

The Chairman and Councillors  
**Regional Transport Committee**

**NOTICE IS GIVEN** that the next meeting of the **Regional Transport Committee** will be held in **The Boeing Room, Classic Flyers NZ.Com, 8 Jean Batten Drive, Tauranga Airport** on:

**EMBARGOED**

Until 2 working days before meeting on:

**Thursday, 5 May 2011**

**commencing at 9.30 a.m.**

Members please note that a Workshop is scheduled during the day, that will be used to further develop the Draft Regional Land Transport Strategy

Bill Bayfield  
**Chief Executive**

28 April 2011



## **Regional Transport Committee - Terms of Reference**

### **Delegated Function**

Section 105(1) of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 requires the Regional Council to establish a Regional Transport Committee for its region. Section 105 is a new section dealing with the establishment of Regional Transport Committees and was inserted in the Act by the Land Transport Management Amendment Act 2008 which commenced on 1 August 2008.

### **Membership**

Each regional council must appoint to its regional transport committee:

- Two persons to represent the regional council;
- One person from each territorial authority in the region to represent that territorial authority;
- One person to represent the agency;
- One person to represent the objective of economic development;
- One person to represent the objective of safety and personal security;
- One person to represent the objective of public health;
- One person to represent the objective of access and mobility;
- One person to represent the objective of environmental sustainability; and
- One person to represent cultural interest.

Each regional council must appoint from its representatives the chair and deputy chair of the committee.

At any meeting of a regional transport committee, the chair, or any other person presiding the meeting,

- Has a deliberative vote; and
- In the case of an equality of votes, does not have a casting vote (and therefore the act or question is defeated and the status quo is preserved).

### **Term of the Committee**

As soon as practicable after each triennial election, every regional council must establish a regional transport committee under Section 105(1) of the Land Transport Management Act 2003 for its region.

### **Specific Responsibilities and Delegated Authority**

To prepare for approval by the Regional Council:

- 1 A Regional Land Transport Strategy for its region, any variations to it and any reports on it.
- 2 A regional land transport programme for its region and any variations to it.
- 3 Any advice and assistance the Regional Council may request in relation to its transport responsibilities generally.
- 4 Approve submissions to central government, local authorities and other agencies on Regional Transport Committee related matters.

Each Regional Transport Committee must adopt a policy that determines significance in respect of variations made to regional land transport programmes and regional land transport strategies.

### Procedure of the Committee

The persons appointed to represent the objectives of economic development, safety and personal security, public health, access and mobility, environmental sustainability; and cultural interest have full speaking rights but are not entitled to vote on matters related to regional land transport programmes.

The persons appointed to represent the objectives of economic development, safety and personal security, public health, access and mobility, environmental sustainability; and cultural interest are entitled to vote on matters related to regional land transport strategies and regional fuel tax schemes.

The provisions of the Local Government Act 2002 and the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 concerning the meetings of committees of regional councils, so far as they are applicable and with the necessary modifications, apply in respect of meetings of the regional transport committees.

#### **Note:**

- *The Regional Transport Committee does not have any financial delegation.*
- *Under the Local Government Act 2002 the Regional Transport Committee is not defined as a joint committee.*
- *The Regional Transport Committee reports directly to the Regional Council.*

## Public Forum

1. A period of up to 15 minutes shall be set aside near the beginning of the meeting to enable members of the public to make statements about any matter on the agenda of that meeting which is open to the public, but excluding any matter on which comment could prejudice any specified statutory process the council is required to follow.
2. The time allowed for each speaker will normally be up to 5 minutes but will be up to the discretion of the chair. A maximum of 3 public participants will be allowed per meeting.
3. No statements by public participants to the Council shall be allowed unless a written, electronic or oral application has been received by the Chief Executive (Governance Team) by 12.00 noon of the working day prior to the meeting and the Chair's approval has subsequently been obtained. The application shall include the following:
  - name of participant;
  - organisation represented (if any);
  - meeting at which they wish to participate; and matter on the agenda to be addressed.
4. Members of the meeting may put questions to any public participants, relevant to the matter being raised through the chair. Any questions must be asked and answered within the time period given to a public participant. The chair shall determine the number of questions.



## Committee Membership

**Chairman:** Councillor J Nees (Bay of Plenty Regional Council)

**Deputy Chairman:** D Owens (Bay of Plenty Regional Council)

**Members:** Mayor T Bonne (Mayor, Whakatane District Council), Councillor R Chase (Kawerau District Council), Mayor S Crosby (Tauranga City Council), Mayor J Forbes (Opotiki District Council), Senior Sergeant S Nightingale (NZ Police), Mayor R Paterson (Western Bay of Plenty District Council), B Pointon (BOP District Health Board), N Pope (Access and Mobility Representative), T Reynish (Economic Sustainability Representative), T Richardson (Environmental Sustainability Representative), M Tapsell (Cultural Interest Representative), H Wilson (NZ Transport Agency), Mayor K Winters (Rotorua District Council)

**Secretary:** S Kameta

---

Recommendations in reports are not to be construed as Council policy until adopted by Council.

