work is the end of July 2019. KiwiRail have progressed the pre-implementation work for the Te Rapa maintenance facility and have completed their design for track alterations at Rotokauri.

21. KiwiRail has commenced the refurbishment of the carriages utilising funding approved by NZTA. Whilst NZTA approved further funding on the 29th of March, this has impacted the timing of order placements and is likely to affect the refurbishment programme and resulting service commencement. We are awaiting KiwiRail advice on this matter once all the orders have been placed and a delivery schedule confirmed by suppliers.

22. A project Governance Group meeting is scheduled for 13 May to confirm the project timelines and any recommendations arising from the NZTA’s independently commissioned open book price audit and technical review work.

23. Pictured below is a photo of one of the train carriages currently undergoing refurbishment at the KiwiRail workshop in Upper Hutt. The carriage has been stripped down, the roofing has been removed, the base livery colour painted and metallic silver wrapping has been applied.
Conclusion
24. The RPTP was adopted by WRC on 12 December 2018 following a comprehensive review process. Staff are making good progress on the RPTP implementation, with a number of priority projects being well advanced.

25. The Hamilton to Auckland Start-up Passenger Rail service continues to make good progress. A PGWG has been confirmed to provide oversight and guidance for the project. Funding support has been obtained from NZTA to support the carriage refurbishment being undertaken by KiwiRail and for pre-implementation activities undertaken by co-funding Councils.

Assessment of significance
26. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

Attachments
Attachment One: Network Concept Plans and Public Transport Service Layers

1. Regional Network Concept

2. City and Surrounds Network Concept
3. Public Transport Service Layers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service layer</th>
<th>Mass transit</th>
<th>Frequent</th>
<th>Connector</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary purpose</td>
<td>Enhance economic and social wellbeing by enabling access to education, employment, healthcare and social opportunities.</td>
<td>Connect major population and activity centres and move more people as efficiently as possible. Provide network capacity to support population growth and development. Reduce the use of low occupancy cars and enable better use of valuable urban land.</td>
<td>Connect suburban/regional population and activity centres. Connect with frequent and mass transit services.</td>
<td>Provide broader population coverage and access to essential services.</td>
<td>Services designed for a specific purpose such as school transport or special events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hamilton city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of operation</th>
<th>6am to 11pm weekdays and 7am to 9pm weekends</th>
<th>6am to 9pm weekdays and 7am to 9pm weekends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frequency</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hamilton and neighbouring towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of operation</th>
<th>6am to 9pm weekdays and 7am to 9pm weekends</th>
<th>6am to 9pm weekdays and 7am to 7pm weekends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frequency</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of operation</th>
<th>6am to 9pm weekdays and 7am to 7pm weekends</th>
<th>7am to 7pm weekdays and 8am to 6pm weekends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frequency</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (a) in some cases, hours of operation may be varied/extended to enable connections with other transport services or to meet specific community needs.
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Subject: Waikato Stock Truck Effluent Disposal Programme

Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To provide the committee with information on the progress towards the implementation of new stock truck effluent facilities in the Waikato Region.

Executive Summary
2. The stock truck effluent disposal (STE) programme is a partnership project between NZ Transport Agency (NZTA), Waikato Regional Council (WRC) and local territorial authorities to implement up to ten new stock truck effluent facilities across the Waikato Region.

3. The project team are on track with progress of the two highest priority sites at Kaimai (SH29/SH24) and Taupō (SH1/SH5) to be operational by 30 June 2020.

4. The project planning work to-date includes the preparation of site design plans, safety audit, legal agreements such as Multi Party Funding Agreements, stakeholder engagement and research to inform a strategy for the collection and treatment of the effluent from the sites.

5. For the broader stock truck effluent work programme, work has been undertaken to complete the detailed project plans, stakeholder engagement plan and a governance and reporting structure between the NZTA and WRC. In addition, a new Council Project Manager for the Stock Truck Effluent programme – Noel Robinson, has been appointed to manage the programme for the planning and delivery of the 2 new stock truck effluent facilities by 30 June 2020.

Staff Recommendation:
That the report ‘Waikato Stock Truck Effluent Disposal Programme’ (dated 11 April 2019) be received.

Background
6. There has been a long history behind the development of the STE Programme in the Waikato Region. During 2009 and 2010, WRC in collaboration with regional partners and stakeholders developed a Stock Truck Effluent Strategy 2010-16 outlining the issues from stock truck effluent, either accidently or deliberately being discharged onto the road.

7. The issues and actions identified in the strategy remain relevant today including the identification of a network of disposal facilities around the Waikato region to minimise the incidence of effluent spills.
8. In 2012 to address the funding shortfalls, WRC resolved to rate properties in the region, using a targeted rating system, to collect funds for the local share of building and maintaining the new disposal sites identified in the strategy. The rates collection was calculated on the average cost of construction and maintenance, where WRC would pay 50% of the facility construction and maintenance costs. As at 30 April 2018, Waikato Regional Council currently has $448,017 held in a dedicated stock truck effluent reserve fund. These funds will provide the Waikato Regional Council local share to begin construction on the first site, determined as the Kaimai site. The second priority site has been agreed upon as the Taupō site, and project work will continue in parallel to the Kaimai site to secure a contract for construction.

