

Governance Group Meeting  
MINUTES

Meeting Information

<b>Time:</b>	1:30 – 3:00 pm
<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday 12 June 2018
<b>Location:</b>	Room 5.16, Majestic Centre, 100 Willis Street, Wellington
<b>Present:</b>	Raewyn Bleakley (NZTA) Fergus Gammie (NZTA) Mayor Justin Lester (WCC) Cr Chris Calvi-Freeman (WCC) Cr Chris Laidlaw (GWRC) Cr Barbara Donaldson (GWRC) Mayor Wayne Guppy (UHCC)
<b>In Attendance</b>	Dame Fran Wilde (NZTA) Barry Mein (Alliance Director) Kevin Lavery (WCC) Greg Campbell (GWRC) Peter Clark (NZTA) – by phone David Chick (WCC) Anna Harley (WCC) Emma Speight (NZTA) Willy Trolove (LGWM) Natasha Hayes (GWRC)

Minutes

Item	Description
1	<b><u>Apologies</u></b> Dame Fran Wilde (lateness) Kevin Lavery (lateness)
2	<b><u>Minutes of 16 May 2018 Governance Group meeting</u></b> Minutes from the previous meeting held on 16 May 2018 were accepted as a true and correct record. There were no matters arising
3	<b><u>Directors' update</u></b> The Alliance Director's report was briefly discussed. Feedback from the NZTA and joint councillors' workshops was discussed as part of Item 4. The update report will be issued as soon as possible, with an amendment to the next steps section. The Alliance Director advised that Peter Clark will be acting director while he is on leave (from 20 June to 8 August), with support from Adam Nicholls and Willy Trolove.

### Recommended programme of investment (RPI)

The Director advised that the Draft RPI Background report had not yet been circulated, pending further amendments arising from the Governance Group discussion. The need for this document to provide the background information and the analysis undertaken to arrive at the RPI, was noted.

The Director also advised that the costs had been reviewed and incorporated into the revised presentation version of the Draft RPI. The total level of investment is not significantly different from the amounts in the version circulated to the Group with the agenda papers.

There was discussion of the issues raised in briefing workshops held on 11 June with NZTA Board members, and the separate joint WCC/GWRC councillors' workshop later that day.

The key issues raised by the workshops are set out below, with Governance Group response and agreed actions.

- **Basin Reserve:** can we be more definitive about what is proposed and why, and illustrate this?
  - Indicate what is preferred at the Basin, and why. This should also describe what is not proposed (and why). Be clear that any preference is based on information available at this stage of the programme and that may change as more detailed work is done and there's engagement with stakeholders etc
  - Diagrams of an example layout will be required. Consider showing an embankment
  - **Action:** Prepare a paper to explain why the example is favoured over cut/cover, indicative illustration, define next steps etc
  
- **Te Aro:** can we be more definitive about what is proposed and why, and illustrate this?
  - A similar approach to the Basin is proposed
  - **Action:** Prepare a paper to explain the rationale behind the Te Aro proposal, and include indicative illustration, define next steps
  
- **Emissions:** need to tell the full story of intensification, compact development to reduce emissions?
  - Explain the potential impact on emissions from the RPI, especially its impact as a catalyst for positive changes in land use and transport behaviour, which will reinforce emission reductions.
  - Consider a narrative approach to evaluation rather than ticks
  - **Action:** Revise narrative to include potential CO2 impact of aspirational future land use (& what is needed to get emissions down significantly, e.g. pricing, fleet changes etc)
  
- **Urban development:** Provide more detail on development, where, issues etc (including Kilbirnie)
  - **Action:** Be more explicit about where intensification is and is not proposed, what level of intensification is expected/possible, and issues to be addressed (such as climate change adaptation in Kilbirnie etc)
  
- **Pricing:** Can we be more definite that pricing is part of the proposal?
  - Agreed that pricing needs to be clearly described as part of the RPI.
  - Also need to clearly emphasise other demand management initiatives, e.g. car sharing
  - **Action:** Include (and model) an explicit pricing proposal in the RPI
  
- **PT affordability:** No commitment to affordable fares
  - Make it clear that the RPI assumes mass transit fares will not attract a premium
  - Further work required to understand how reduced PT fares would perform, to enable the Governance Group to determine how this should be incorporated.

- Note that extra PT funding is available in the GPS; and that a fare reduction would need to apply across the whole region, not just in the N2A area
- **Action:** Model impact of a reduction in PT fares
  
- **Mass transit: route:** can we identify a preferred route?
  - Agreed that the RPI identifies a preference for mass transit route, or at least show the issues that need to be considered in making that choice
  - Consider Featherston St option as part of analysis of the central city part of the route
  - **Action:** Assemble info and workshop pros and cons of route options on Station-Newton corridor (especially central city)
  
- **Mass transit: mode:** do we need to define mode or go with “mass transit”?
  - Agreed that the option should remain as currently defined, leaving open the options of light rail or “light rail-like”.
  - Engaging with Ministers would be useful. The Governance Group noted that the Minister may wish to express a preference for LRT, but it is the Governance Group’s view that this should not be at the expense of removing other investments from the overall programme to enable LRT to be funded; assurance would be needed that LRT could be developed as part of the overall integrated package.
  - **Action:** assemble further information needed to support discussion with Minister on this issue, including preferred route (and supporting rationale), value uplift potential, Integration with other investments (e.g. Basin), cost, patronage, feasibility and sequencing issues, and resilience
  
- **Mass transit Stage 2:** Clarify triggers for extension to the airport; and how airport will be served in the meantime
  - **Action:** assemble further information on alternatives for mass transit to the east, and incorporate urban development potential
  
- **Seismic/ resilience assessment:** Assess and report on routes/ground conditions/assets
  - **Action:** Prepare resilience assessment and summary
  
- **Economic assessment:** needs to be completed
  - **Action:** Complete economic analysis to include more complete picture of benefits
  
- **Next steps:** What do we say about it:
  - Agreed rationale based on the following:
    - We’re doing further work on a number of the programme’s elements.
    - We need to engage with central government to ensure we can move forward together.

**Other issues:**

- Ensure that the RPI includes a clear picture of early improvement proposals

**AGREED:**

- a) That the work described above should be completed.
- b) That the Governance Group arrange to meet with Ministers to engage them on the draft RPI (incorporating the additional actions outlined above). This should be scheduled for after the LGNZ Conference in July

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>c) That a Governance Group meeting be held in advance of the meeting with Ministers to review the additional actions completed at that point.</li><li>d) That review and agreement of the final RPI should be done by the Governance Group after the above work and actions are completed.</li></ul>
5	<p><b><u>Other business</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There was no further business</li></ul>