## Agenda

### 1 Apologies

### 2 General Business and Tabled Items

Items not on the agenda for the meeting require a resolution under section 46A of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 stating the reasons why the item was not on the agenda and why it cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.

### 3 Reports

3.1 **Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding** 11

3.2 **Regional Land Transport Strategy Draft Significance Policy** 13

3.3 **Approval of Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy for Consultation** 17

Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy 2011 - 2041

### 4 Consideration of General Business



## Reports



**File Reference:** 2.00025  
8.00048  
8.00049

**Significance of Decision:** Low

**Report To:** Regional Transport Committee

**Meeting Date:** 5 May 2011

**Report From:** Garry Maloney, Transport Policy Manager



---

## Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding

---

### Executive Summary

This report advises the Regional Transport Committee that Government has released 'Engagement document - Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding 2012/13 – 2021/22' and seeks guidance from the Committee on how it wishes to respond.

## 1 Recommendations

**That the Regional Transport Committee under its delegated authority:**

- 1 Receives the report, Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding.**
- 2 Delegates to the Committee Chair the power to approve a submission on behalf of the Regional Transport Committee on the 'Engagement document - Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding 2012/13 – 2021/22'.**
- 3 Confirms that the significance of the decision has been assessed as LOW, and under Section 79 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) confirms that in light of the level of significance of the decision it does not require: (a) Further identification and assessment of different options under section 77 LGA; (b) Further investigation or consideration of community views under section 78 LGA; (c) Any further written record of the manner in which section 77 and section 78 matters have been addressed.**

## 2 Introduction

On 26 April 2011, the Ministry of Transport selectively released 'Engagement document - Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding 2012/13 – 2021/22' for consultation (appended). Due to the way in which the engagement document was released and the timeframes for preparing the Committee Agenda (the Agenda was dispatched on 28 April), Regional Council are unable to provide members within this report:

- an overview of the document;
- any analysis; and

- a draft submission for consideration at the meeting.

With that in mind, the Committee should consider whether it wishes to submit on the document and the process it will follow to do so. I note that 'feedback' is required by 5:00 pm on 27 May 2011 (that is, before the next Committee meeting).

I suggest that one way to progress this matter is for:

- members to provide feedback on the engagement document at the Committee meeting;
- Regional Council staff will prepare a draft submission and circulate it to members for their further input;
- the Committee to empower the Chair to approve the submission on its behalf so that it can be submitted by the close of the consultation process.

### **3 Financial Implications**

#### **Current Budget**

There are no current budget financial implications.

#### **Future Implications**

Future financial implications will not be known until the Government Policy Statement has been finalised.

#### **Ten Year / Annual Plan Implications**

Ten Year and/or Annual Plan implications will not be known until the Government Policy Statement has been finalised.

Garry Maloney  
**Transport Policy Manager**

**for Transport Policy Manager**

**28 April 2011**

# Appendix



# Engagement document

## GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENT ON LAND TRANSPORT FUNDING 2012/13 – 2021/22

The Ministry of Transport, on behalf of the Minister of Transport, would like to hear your views on the direction of the next Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding (GPS 2012). This engagement document outlines the direction proposed for GPS 2012.

Please provide any feedback by **5pm on Friday 27 May 2011**. This timeframe is necessary so GPS 2012 can inform the development of the National Land Transport Programme<sup>1</sup> for 2012–15.

Written feedback is preferred and can be provided by:

- e-mail to [GPS@transport.govt.nz](mailto:GPS@transport.govt.nz)
- writing to GPS Development Team, Ministry of Transport, Novell House, 89 The Terrace, PO Box 3175, Wellington

Your feedback will be considered alongside that from other key stakeholders and will be provided to the Minister to inform his final decisions on the GPS. The key stakeholders include Local Government New Zealand and representative groups of land transport users and providers.

In addition, to your views on the proposed direction for the next GPS, the Ministry is also interested in hearing feedback on whether the design of the GPS document could be improved. We welcome your thoughts on the design of the previous GPS document and, in particular, would appreciate feedback on:

- The structure of the previous GPS document. Which sections are useful and which could be improved?
- The information covered in the GPS. Is there other information you think would be useful to include?"

If you have any enquires on the feedback process please contact Marian Willberg on 04 439 9290 or [GPS@transport.govt.nz](mailto:GPS@transport.govt.nz).

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Land Transport Programme sets out the land transport projects and services that are likely to receive funding from the National Land Transport Fund. The National Land Transport Programme is prepared by the NZ Transport Agency and is published on a three-yearly basis. It must give effect to the GPS. Regional land transport programmes, on which the National Land Transport Programme is based, must be consistent with the GPS.

## What is the GPS?

The GPS is issued by the Minister of Transport every three years. It sets the outcomes and priorities the government expects from the investment of the National Land Transport Fund. The GPS describes:

- what the government wishes to achieve from its annual investment of around \$3 billion in land transport through the National Land Transport Fund
- how it will achieve this through certain areas of investment known as activity classes (eg road safety, State highways)
- how much funding will be provided
- how the funding will be raised.