9. In September 2016 an MOU was developed between the NZTA and WRC for the development of the stock truck effluent sites. It reflected a high level way of operating between the two agencies for the programme.

**Waikato stock truck effluent disposal facilities detailed business case – 2016-2017**

10. A significant step towards addressing the problem of stock truck effluent dumping occurred in late 2016, with the NZTA approving the development of a detailed business case (DBC) to investigate a network of stock truck effluent disposal sites in the region. The subsequent DBC identified ten sites around the region and sought feedback from stakeholders including the livestock trucking industry, NZTA and territorial local authorities.

11. The ten sites identified, in most cases confirmed the sites identified over the last decade in the strategy. The DBC draws on the strategic direction from the strategy and details the costings of each site and the funding investment required for ten new STE sites in the Waikato region with an estimated total cost at $17.487 million including both the roading costs (in, out and through the facility) and the facility itself. The DBC however did not take into consideration any changes in the design of the site to reflect current and future trends in disposal of the waste once it was collected. A list of these ten sites can be found in attachment one.

12. The DBC was approved by NZTA in February 2018 along with subsequent funding to fund up to 3 sites this year, dependent on cost.

**Stock truck effluent sites for construction (2019/2020)**

13. In 2018, three sites were identified as priority sites (see Table 1 below) for more detailed investigations (including consultation) with a view to progressing to construction.

14. Two sites (Kaimai SH29 and SH24, Taupō SH1 and SH5 roundabout) were identified as the highest priority to progress for construction by June 2020, and to which the focus of the project work has been directed. The third site (Eight Mile junction, SH3 and SH4) will continue to be a priority site that the project team will focus in more detail once the planning and design phases for the other two priority sites is completed. This is estimated to be around September 2019.

15. NZTA and WRC governance of the project, alongside the project team, have supported the decision to progress the Kaimai site located within Matamata-Piako District Council and the Taupō site located within Taupō District Council as the two higher priority sites for construction of both sites completed by June 2020. This was determined based upon geographic location and need, interest from the territorial authority, and feasibility to move forward within a short time frame.

16. These sites have been identified as high priority sites going forward based on their viability (and least amount of constraints) including criteria such as land ownership, geo-technical/ground conditions, safety issues, ease of implementation, and cost. They also provide a geographical spread across the Waikato region and also have strong support from key stakeholders in the region.

17. If any of these sites prove unfeasible, including the lack of support from territorial authorities, we will revisit the other medium – high priority sites as identified in the DBC.
18. Table 1 below identifies the site locations and progress to date for the sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Progress to date (2018)</th>
<th>Cost Estimates(^1) – (95\textsuperscript{th} percentile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kaimai Site</td>
<td>The intersection of SH29 and SH24 at the base of the Kaimai Ranges (Western side). A facility will be located adjacent to an existing enforcement/weigh facility.</td>
<td>Site Design: WSP Opus have been contracted by NZTA to lead the detailed site design, and have provided a preferred option supported by an external NZTA safety audit process. The Road Transport Association and stock truck operators were consulted to capture their feedback on the preferred option. Furthermore, as the site will be located next to a weigh station, Police were also engaged with. Feedback from the Road Transport Association and Police show support for the planned site location. The feedback from these stakeholders has been incorporated into the draft detailed design for the site. Final detailed site design is due to be completed on 17 May, with the tender process for construction following. It has been identified by the project team that the award for tender is planned for 23 July, with target completion date to open 1 November 2019. The project team is working diligently to understand how those timeframes can be amended to allow for construction to occur earlier.</td>
<td>Planning/resource consent requirements: WSP Opus have recommend an outline plan of works under the existing NZTA designation. There is however a legality question regarding the requirements associated with the legal ownership of the STE facility (not the land it sits on) for which we are seeking clarification from appropriate legal sources. MPDC are considering their position regarding consent requirements under their District Plan. Legal Agreements: Based on feedback from the NZTA and MPDC legal advisors, WRC legal advisor is currently preparing a final draft of the Multi-Party Funding Agreement (MPFA). A Maintenance and Operations Funding Agreement (MOFA) between WRC and MPDC for the site, is currently being drafted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$640,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The current NZTA Proforma for Scheme Estimate (SE) cost estimation was used for each site based on scheme drawings for each site. 95% estimates have been included in this report. Contingencies ranging between 15% and 20% were applied depending on site assessment. No costs have been allowed for future investigation although allowance has been made for professional fees and client managed costs during the Pre-Implementation phase and professional fees and client managed costs during the Implementation phase. Physical works have been estimated separately for each site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Progress to date (2018)</th>
<th>Cost Estimates(^1) – (95th percentile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collection, Treatment &amp; Disposal:</td>
<td>Roading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WRC is scheduling the preparation of a Strategic Action Plan to deliver a solution for the effluent collection and treatment. This will be informed by the Disposal Strategy work completed to date.</td>
<td>$1,386,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Taupo Site</td>
<td>SH1 and SH5 roundabout, Taupō (south-eastern quadrant of the intersection). The facility has been designed alongside a new ‘Weighright’ police enforcement facility.</td>
<td>The Strategic Action Plan will inform an RFP process. However, in order to have the Kaimai site operational by 1 November 2019 it is likely that a short-term, interim solution will be necessary to service and maintain this site. Interim solution options are being investigated by the project team to ensure for operation of the site within the 2019 calendar year.</td>
<td>$926,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Eight Mile Junction</td>
<td>Eight Mile junction, SH3 and SH4 The site is slightly west of the SH3/SH4 intersection on SH3 and will require a partial land acquisition.</td>
<td>Concerns raised by Waitomo District Council (WDC) are being addressed through ongoing discussions with WDC staff, safety audits, and consultation with truck operators. WDC have endorsed the regional stock truck effluent project, and agree in principle to a proposed stock truck effluent site at or near the Eight Mile junction intersection of SH3/SH4. They have reiterated their concerns with the proposed location, strongly advocating for a new location of the SH3 weighbridge. They request that the disposal and treatment of the effluent collected is to be decided upon by the project team as soon as practically possible. Furthermore, WDC have stated they will not take ownership nor asset management responsibilities of the site.</td>
<td>$926,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NZTA has worked with the project consultants, AECOM, to understand why the SH3 weighbridge wasn’t identified as a preferred location when the Detailed Business Case was completed. The consultants identified that the location wasn’t suitable due to:

- It requires the realignment of a stream that goes through the site which will require more RMA considerations and additional consent conditions
- It can only be used by traffic in one direction as the land across the road is elevated making earthworks more expensive
- It will take a longer time to get approvals and be of higher cost for a one-directional site only and was deemed too costly to make it work in both traffic directions.

WDC have a representative that serves on the Governance Group to ensure all communications of the project are shared. We will continue to work with WDC to address their concerns in order to find a solution for a STE site in Waitomo that supports the regional approach. WRC is planning to meet with Waitomo District Council in June for further discussions.

### Funding

19. Under the current NZTA funding policy, NZTA will pay 100% of the roading costs allocated with the facility (refer to the roading column in Table 1). Costs for constructing the facility (refer to the facility column in Table 1) will be funded approximately 50% by WRC with the remaining 50% funded by NZTA. The actual cost share between WRC and NZTA will depend on the Financial Assistance Rate (FAR) of the local authority in which the facility is located.

20. At the local authority level the costs will be ‘cost neutral’ as WRC pays the local share via the Council targeted rate and NZTA provides its share via the National Land Transport Programme. Currently there are four local authorities drawing from the fund for maintenance and operations (Matamata-Piako, Waitomo, South Waikato and Taupō District Councils).

### Programme issues and actions taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local territorial authority resourcing:</th>
<th>We are having discussions with each of the local territorial authorities to understand their concerns, confirm the roles and responsibilities through the MPFA, and support and deliver stakeholder engagement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local territory authorities are concerned about resource requirements for adequate engagement. They are not willing to undertake the proposed responsibility for leading consultation or public communications.</td>
<td>We have focused specifically on the Kaimai site as our first pilot site, and are working closely with Matamata-Piako District Council to ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local territory authorities appear to lack commitment and support for the project/sites.</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a full partnership approach. We will be working closely with Taupō District Council and continue to work with Waitomo District Council.

For Matamata-Piako District Council and Taupō District Council, the following actions have occurred:

- Discussion, review, editing and finalising in principle of the Multi-Party Funding Agreement to confirm the territorial authority’s role in the ownership, maintenance and management of the site and its assets. A licence to occupy agreement between NZTA and the territorial authority will be set-up to enable access to the facility.
- Initial assessments of the allocated funds of $30,000 p.a. for maintenance and effluent disposal indicate that this amount may be insufficient. The WRC project sponsor foreshadowed to council during annual plan discussions that when more accurate costings have been completed an increase in the targeted rate may be requested. This requirement will be reviewed at the next LTP.
- The transfer of the ownership of the asset from NZTA to the territorial authority will be completed after construction. However, the true legal description of “ownership” needs to be confirmed. The ownership of the land and asset was an issue that was raised by the territorial authorities, and was resolved at the workshop through discussions with NZTA.
- Consultation with iwi and affected land owners to identify any issues prior to resource consent applications.
- Completing an ROI process that includes the territorial authorities to provide input into the criteria, and serve on the evaluation panel.
- Drafting the RFP based on the ROI process for the maintenance of the site including removal, treatment and disposal of waste.
- Engagement with NZTA on the site layout (and preferred option) to identify any issues from the territorial authority and other key stakeholders (Police, Road Transport Association).

### Waste Disposal:
How the effluent from the facilities is going to be collected and treated is still unknown. Disposal

A Registration of Interest was undertaken to understand potential contractors for the collection and treatment of the effluent. It aimed
expectations are not clear and decisions related to treatment and disposal are at the discretion of the local territory authorities. LTAs have limited understanding of disposal options. This will likely result in existing contractors having extensions to their contracts rather than a robust tender process.

to seek a solution that met both economic and environmental outcomes. Taupō and Matamata-Piako District councils were part of the process, and served on the evaluation panel.

Council along with its partners are reviewing the best disposal methods for the region and site specific to understand what further information is required to move to the RFP stage. This includes investigation with MPDC as to whether the Morrinsville waste water treatment plant is a feasible option to dispose of the stock waste once it has been collected from the site.