The GPS influences decisions on how money from the National Land Transport Fund will be invested in activity classes, such as State highways and public transport. It also guides the NZ Transport Agency and local government on the type of activities that should be included in regional land transport programmes and the National Land Transport Programme.

While the GPS provides a national picture of land transport funding, the detail of how money is allocated to regions and specific activities is the responsibility of the NZ Transport Agency. However, in carrying out this responsibility the NZ Transport Agency must give effect to the GPS while also taking regional land transport strategies and programmes into account. This means the direction and aims of the GPS have a direct effect on the money that will go to regions and activities.

---

## What did GPS 2009 do?

In the last GPS, GPS 2009, the government changed the direction and priorities of land transport funding to:

- make increased economic growth and productivity the main goal for land transport expenditure. As part of this, GPS 2009 emphasised the need for transport infrastructure to encourage future economic growth
- allow for a short to medium-term focus on using roading investments to stimulate economic activity in response to the economic downturn
- focus investment into projects and services that offer value-for-money through an emphasis on economic efficiency
- place particular importance on investing in the State highway network and to prioritise work on seven initial Roads of National Significance as key to reducing congestion, improving safety and supporting economic growth

A lot of progress has been made in terms of these aims. Land transport investment has been refocused onto increasing economic growth and productivity, and projects have been prioritised from a national perspective.

Good progress has been made on the **Roads of National Significance** (RoNS) and all seven are on track. At the same time, work on **State highway improvements** is ahead of plan. This is partly a result of bringing funding forward to provide work for contractors during the recession. In addition to the RoNS programme, funding has been approved for other important roading projects around the country (e.g. the Kōpū bridge replacement and the Hawke's Bay expressway southern extension).

To improve **walking and cycling** a proportion of the funding from the walking and cycling, facilities activity class is concentrated on two model communities in New Plymouth and Hastings. These initiatives seek to reduce congestion by encouraging walking and cycling. Based on the experience of the Cycling Demonstration Towns programme in England, an increase in walking and cycling in New Plymouth and Hastings is expected as a result of these projects. By concentrating the funding on these two areas we are likely to get greater gains overall, rather than spreading the funding across a larger number of smaller projects throughout the country.

Outside of the National Land Transport Fund, there have been major investments to upgrade, modernise and expand **metro rail** systems in Auckland and Wellington. By making significant improvements in service frequency, quality and reliability we expect metro rail operators to attract more users and make better use of the network.

**Public transport** is also being improved through a new operating model which is being tested for the bus and ferry sector. This model aims to create incentives for public transport providers to operate more commercially and improve services so there is greater patronage and less reliance on subsidies.

---

## What is the direction planned for GPS 2012?

In GPS 2012, the Minister of Transport proposes to broadly continue the overall direction set by GPS 2009. To continue this direction and better support future economic growth, some changes to GPS 2012 are planned. These changes are important given the need to repair the land transport system in Canterbury, while at the same time maintain momentum in roading projects critical to the nation's future economic growth.

This means the following three priorities will be included in GPS 2012.

- **A strong and continuing focus on economic growth and productivity.** The government's investment in land transport should support increased economic growth and productivity in New Zealand. This includes providing any ongoing support necessary to repair the land transport system in Canterbury over the next 3

years alongside continuing to improve the State highway network, particularly through the RoNS programme.

- **Value-for-money.** As for other areas of public spending, it is expected that land transport services should be delivered better and smarter. Asset management will be improved to boost the performance of roading infrastructure. Although value-for-money is stressed in GPS 2009 its focus is on the initial selection of projects and activities. GPS 2012 will make it clear that getting more out of what is spent is an expectation.
- **Road safety.** Road safety is a transport priority for the government, This will be reflected in the GPS so that the direction outlined in *Safer Journeys*, the government's road safety strategy, will be supported through the next National Land Transport Programme.

### **Including a statement of strategic direction**

To provide greater clarity to the NZ Transport Agency and the New Zealand transport sector, the Minister of Transport proposes including a statement of strategic direction in GPS 2012. This will set out the government's overall vision for the sector. The strategic direction in GPS 2012 will be guided by the non-statutory Forward Plan for Transport which the Minister of Transport is currently developing and the second National Infrastructure Plan, which will outline the government's vision for New Zealand's infrastructure to 2030.

In GPS 2009 the government committed to developing a Forward Plan for Transport. It is intended that the Forward Plan will replace the non-statutory New Zealand Transport Strategy, issued by the previous government.

Currently the vision for the transport sector is:

*An effective, efficient, safe, secure, accessible and resilient transport system that supports growth in our country's economy in order to deliver greater prosperity, security and opportunities for all New Zealanders.*

In addition, where appropriate, the strategic direction for GPS 2012 will also take into account work on the Auckland spatial plan. The Auckland spatial plan will articulate the 20 to 30 year vision for Auckland.

### **Removing the short to medium-term focus on economic stimulus**

The Minister intends to remove the specific short term emphasis on using transport investment to provide additional economic stimulus. This emphasis was added to GPS 2009 in response to the global economic crisis so transport expenditure could help soften the impact of the recession.