An RFP will be undertaken to contract the disposal of the effluent to for each site. This will have to be completed by the territorial authority with support from WRC and can take up to minimum 8 weeks to complete.

Resource consents may be required to dispose of the waste, this may extend the time frame. WRC is working with each territorial authority to understand and support any consenting requirements.

WRC is currently undertaking further research as part of a new Disposal Strategic Action Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership of facility assets: Ownership of the effluent disposal facilities on state highway land once constructed is unclear and requires resolving. The understanding to date has been that the ownership of the asset on state highway land would be transferred to the TLA to own and maintain. However, this could potentially present issues if the asset was adjacent to state highway identified for future upgrade.</th>
<th>NZTA have investigated how other sites nationally operate and whether a MOU agreement between NZTA and the territorial authorities for the maintenance would be more appropriate. Their findings have indicated that ownership should be held with the territorial authorities through the transfer of the asset, and leasing of the land. This will be at no extra cost to the territorial authority. Further discussions and agreements with the local territorial authorities around this arrangement have been undertaken.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iwi Engagement: Engagement did not adequately take place with Iwi in the lead up to decisions regarding site location which could result in negative perception.</td>
<td>Working through local territory authority and iwi forums, the appropriate people have been identified to engage with. Site information and proposals have been shared with iwi for feedback. Detailed site designs will also be shared with iwi once they are completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project plan: The initial scope of the project plan was large and complex, and lacked a thorough and detailed understanding of the specific time</td>
<td>The NZTA/Council workshop identified the project plan would be focused specifically on the Kaimai site as a pilot, and would serve to inform the future site builds with a detailed thorough process around all the tasks associated with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
commitments required for each milestone specific to tender processes, resource consents, detailed design and engagement.

| engagement, legal documents and agreements, resource consents, tendering processes and awards for service. |
| The creation of a project management and governance structure with NZTA has been undertaken to enable delivery of the project plan to address the decision making required for the different phases of the project. |
| Meeting project milestones may be affected due to the time requirements required for stakeholder engagement and consultation, and availability of contractors to provide services (e.g. surveying). The project team is actively mitigating these issues, and working to ensure all future engagement and consultation work has larger timeframes built in to meet deadlines. |

30. Regular reports will be presented to the RTC on progress of STE facility construction.

**Attachments**
1. Stock truck effluent sites and estimated costs in the Waikato region
2. Location of the proposed STE sites
3. Locations of choice for stock truck effluent disposal facilities.
## Attachment 1: Stock truck effluent sites and estimated costs in the Waikato region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Cost Estimates² – (95th percentile)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The intersection of SH29 and SH24 at the base of the Kaimai Ranges (Western side).</td>
<td>$640,285</td>
<td>$197,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adjacent to the Ohinewai Interchange (Waikato Expressway) and Tahuna Road</td>
<td>$1,445,537</td>
<td>$162,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land adjacent to the SH1 and SH5 roundabout, Taupō</td>
<td>$1,386,086</td>
<td>$158,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whatawhata adjacent to SH23 (Raglan) and SH39 intersection</td>
<td>$1,397,687</td>
<td>$151,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Piarere existing truck layby (suited for northbound trucks only)</td>
<td>$456,806</td>
<td>$124,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Litchfield, Te Rere Road, off SH1 south of Putaruru</td>
<td>$1,216,990</td>
<td>$149,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adjacent to the existing truck wash site on Huiputea Road.</td>
<td>$176,066</td>
<td>$117,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turangi ‘Z’ Truck Stop close to SH1</td>
<td>$704,141</td>
<td>$179,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a(N)</td>
<td>SH2: Mangatawhiri bypass, one site for each direction</td>
<td>$3,672,160</td>
<td>$204,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b(S)</td>
<td>SH2: Mangatawhiri bypass, one site for each direction</td>
<td>$3,699,882</td>
<td>$164,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Eight Mile junction, SH3 and SH4</td>
<td>$926,302</td>
<td>$155,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Costs $17,487,003**  
**$15,721,942**  
**$1,765,061**

---

² The current NZTA Proforma for Scheme Estimate (SE) cost estimation was used for each site based on scheme drawings for each site. 95% estimates have been included in this report. Contingencies ranging between 15% and 20% were applied depending on site assessment. No costs have been allowed for future investigation although allowance has been made for professional fees and client managed costs during the Pre-Implementation phase and professional fees and client managed costs during the Implementation phase. Physical works have been estimated separately for each site.
Attachment 2: Location of the proposed STE sites
Attachment 3: Locations of Choice for Stock Truck Effluent Disposal Facilities

The map below shows the locations of choice for stock truck effluent disposal facilities. These were established during a series of five mapping workshops with stock truck effluent stakeholders.

- The deep red wider lines on the map show the original locations of choice seen in the Stock Truck Effluent Strategy 2010-2016.
- The blue dots are locations identified by truck drivers during the mapping workshops. It is interesting to note that many of these dots are near or on the original locations, reinforcing the current ten priority locations (see Table 3 above).
- The green spots indicate the current disposal facilities, either in-transit, sale yards or meat processing agencies.

---

3 These stakeholders included representatives from livestock transport companies, Road Transport Association, Federated Farmers and national road carriers
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 14 April 2019

Author: Nigel King, Team Leader, Transport and Infrastructure

Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy

Subject: Transport Planning and Projects Report – May 2019

Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To provide the Committee with an update on current regional transport plans and projects as at 14 April 2019.

Executive Summary
2. This report summaries some key planning and project matters for the committee’s information. It is intended to keep members abreast of current thinking in national, inter-regional and regional transport planning.

Staff Recommendation:

Background
3. A number of transport projects are being undertaken as part of the implementation of the 2018 Update to the Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan 2015-2045 and Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-2028. This report provides an update on these projects, together with other national and regional transport matters of interest, sorted by national, inter-regional and regional sub-groups as outlined in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project | Status | Future actions
--- | --- | ---
**Staff from MOT will attend the 6 May 2019 Regional Transport Committee (RTC) meeting as an early opportunity for RTC members to engage with the MOT on GPS 2021.**

**Long Term View**
The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) is developing the Long Term View (LTV). The LTV will look ahead at the big issues facing New Zealand over the next thirty years and it will go on to set agreed direction about how the sector wishes to position the land transport system over the next ten years to address these issues. The LTV will not be the avenue to agree on specific activities.

Katie Mayes from the NZTA LTV team attended the meeting of the RTC on 1 April to present on the project and discuss the region’s strategic opportunities and challenges. This provided an opportunity for Waikato RTC members to hear first-hand the direction of the LTV and to provide direct feedback to NZTA for consideration.

**Targeted Enhanced Financial Assistance Rate (TEFAR)**
A letter from NZTA Interim CE Mark Ratcliffe to CEs and Chairs of Local Government was sent in mid-March 2019. This issue was discussed at the 1 April 2019 meeting. There has been a strong response to this initiative with NZTA having received a large number of requests from councils seeking TEFAR for activities. This issue has been addressed through the NZTA Quarterly report also included on this agenda.

### Inter-regional activities

**Project** | **Status** | **Future actions**
--- | --- | ---
**Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Partnership**
The Hamilton to Auckland Corridor partnership is a collaboration between NZ Government, Waikato Regional Council, Hamilton City Council, Waikato District Council, Waipa District Council, Auckland Council, Waikato Tainui, Ngati Paoa, Hauraki and other iwi. The purpose of the partnership is to develop an integrated spatial plan and establishing an ongoing growth management partnership for the corridor between Hamilton and Auckland.

The objectives of the plan are to better support growth and increase connectivity in a way that realises its social, economic, cultural and environmental potential by:
- Improving housing affordability and choices
- Enhancing the quality of the natural and built environments and the vitality communities
- Improving access to employment, public services and amenities
- Creating employment opportunities.

At their March meeting, the Future Proof Implementation Committee agreed to build on the Future Proof model to include Central Government and Auckland Council as associate members for the purpose of the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor Plan, and to enhance Mana Whena representation.

The NZTA attended the 1 April RTC meeting to present on the LTV.

NZTA to continue to work with councils on TEFAR applications.

RTC to be kept informed on the Hamilton to Auckland Corridor partnership going forward.
### Regional activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Future actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-28 Regional Land Transport Plan</td>
<td>Implementation of the 2018 Regional Land Transport Plan is underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Public Transport Plan 2018-2028</td>
<td>The Regional Public Transport Plan 2018 – 2028 was adopted by the Regional Council on 12 December 2018 and became operational on 16 January 2019. The Plan now moves into an implementation phase. An update on the implementation of the RPTP is included in a separate RTC report “Regional Public Transport Projects Update”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato Regional Transport Model (WRTM)</td>
<td>A meeting of the WRTM Working group was held on Tuesday 12 March 2019. The next meeting of the WRTM working group will be held on 30 April 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Speed Management Plan</td>
<td>Work is currently underway on the draft Regional Speed Management Plan and alternative institutional arrangements for speed management. Please refer to the separate report “Regional Speed Management Approach report back” for further information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Hamilton</td>
<td>The One Network Steering Group (ONSG) comprising WRC, HCC and NZTA are working closely on One Network planning in Hamilton and in particular Access Hamilton. A key project going forward will be the Mass Transit Plan. An ONSG meeting was held on 26 March 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-Up Hamilton to Auckland Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td>This activity has progressed with support from the NZTA Board. Carriage refurbishment is currently being undertaken and pre-implementation activities are being undertaken to support the delivery of the service. A Project Control Working Group has been established to provide governance control for the project. An update on the SSBC project is included in a separate RTC “Regional Public Transport Projects Update”.</td>
<td>RTC to be kept informed on the progress of the Start-up Hamilton to Auckland Passenger Rail Service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of significance
4. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.

Conclusion
5. A number of important projects are happening at national, inter-regional and regional level. This report updates the RTC on key project and planning matters.
Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 18 April 2019

Author: Rachel Cook, Senior Policy Advisor-Transport Relationships, Transport and Infrastructure

Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy

Subject: Submission on Matamata-Piako District Council Transport by-law change

Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose
1. To update the committee on Matamata-Piako District Council’s Statement of Proposal ‘Shared Pathways’ Land Transport Bylaw, and to seek approval of a submission in support of the proposed bylaw.

Executive Summary
2. Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC) are consulting on a change to their Land Transport Bylaw to include Shared Pathways.