The need for a specific focus on short term stimulus has reduced as a result of the significant development and construction programme now underway, particularly as a result of the increased expenditure on the State highway programme.

In 2010, the NZ Transport Agency estimated that the State highway programme accounts for around 9,000 jobs each year. The RoNS make up a significant share of this. For each of the 10 to 15 years that the RoNS are being delivered, on average there will be around 3,000 employed on their construction.

Delivery of the State highway programme has preserved and will continue to preserve a significant number of jobs in the construction sector.

### **Roads of National Significance**

In GPS 2009, the government listed seven RoNS as national roading priorities. These are seven of New Zealand's most essential routes and all require significant development to reduce congestion, improve safety and support economic growth. Progress on the seven RoNS is well underway. As roading construction projects have a long-term timeframe, investment in RoNS will continue throughout the GPS 2012 period. The ongoing RoNS programme is an important part of meeting the priority for greater economic growth and productivity.

As RoNS projects are completed new ones can be added. Although the Minister of Transport does not propose announcing new RoNS in GPS 2012, potential new routes can be identified through the State highway classification system, as required. This system is being developed by the NZ Transport Agency and Ministry of Transport to classify State highways based on the traffic carried and the function performed. This initiative aims to build a national consensus on the role and function of different State highways, and thus the nature of improvements that can be expected over a 20 year timeframe.

The draft State highway classification paper has identified four more high value highways, parts or all of which could be possible future RoNS. These are:

- Hamilton to Tauranga
- Cambridge to Taupō
- Hawke's Bay Expressway further development
- State Highway 1 north and south of the current Christchurch motorway projects.

These routes are of national strategic importance based on their high volumes of traffic, their importance for freight movements, including port access, and the need to improve road safety on these routes.

### **Making explicit the full extent of infrastructure investment in road safety**

Roading improvements have contributed significantly to the gains that New Zealand has made over time in reducing deaths and serious injuries from road crashes, and are a key part of the *Safer Journeys* road safety strategy. Currently much of the infrastructure expenditure appears as roading improvements or maintenance with the safety portion tending to be understated. Part of the safe system approach to road safety means recognising that reducing death and injury requires investment in all aspects of the road system and not just a focus on the road user.

To support this approach, the Minister of Transport proposes to indicate in the GPS the proportion of the State highway and local road expenditure that is expected to provide safety benefits. This will include a proportion of the cost of the RoNS and other large projects. All of the RoNS projects will contribute to improving the safety of our State highway network. Safety specific expenditure will include:

- safety improvements such as installing safety barriers, improving line markings, providing better passing opportunities, intersection improvements, rural road realignments and demonstration projects<sup>2</sup>
- safety improvements that target high-risk rural roads, high-risk intersections and motorcycle black routes
- maintenance and renewal activity for safety e.g. providing the appropriate level of skid resistance.

On this basis the Minister of Transport expects the following amounts to be invested within overall roading expenditure over the first three years of GPS 2012 to improve the safety of our roading network:

Safety related roading expenditure	2012/13 \$ million	2013/14 \$ million	2014/15 \$ million
State highways	150–240	150–240	150–240
Local roads	80–120	80–120	80–120

The NZTA would be expected to report on how its overall expenditure has improved road safety outcomes. For example, the extent to which the proportion of vehicle kilometres travelled on 3-star or 4-star roads has increased relative to 1-star and 2-star roads<sup>3</sup>.

This change will make it clear that safety is a key part of activity across the National Land Transport Programme and does not only occur in activity funded through the road user safety activity class.

### Canterbury earthquake recovery

Costs to reinstate the State highway and local road network following the Canterbury earthquakes are currently estimated by the NZ Transport Agency at around \$360–\$470 million. Most of this cost, \$300–\$400 million, is for Christchurch City Council roads. This cost is likely to be spread over 4 to 5 years and will therefore impact on the 2012–2015 National Land Transport Programme.

The New Zealand Transport Agency will contribute to the Christchurch City Council's costs on the basis of its special funding assistance rate for emergency works. Current

<sup>2</sup> Demonstration projects trial and show-case the safe system approach to improving road safety that is outlined in *Safer Journeys*. The projects incorporate roading improvements, speed management and road user and vehicle initiatives as appropriate. The intention is to focus the projects on high-risk rural roads and high-risk urban intersections and one project is currently underway in Maramarua (Waikato).

<sup>3</sup> The star ratings measure and rate the safety that is built into roads. The ratings range from 1-star which represents a road with poor infrastructure design for the prevailing speed environment, to 5-star which represents the safest road infrastructure design. Our greatest safety gains from roading, in terms of reducing road deaths and serious injuries, will come from moving traffic off 1-star and 2-star roads and onto 3-star and 4-star roads.

assumptions suggest that this rate might be around 75 percent (the Christchurch City Council's usual rate for maintenance spending is around 43 percent).

If the rebuild for Christchurch City Council's roads from the 22 February quake remains within the currently estimated \$300–\$400 million, the New Zealand Transport Agency share should be able to be met from within the National Land Transport Programme over the projected 4 to 5 year period that the work is expected to proceed. Some of this funding will come from the existing emergency works provisions within the National Land Transport Fund, and some will come from reprioritisation of expenditure.