3. The proposed change will also enable the Hauraki Rail Trail, an initiative supported by the Regional Transport Committee, to be made and become operational within the district and are consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Road Safety Strategy.

4. Accordingly, a draft submission from the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) in support of the proposed changes has been prepared.

5. The submission comments on the implementation of shared paths and requests care in decision making around the most appropriate and safe place to use shared paths, as cycles on paths can at times have a negative effect on our most vulnerable pedestrians, in particular the elderly and disabled, and cycle lanes will be more appropriate in some cases.

Staff Recommendation:
1. That the report ‘Submission on Matamata-Piako District Council Transport by-law change’ (Regional Transport Committee 6 May 2019) be received.
2. That the Committee approve the draft submission to Matamata-Piako District Council’s Statement of Proposal ‘Shared Pathways’ Land Transport Bylaw (Doc # 14129968).

Background
6. Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC) are consulting on a bylaw change to their Land Transport Bylaw 2008. Submissions close on 22 April 2019 before this RTC meeting and so will be filed late – however late submissions can be considered at the discretion of MPDC.

7. Their Statement of Proposal seeks public support to amend their Bylaw to include Shared Pathways. The full proposal can be found at: https://www.mpdc.govt.nz/pdf/News/HaveYourSay/Consultation2019/SOPLandTransportBylaw.PDF.
8. The Statement of Proposal includes:

“the addition of shared pathways will allow Council to place shared pathways throughout the district for new projects and specifically at the moment it will allow for the Hauraki Rail Trail to be made and become operational. The extension to the Hauraki Rail Trail that will link Matamata and Te Aroha as well as some and extra sections within the Matamata-Piako District. The amendments include a range of technical requirements including signage, the location of the shared pathways being easily identifiable and terminology and definitions being added, this is required to reflect best practice, provide clarity and align with the LGA”.

“There are some other smaller amendments required to keep the Bylaw consistent, such as the term Shared Pathway being defined and the term Shared Pathway being included in other sections to restrict all activities that are not allowed on footpaths to also not be allowed on Shared Pathways”.\(^1\)

The wider issue
9. Paths have long being used by more than foot traffic (e.g. scooters, bicycles and skateboards). However, the success of regional cycle networks, more dense urban environments, increasing uptake of active transport modes and electronic mobility (e.g. e-scooters, bikes, skateboards etc.) are increasing pressure on these spaces and the risk of conflict between uses.

10. This is necessitating a more structured approach to managing these spaces. This is only possible when they are formally provided for in district policy and regulation such as proposed by MPDC to their Land Transport Bylaw. A level of regional consistency in approach is also desirable to ensure that users of shared paths can have consistent expectations of their experience across districts.

11. Currently councils in the Waikato region address shared pathways in their bylaws in different ways, and some, like Matamata-Piako may not currently have a shared pathway defined in their Land Transport Bylaw.

12. To enable the continued success of regional cycle trails, the uptake of active transport modes and safe and appropriate use of single-use and shared spaces, it in the regional interest to ensure that these spaces are appropriately provided for in local policy and regulation.

Submission
13. A draft RTC submission has been prepared supporting the Matamata-Piako District Council Statement of Proposal ‘Land Transport Bylaw’, as the proposed changes are consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan.

14. The submission comments on the implementation of shared paths and requests care in decision making around the most appropriate and safe place to use shared paths, as cycles on paths can at times have a negative effect on our most vulnerable pedestrians, in particular the elderly and disabled.

15. The Committee is asked to approve this draft submission, which is attached as Attachment 1 to this report.

\(^1\) https://www.mpdc.govt.nz/pdf/News/HaveYourSay/Consultation2019/SOPLandTransportBylaw.PDF
Strategic Alignment

16. The Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan² (RLTP) has a three key priorities that support the safe and appropriate use of shared paths:
   - Road Safety Priority 4, ‘Target behaviour change for highest risk and vulnerable users, and design and deliver safety initiatives for road users at highest risk’.
   - Access and Mobility Priority, ‘Provide safe, connected, coherent and accessible walking and cycling networks and facilities supported by activities aimed at reducing barriers to participation in active transport modes’ (Policy 23).

17. The RLTP Strategic Corridors and Economic Development policy framework Priority 9 is to ‘Maximise opportunities to grow a connected network of regional cycle trails.’

18. The Waikato Regional Road Safety Strategy 2017-21³ has a number of key short term priorities which support the safe and appropriate use of shared paths:
   1. ‘Plan and implement safe and appropriate pedestrian and cycle infrastructure’ (4.3.2).
   2. ‘Enable planning for the impacts of demographic change and the ability of all users to access the transport system safely’ (4.3.3).
   3. ‘Identify safe/unsafe routes and road crossing opportunities for vulnerable road users on preferred routes and town centre destinations’ (4.3.3).

Assessment of significance

19. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002, Land Transport Management Act 2003 or any other enactment.

Conclusion

20. The Committee is asked to support the addition of Shared Pathways to the Matamata-Piako District Council Land Transport Bylaw change as this supports regional priorities to increase safe walking and cycling connections, and growth around the region’s cycle trails.

Attachments

1. Regional Transport Committee Submission for Matamata-Piako Land Transport Bylaw April 2019 (Doc # 14129968).

Dear Sir/Madam

Regional Transport Committee Submission to the Land Transport Bylaw Review

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on the “Matamata-Piako Land Transport Bylaw.” Attached is Waikato Regional Transport Committee’s submission in regard to this document. This submission was formally endorsed by the Regional Transport Committee under delegated authority on 6 May 2019.

The Regional Transport Committee does not wish to be heard on this submission.

Should you have any queries regarding the content of this document please contact Rachel Cook, Senior Policy Advisor, on (07) 859 0571 or by email rachel.cook@waikatoregion.govt.nz

Regards

Clr Hugh Vercoe
Chairman Waikato Regional Transport Committee
Submission from Waikato Regional Transport Committee on the Matamata-Piako District Council Land Transport Bylaw Review – Shared Pathways

16 April 2019

Introduction

1. Waikato Regional Transport Committee appreciates the opportunity to make a submission on the Matamata-Piako District Council (MPDC) Land Transport Bylaw review. Overall, the Committee supports the addition of Shared Pathways to the Land Transport Bylaw.

2. Providing better connections through walking and cycling facilities supports priorities in the Regional Land Transport Plan (2018) and Waikato Regional Road Safety Strategy 2017-2021, and shared paths can support this when used appropriately and with adequate width.

Specific comments on the proposed Bylaw change.

Shared Pathways

3. Shared paths can be an appropriate and useful tool in some locations for supporting an increase in walking, cycling and micro mobility, and can be a cost efficient way to build infrastructure for people walking, cycling and wheeling. Shared paths typically provide a wider surface to accommodate users on mobility scooters, in wheelchairs (and their carers), people using pushchairs, scooters, e-scooters, and adaptive bikes.

4. Having said that, there are valid concerns around width and user behaviour which should be addressed, in particular for the benefit of our most vulnerable community members the elderly and disabled.

   a. As more people use a shared path, the conflict between pedestrians, and people cycling can increase due to the person cycling faster than pedestrians and having more mass or collision impact. This is well articulated in a 2017 submission by VICTA – the Visual Impairment Charitable Trust Aotearoa (NZ).

   b. As such, careful selection of the most appropriate place to locate shared paths, alongside signage, education and enforcement to support safe and considerate use is critical.

   c. It is important that where high a high number of cycle users are anticipated, appropriate and separated facilities for pedestrians are provided, as per best practice guidelines.

   d. Anecdotally, there is phenomenal increase in electric bikes (e-bikes) being imported into New Zealand and sold, although recent statistics are difficult to obtain. E-bikes are typically heavier than pedal bikes and can, but don’t necessarily, travel at higher speeds than peddle bikes. Where there are high volumes of people riding bikes, separation of modes should be considered for the safety of pedestrians.

5. The Waikato Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) has a three key priorities that support the safe and appropriate use of shared paths

   • Road Safety Priority 4, ‘Target behaviour change for highest risk and vulnerable users, and design and deliver safety initiatives for road users at highest risk’.
   • Access and Mobility Priority, ‘Provide safe, connected, coherent and accessible walking and cycling networks and facilities supported by activities aimed at reducing barriers to participation in active transport modes’ (Policy 23).

---

The Waikato Regional Road Safety Strategy 2017-21 has a number of key short term priorities which support the safe and appropriate use of shared paths:

- ‘Plan and implement safe and appropriate pedestrian and cycle infrastructure’ (4.3.2).
- ‘Enable planning for the impacts of demographic change and the ability of all users to access the transport system safely’ (4.3.3).
- ‘Identify safe/unsafe routes and road crossing opportunities for vulnerable road users on preferred routes and town centre destinations’ (4.3.3).

**Hauraki Rail Trail connection via Shared Pathway**

With the Committee’s support, Waikato Regional Council has been supporting the Hauraki Rail Trail (HRT) through ongoing work with regional cycle trail managers and their partners, via a regular forum and the development of the Waikato Regional Cycle Trails Network Programme Business Case. The business case identifies the need to enhance and extend trails, including connecting trails to communities to grow economic benefits locally and for the region.

The council supports the connection of the HRT to Matamata in order to create a multi-day trail which will attract a wider range of visitors to ride the trail and stay longer in the region. A shared path connecting in to Matamata will have wider benefits for residents through creating a path that can also be used for transport and recreation, provided it has sufficient width, is appropriately signed and user education on how to use a shared path is provided. Concerns about pedestrian conflict, as addressed above, should be considered and a separate cycle lane implemented where appropriate.

The RLTP Strategic Corridors and Economic Development policy framework Priority 9 is to ‘Maximise opportunities to grow a connected network of regional cycle trails.’

**Submitter Details**

Waikato Regional Transport Committee
c/- Waikato Regional Council
Private Bag 3038
Waikato Mail Centre
Hamilton 3240

(07) 859 0571
Attention: Rachel Cook, Senior Policy Advisor

---

Report to Regional Transport Committee

Date: 13 March 2019

Author: Nigel King, Team Leader Transport and Infrastructure

Authoriser: Tracey May, Director Science and Strategy

Subject: Regional Transport Issues Forum

Section: A (Committee has delegated authority to make decision)

Purpose

1. To provide the Committee with an opportunity to raise and discuss regionally significant transport issues in an open forum.