There is also likely to be a need to reprioritise currently planned projects in Canterbury. For example, some already programmed maintenance and renewals work will no longer proceed because the relevant roads will be rebuilt as part of the recovery effort. It is also likely that the location and form of the proposed new central city bus interchange will need to be re-considered. The timing of parts of the Christchurch Roads of National Significance programme may need to be reconsidered and either put back, or brought forward, depending on decisions taken around new housing areas and any new commercial areas.

---

## What impacts will GPS 2012 contain?

The GPS sets out a number of specific targets known as impacts. In GPS 2012, the Minister of Transport intends to continue the impacts set out in GPS 2009. These are:

- Improvements in the provision of infrastructure and services that enhance transport efficiency and lower the cost of transportation through:
  - Improvements in journey time reliability
  - Easing of severe congestion
  - More efficient freight supply chains
  - Better use of existing transport capacity
- Better access to markets, employment and areas that contribute to economic growth
- A secure and resilient transport network
- Reductions in road deaths and serious injuries
- More transport choices, particularly for those with limited access to a car
- Reductions in adverse environmental effects from land transport
- Contributions to positive health outcomes

The government also expects to see progress on other social and environmental goals. This means contributing to the aim of achieving an affordable, integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land transport system.

## How much funding is there?

The total level of investment available through the National Land Transport Fund is expected to be approximately \$3 billion in 2012/13 rising to \$4.20 billion in 2021/22.

---

## How will funding be allocated?

The GPS includes funding ranges. These set out the maximum and minimum that can be spent on particular activity classes. Because the funding allocations for each activity class are specified as a range, the NZ Transport Agency has some flexibility to adjust actual funding levels in responding to requests set out in regional land transport programmes and in managing overall investment under the National Land Transport Programme.

### Summary of proposed funding allocations

Table 1 below shows the proposed three year activity class funding ranges for GPS 2012, alongside the actual and projected levels of expenditure for the three years of the National Land Transport Programme (2009/10–2011/12)<sup>4</sup>. The proposed funding ranges for each activity class over the 10 years of GPS 2012 are given in the Appendix.

To improve the focus on value for money, there are a number of proposed changes to the funding ranges for the activity classes. These changes imply more prudence in the allocation and application of transport revenue.

In the current economic environment, the government must ensure that wherever possible investment in transport projects generates high value returns. This requires difficult decisions to be made on the level and mix of investment, and on the way revenue pressures will be managed. There will need to be greater emphasis on finding efficiencies and savings and making appropriate trade-offs.

As is shown in Table 1, the funding ranges for six activity classes would allow expenditure to be broadly maintained at the same nominal level as for 2011/12. In proposing this, the Minister is aware that the funding range for the maintenance and operation of local roads may not be sufficient given the level of damage the Canterbury earthquakes, particularly the 22 February 2011 quake, have caused the local road network.

There is an opportunity to align the New Zealand Cycle Trail Network Expansion Project with GPS 2012. General State highway and local road maintenance and improvement programmes could, where appropriate, include provision for such treatments. This could be reflected in the GPS descriptions of the State highway and local roading activity classes.

---

<sup>4</sup> These figures are from the National Land Transport Programme snap-shot as at 1 March 2011 that can be found on [www.nzta.govt.nz/planning/what-funding/nltp.html](http://www.nzta.govt.nz/planning/what-funding/nltp.html). These numbers are subject to change, particularly in response to the Canterbury earthquake.

For four activity classes<sup>5</sup> the ranges would reduce expenditure from 2011/12 levels. For the public transport infrastructure activity class, expenditure will be maintained at the 2011/12 level to reflect the previous decision by the government to fund the majority of metro-rail infrastructure improvements directly through Crown funds rather than through the National Land Transport Fund. The range has been narrowed to focus expenditure on a limited number of high-priority projects.

Two activity class ranges would increase: new and improved State highways and public transport services. Increases in the former reflect our commitment to have all RoNS under construction, to complete the Waikato expressway within 10 years, and to substantially complete construction of the Waterview Connection by 2016.

The increases in the public transport services activity class reflect additional operating costs following the upgrading, modernising and expanding the metro rail systems in Auckland and Wellington from the National Land Transport Fund.

No change would be made to the funding range for the walking and cycling activity class. The GPS 2009 funding range allows for a \$3 million increase in the upper band of the range from 2012/13 onward<sup>6</sup>. This is important to support the growth that is occurring in these modes and to increase safety. It also allows future model communities to be included as the existing two communities are completed.

---

## Other land transport funding policies

It is proposed that the GPS 2012 will not affect other funding policies such as funding assistance rates or regionally distributed funds (R-funds). Officials are currently developing future funding mechanisms for any future continuation of R-funding. The Minister will consider these options before R-funding expires in March 2015.

---

<sup>5</sup> Road user safety, sector training and research, transport planning and management of the funding allocation system.