Executive Summary

2. The Regional Transport Committee members have raised a number of issues at previous Committee meetings and these matters are generally referred back to the appropriate organisation for action and then reported back to the Committee.

3. This report sets out the current Action table and incorporates actions that have been raised by Regional Transport Committee members in 2018 and 2019.

Staff Recommendation:

That the report Regional Transport Issues Forum (Regional Transport Committee 1 April 2019) be received.

Background

4. One of the objectives of the Regional Transport Committee (RTC), outlined in the Committee’s Terms of Reference, is to provide a regional forum for the consideration of regionally significant transport matters.

5. A Regional Transport Issues Forum is a standing item on the RTC agenda and provides an opportunity for RTC members to raise any regional transport matters that require consideration by the RTC. The Forum may go for up to 15 minutes in duration depending on matters brought forward by members. These transport matters should be brought to the Chair prior to the meeting.

6. An Action Table has been formed (refer Attachment 1) and staff from Waikato Regional Council, the NZ Transport Agency or territorial authorities will report back at following meetings on matters raised in the forum.

7. At the request of the Committee, issues and actions that have been completed have been removed from the Action Table. A complete record of issues raised can be obtained through prior RTC agendas.

Assessment of Significance

8. To the best of the writer’s knowledge, this decision is not significantly inconsistent with nor is anticipated to have consequences that will be significantly inconsistent with any policy adopted by this local authority or any plan required by the Local Government Act 2002 or any other enactment.
Conclusion
9. The Regional Transport Issues Forum provides RTC members with an opportunity to raise any regionally significant transport matters.

10. The Action Table sets out current issues raised by members and how they are being addressed.

Attachments
1. Regional Transport Issues Forum – Action Table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>From RTC meeting dated</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Action required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2018</td>
<td>Cr Adams noted that there were concerns with the Dell reserve heading out of Paeroa on the way to Waihi on SH 2. NZTA are looking at closing access to the reserve Work was undertaken to clear up the area and the council were struggling to get feedback from NZTA.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA</td>
<td>Matter passed on to NZTA staff for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2018</td>
<td>It was noted was a safety concern on SH 2 at Waikino where there was no safe walking path, and a lot of foot traffic along to the bridge and access to the rail trail. Hauraki District Council were looking for support from NZTA for consideration to reducing speed from the Waikino tavern to the bridge at Waitewheta Road.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA</td>
<td>Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2018</td>
<td>Cr Machen noted there had been issues through Tokoroa on a 500m section where new road markings were being trialled. There was concern in the town where there was a mass of lines and a number of pot holes that had opened up over the past couple of years. NZTA to follow up</td>
<td>NZTA to follow up</td>
<td>NZTA advised that they are working with staff from South Waikato District Council and were expecting to be able to complete the work required, alongside the consented stormwater work the council would be undertaking, by the end of summer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2018</td>
<td>Cr Brodie noted an underslip on SH3 heading out of Te Kuiti on Awakino hill. It had been noted there had been no progress in getting the underslip repaired which meant the passing lane was unable to be used and the road with a single lane was a challenge for vehicles, especially trucks. NZTA to address.</td>
<td>NZTA to address.</td>
<td>NZTA advised that they are meeting within the next week with Mayor Brian Hanna and that designs were underway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Cr Webber noted that there has been an issue of speed on State Highway 32 and raised concern about traffic going past the Marotiri School hall. Seeking a reduction in speed past the school.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA.</td>
<td>Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Mayor Barnes requested consideration be given to having median barriers or similar installed at the State Highway 1/29 intersection in Piarere in the absence of a roundabout to address safety concerns at this location. Mayor Barnes also noted an ongoing issue in the Morrinsville community regarding safety at the SH26/Avenue Road intersection and would like to have further engagement with NZTA about possible solutions. Mayor Barnes noted the issue of the incorrect installation of RIAWS at the SH29/Hopkins Road intersection. The expectation for delivery was mid-Feb 2019 and sought advice on when this was going to be remedied. Mayor Barnes noted the issue of potholing on the SH27 section of Firth Street in Matamata and was expecting work to be completed in March and sought advice on when this work might be complete.</td>
<td>Matters referred to NZTA. Matters passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Cr Fulton raised the issue of rural funding for road safety and specifically the Waikato District Council application for TEFAR activities and sought advice on when a decision may be available with regards to the application.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA. Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Cr Rimmington raised concern about the absence of work undertaken at the SH1/29 intersection at Piarere and requested urgent consideration be given to the construction of a roundabout at this location.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA. Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Cr Adams raised the issue of work undertaken on SH2 through Ngatae that did not take and sought advice from NZTA on options for remediation of the initial work.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA. Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Cr Machen referred to an earlier issue raised in August 2018 regarding blacked-out lines on SH1 through Tokoroa that were causing confusion for drivers. Earlier</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA. Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Follow Up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>Cr Christie raised concern about the ongoing resilience of State Highway 25 and sought guidance on whether there was opportunity to address corner easing in conjunction with maintenance or reclamation activities on the route.</td>
<td>Matter referred to NZTA.</td>
<td>Matter passed on to NZTA for follow up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

advice was that this would be remedied by the end of the 2018/19 summer season and sought an update on the work programme.