<sup>6</sup> Under GPS 2009 the funding range for walking and cycling in 2010/11 was \$12 million – 27 Million. This increases to \$12million –\$30 million in 2011/12.

**Table 1: Proposed 3 year funding ranges by activity class**

NLTP spend by Activity class	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	Direction	
	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M		
New & improved infrastructure for State highways	1102	1035	1036	875 1150	900 1200	950 1300	↑	Upper expenditure limit raised to allow progress on all projects including RoNs to be maintained
Renewal of State highways	232	202	202	180 220	180 220	180 220	→	Allows current levels of activity to be maintained, but funding ranges have been lowered to encourage efficiency
Maintenance & operation of State highways	307	299	300	225 325	225 325	225 325	→	
New & improved infrastructure for local roads	165	156	132	130 180	130 185	130 190	→	
Renewal of local roads	205	232	236	190 240	190 240	190 240	→	
Maintenance & operation of local roads	224	248	251	205 260	205 260	205 260	→	
Road policing	288	298	302	280 310	280 310	280 310	→	
Public transport services	187	210	220	220 290	230 300	240 330	↑	
Public transport infrastructure	101	50	57	20 60	20 60	20 60	↘	Upper expenditure limit lowered to focus on highest priorities
Road user safety	36	40	38	29 36	29 36	29 36	↓	Funding range lowered and narrowed to drive efficiencies
Walking & cycling facilities	18	13	15	12 30	12 30	12 30	✓	No change
Sector training & research	5	6	6	3 5	3 5	3 5	↓	Funding range lowered and narrowed to drive efficiencies
Transport planning	20	32	32	14 23	14 23	14 23	↓	Funding range lowered and narrowed to remove unnecessary planning & reduce duplication
Management of the funding allocation system	36	34	32	26 30	26 30	26 30	↓	Funding range lowered to drive efficiencies
Expenditure actual/projected	2927	2856	2866	3000	3100	3250		

Actual spend	
Projected allocation	
Proposed funding ranges	

## Appendix

## Proposed funding ranges for 2012/13–2021/22 by activity class

Activity class	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22
	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M
New & improved infrastructure for State highways	850 1150	875 1150	900 1200	950 1300	1000 1400	1050 1450	1100 1500	1150 1550	1200 1600	1250 1700	1300 1750
Renewal of State highways	200 240	180 220	180 220	180 220	190 230	190 230	190 230	200 240	200 240	200 240	200 240
Maintenance & operation of State highways	280 345	255 325	255 325	255 325	255 350	255 350	255 360	255 360	255 360	255 380	255 380
New & improved infrastructure for local roads	150 250	130 180	130 185	130 190	140 210	140 210	140 210	150 230	150 230	150 230	160 250
Renewal of local roads	220 260	190 240	190 240	190 240	200 250	200 250	200 270	210 270	210 290	210 290	210 310
Maintenance & operation of local roads	225 290	205 260	205 260	205 260	205 280	205 280	205 280	205 300	205 300	205 300	205 320
Road policing	302 314	280 310	280 310	280 310	280 315	280 315	280 315	280 320	280 320	280 320	280 320
Public transport services	205 235	220 290	230 300	240 330	255 340	270 360	280 370	295 390	295 410	295 420	295 440
Public transport infrastructure	20 100	20 60	20 60	20 50	20 50	20 40	20 40	20 30	20 30	20 30	20 30
Road user safety	30 55	29 36	29 36	29 36	29 36	29 36	29 36	31 38	31 38	31 38	33 38
Walking & cycling facilities	12 27	12 30	12 30	12 30	14 32	14 32	14 32	15 34	15 34	15 34	16 36
Sector training & research	5 7	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5	3 5
Transport planning	20 32	14 23	14 23	14 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23	15 23
Management of the funding allocation system	29 35	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30	26 30
<b>Expenditure target</b>	<b>2900</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>3100</b>	<b>3250</b>	<b>3400</b>	<b>3500</b>	<b>3650</b>	<b>3800</b>	<b>3900</b>	<b>4100</b>	<b>4200</b>



**File Reference:** 2.00101  
7.00047  
**Significance of Decision:** Low



**Report To:** Regional Transport Committee  
**Meeting Date:** 5 May 2011  
**Report From:** Garry Maloney, Transport Policy Manager

---

## Regional Land Transport Strategy Draft Significance Policy

---

### Executive Summary

The Land Transport Management Act (LTMA) requires the Regional Transport Committee (RTC) to develop and adopt a significance policy to determine the point at which variations to the Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) trigger the need to revisit public consultation. This report proposes a draft policy for the Committee's consideration

### 1 Recommendations

**That the Regional Transport Committee under its delegated authority:**

- 1 Receives the report, Regional Land Transport Strategy Draft Significance Policy.**
- 2 Adopts the Significance Policy outlined in the report, Regional Land Transport Strategy Draft Significance Policy, for inclusion in the draft Bay of Plenty Regional Land Transport Strategy 2011 – 2041.**
- 3 Confirms that the significance of the decision has been assessed as LOW, and under Section 79 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) confirms that in light of the level of significance of the decision it does not require: (a) Further identification and assessment of different options under section 77 LGA; (b) Further investigation or consideration of community views under section 78 LGA; (c) Any further written record of the manner in which section 77 and section 78 matters have been addressed**

### 2 Introduction

Section 77(m) of the LTMA requires each regional transport committee (RTC) adopt a policy that determines significance in respect to variations made to its RLTS. The significance policy will apply to any process initiated under Section 81(4) of the LTMA. This section states that a variation to the RLTS does not require public consultation providing the variation is not significant.

The significance policy determines the threshold for the extent of changes at which the region will revisit public consultation.

Public consultation contributes to the transparency and accountability of any process, but consultation also involves a degree of time and cost. Any significance policy will need to have thresholds that maintain an open and transparent process, but do not trigger consultation every time a relatively minor variation is required to the Strategy.

### 3 **Draft Significance Policy**

The following draft Significance Policy is presented to the Committee for its consideration:

*“The RLTS can be varied at any time but consultation will be required in accordance with section 78 of the LTMA if the variation is significant.*

*The significance of any proposed variation to the RLTS will be made on a case by case basis. When making a decision as to the significance of the matter the RTC will consider information on the reasons for the variation, the options, relative costs and benefits and those affected by the decision.*

*When determining the significance of a proposed variation to the RLTS, consideration will be given by the RTC to the extent to which the variation:*

- *affects the RLTP or any of the region’s local authority Long Term Plans;*
- *is consistent with national or regional policies and strategies;*
- *is consistent with the preferred strategic direction in the strategy; and*
- *affects the overall affordability and integrity of the strategy.*

*Matters that are not considered significant include:*

- *the addition, removal or amendment of any matter that has already been consulted on in accordance with section 78 of the LTMA; and*
- *minor editorial changes to the strategy.”*

The Significance Policy proposed above enables changes to be made to the Strategy that will have little impact on the direction and integrity of the document. An example of this could be the addition of updated facts and figures in the Context chapter of the document. In these cases the expense in undertaking full consultation using the special consultative procedures of the Local Government Act is likely to significantly outweigh the benefits.

If however, changes to the Strategy affect financial planning for transport activities, create inconsistencies with other planning documents, or change its underlying philosophy, then the public should be consulted on the proposed changes before they are finalised. This will ensure that the Strategy continues to enjoy public support and acceptance.

Once the Committee has adopted the Significance Policy it will be included in the draft RLTS for consultation.

### 4 **Financial Implications**

#### **Current Budget**

No current financial implications from implementing the decision

### **Future Implications**

Should the Committee wish to make a variation to the RLTS in the future, the significance of that proposed variation will be assessed against the adopted Significance Policy. If the proposed change is significant, it will require an additional round of public consultation – an exercise which is not currently budgeted.

### **Ten Year / Annual Plan Implications**

As Above

Mike Calvert

**Senior Planner (Transport)**

**for Transport Policy Manager**

**30 March 2011**



**File Reference:** 2.00025  
7.00047  
**Significance of Decision:** Low



**Report To:** Regional Transport Committee  
**Meeting Date:** 5 May 2011  
**Report From:** Garry Maloney, Transport Policy Manager

---

## Approval of Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy for Consultation

---

### Executive Summary

The following report briefly summarises the preparation of the Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy 2011 – 2041 and recommends the adoption of the Proposed Strategy for public consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Land Transport Management Act 2003.

### 1 Recommendations

That the Regional Transport Committee under its delegated authority:

- 1 Receives the report, Approval of Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy for Consultation.
- 2 Adopts the Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy 2011 – 2041, including any amendments arising from discussions at the 5 May 2011 workshop, or through the discussion of the report, Approval of Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy for Consultation, for public consultation in accordance with the requirements of the Land Transport Management Act 2003.
- 3 Delegates to the Committee Chair the power to make further minor amendments to the Proposed Regional Land Transport Strategy prior to its release to the public.
- 4 Decides whether the Regional Transport Committee or a subcommittee is appointed to hear submissions and determines the size and membership of any subcommittee.
- 5 Confirms that the significance of the decision has been assessed as LOW, and under Section 79 of the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) confirms that in light of the level of significance of the decision it does not require:  
(a) Further identification and assessment of different options under section 77 LGA; (b) Further investigation or consideration of community views under section 78 LGA; (c) Any further written record of the manner in which section 77 and section 78 matters have been addressed.

## 2 Introduction

The Regional Transport Committee (RTC) will recall that it considered key elements of the reviewed Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) at its last workshop on 4 March 2011. At that workshop, staff advised that they would place those parts of the draft document that the RTC had yet to fully workshop (for example the RLTS Policies) before its next workshop (5 May 2011).

Since the last workshop, a number of additional changes have been made to the document (which is separately appended for member's review) to reflect member's comments. These will be covered in more detail at the 5 May 2011 workshop.

Given that the Committee has considered the key elements of the RLTS prior to this meeting, the intent of this paper is to:

- 1 incorporate the changes arising from the 5 May 2011 RTC workshop in to the appended Proposed RLTS;
- 2 seek the Committee's adoption of the Proposed RLTS for the purpose of public consultation; and
- 3 seek guidance from the RTC as to how it wishes to hear those subsequent submissions and make decisions on the matters raised.

## 3 Content of the RLTS

The required content of the RLTS is set out in Sections 75, 76 and 77 of the LTMA and an assessment of compliance with the Act is included as Appendix 1 of the Strategy. The main requirements of the LTMA are that a RLTS must contain the following matters:

- (a) *“inter-regional and intra-regional transport outcomes relevant to the region; and*
- (b) *the strategic options for achieving those outcomes; and*
- (c) *an assessment as to how the regional land transport strategy complies with sections 75 and 76; and*
- (d) *a statement of any relevant regional economic or land use considerations, and the likely funding of any land transport infrastructure associated with those considerations; and*
- (e) *a demand management strategy; and*
- (f) *an assessment of the appropriate role for each land transport mode in the region; and*
- (g) *an assessment of the role of education and enforcement in contributing to the land transport outcomes; and*
- (h) *(repealed)*
- (i) *a statement that identifies any strategic option for which co-operation is required with other regions; and*
- (j) *a statement that identifies persons or organisations who should be involved in the further development of strategic options; and*
- (k) *measurable targets to be achieved to meet the outcomes of the regional land transport strategy; and*
- (l) *a statement provided by an independent auditor of how the process followed by the regional transport committee complied with the requirements of this Act; and*

- (m) *a summary of the policy relating to significance adopted by the regional transport committee.”*

Staff have worked to ensure that the document meets the requirements of the Act and an interim audit statement will be included in the Proposed Strategy (we hope to table it on the day of the meeting) confirming that the process followed to date by the Bay of Plenty RTC has complied with the requirements of the Act. This statement will be updated in the final document to encompass the consultation process.

## 4 Consultation Process

Once the RTC has prepared the Proposed Strategy the document must be released for public consultation, in accordance with Section 78 of the LTMA, under the special consultative procedure set out in the Local Government Act 2002.

The consultation process and subsequent adoption of the final document by the RTC and subsequently by the Regional Council is proposed to be completed by August/September 2011. This will provide for a buffer of several months from the required completion date of December of this year in case of unanticipated delays.

### 4.1 Timetable for consultation

The timeframe for consulting on the proposed RLTS is:

Action	Meeting	Date
Adoption of proposed RLTS for Consultation	RTC Meeting	5 May 2011
Proposed RLTS available to the public		Monday 30 May 2011
One month of public consultation closes		Friday, 1 July 2011
Hearings for proposed RLTS	RLTS hearings sub-committee	Tuesday 12, Wednesday 13 and Thursday 14 July 2011
Deliberations for proposed RLTS	RLTS hearings sub-committee	Friday, 15 July 2011
Proposed RLTS adopted by RTC	RTC Meeting	August 2011
Regional Land Transport Strategy approved by Regional Council.	Regional Council meeting	Thursday, 25 August or 29 September 2011.

### 4.2 Hearing of Submissions

The indicative timetable has the hearing of submissions scheduled for early July. In order to conduct those hearing however, the Committee needs to give staff some direction about the size of the committee to hear the submissions. The Committee has the following two options:

- 1 the full RTC hears the submissions, or

2 the RTC establishes a smaller sub-committee to hear the submissions.

The RTC has previously utilised smaller hearings sub-committees to consider and make recommendations on submissions when the Regional Land Transport Programme was being prepared in 2009 and the previous RLTS. The sub-committee comprised four members of the RTC and heard submissions over two days, with one day spent on deliberations.

Environment Waikato has just completed hearings on its draft RLTS for which it established a sub-committee comprising five members of the RTC. The NZTA representative was also present to provide technical advice to the sub-committee.

Should the Committee's preference be to establish a sub-committee to hear submissions, its size and membership will also need to be determined.

## 5 **Process for Approving the RLTS**

Provided the RTC agrees with the Proposed RLTS, as amended for the submissions, the document will go to the Bay of Plenty Regional Council for approval at its meeting on 25 August 2011. The Council can either approve the RLTS, or, refer the RLTS back to the RTC for reconsideration of issues. If this occurs the RTC must consider the issues raised by the Regional Council. The RTC may, after reconsidering the aspects referred back to it by the Regional Council, forward either:

- an amended RLTS that has been consulted on in accordance with S78; and/or
- any additional information that has been requested by the Regional Council or that the RTC considers will help the Regional Council with its decision.

The Regional Council must approve the RLTS before December 2011 when the current RLTS becomes redundant.

When the approved RLTS has been forwarded by the Regional Council to the NZTA, copies of the document must be made available to the public.

## 6 **Financial Implications**

### **Current Budget**

Financial implications from implementing the decision are provided for in the current Transport Planning budget.

### **Future Implications**

No future implications from implementing the decision.

### **Ten Year / Annual Plan Implications**

No Ten Year / Annual Plan implications from implementing the decision.

Mike Calvert  
**Senior Planner (Transport)**

**for Transport Policy Manager**

**30 March 2011**

