

MINUTES

TITLE: Tasman Regional Transport Committee
DATE: Friday 19 June 2009
TIME: 9.30 am
VENUE: Tasman Council Chambers, 189 Queen Street,
Richmond
PRESENT: Crs T E Norriss (Chair), S G Bryant, B F Dowler,
T B King, C Musgrave, P Heywood, F te Miha, D Hume
IN ATTENDANCE: Engineering Manager (P W Thomson), Transportation
Manager (G Clark), MWH NZ Ltd (P Peet, R Firth),
Executive Assistant (V M Gribble)

APOLOGIES

Moved Crs Bryant/Dowler
RTC09/06/01

THAT apologies for absence from Cr J L Edgar, B McGurk, B Findlater,
P Burton and R White (NZTA) be received.
CARRIED

1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1.1 Regional Transport Committee – 8 May 2009

Moved Crs King/Bryant
RTC09/06/02

THAT the minutes of the Regional Transport Committee meeting held on 8 May
2009 be confirmed as a true and complete record.
CARRIED

2 REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT PROGRAMME

Mr Thomson spoke to the report contained in the agenda which sought approval of
the final Tasman Regional Land Transport Programme 2009/2010 – 2011/2012.

Mr te Miha arrived at the meeting at 9.40 am.

Mr Thomson said the public transport service provided will be roughly equivalent to
what is privately provided at the moment. He is awaiting confirmation from Nelson
City Council. If there is a delay or uncertainty around the subsidy from NZTA it will
affect the amount of money required from Tasman District Council. We will be
reviewing budgets from year to year and the step-up in year two will only happen if
there is a need.

C Musgrave said if TDC is putting money into the programme it should be having a
say. The people that use the buses should be surveyed to ask what times they want.
She asked about membership of the co-operative transport committee.

Mr Thomson said most of the work can be done efficiently at officer level and reported back.

C Musgrave said the people who have very limited access don't get representation or consulted as to their needs.

Cr Norriss said the Total Mobility Committee is no longer operating so it is more important to setup a liaison group in Tasman to bring the issues back to this committee.

D Hume arrived at the meeting at 10.00 am.

Mr te Miha congratulated the people who have done the environmental work on the Ruby Bay Bypass. He said it is all being done to a very high standard.

D Hume said the Government has changed direction and there is less money and Tasman will be getting less from the government than it thought it was getting. Nelson may consider using R dollars for buying buses, but not for operating them. Passenger transport has been reprioritised to areas with high need and Nelson Tasman is unlikely to get funding for passenger transport.

D Hume reported on discussions about R-funding held with Nelson Regional Transport Committee, based on process and good sense. Money in R-fund expires if you don't commit it to a project. It's uncommon for government to top-up R-funding.

Mr Thomson said in terms of RLTP, it was highlighted in the draft that the proposed local share for passenger transport operations was not something that is the responsibility of this committee to prioritise. It falls back to Council in terms of the local roading programme. Tasman District Council may want to make some alterations to final budgets in light of what comes from Nelson City Council.

Mr Heywood said members are not given the opportunity to express a view or discuss at this committee level. We don't have any detail about what is likely to be the passenger programme.

Cr Norriss said Council has approved provision for funding in light of discussions with our counterparts in Nelson. You can express a view around this table.

Mr Heywood said we shouldn't be in the position of rubber stamping when there is no opportunity for debate.

Mr Thomson said there will be work done in the coming months. The scope of responsibility and decisions by this committee don't include whether Tasman District Council as a unitary authority makes a local contribution to passenger transport. It's outside the scope in terms of adopting the RLTP.

Mr Heywood said either we're here for a purpose or we are not. What is our purpose?

Cr Norriss said one is to approve the roading programme and the next part is the Regional Land Transport Strategy which you will have input into, and there will be passenger transport in this.

Mr Thomson said the purpose of the RLTP committee is to approve the programme and then it goes to the NZTA to recommend funding from NLTP. In terms of this agenda item it is the essence of what we're doing. Local road issues are dealt with by Tasman District Council in this case and there are some things outside the scope of this RLTP and the committee's responsibility in terms of funding.

Mr Heywood said the programme is in very general terms, not specific in any shape or form.

D Hume asked Mr Heywood what his concerns were. Do you think public transport will be done badly, or not enough of it?

Mr Heywood said it goes back to his input and time and effectiveness of this group. If we don't have the ability to have input then why are we here?

D Hume said priority and programme is NZTA responsibility. She said in this case she doesn't think it will go ahead because there is no national money for it.

Cr King said this committee recommends the programme through to Tasman District Council and there are comments and issues around public transport services. If Mr Heywood thinks public transport is not the way to address the issue he is entitled to comment and vote accordingly.

Cr Norriss said as part of the strategy it will go out to public submission.

Mr Heywood said the way it is written there is nothing specific to be critical of and change. It is so encompassing, it is not a decision-making process. It is a very well worded global presentation.

Cr Norriss said the strategy will encompass a lot of issues, such as car pooling, and there is a lot of room for input by this committee and by way of submissions.

C Musgrave said until finance is decided we can't go into specifics. She is satisfied with the process so far. Changes made and presented have reflected what we've heard here. We are here to represent a group.

Cr Norriss said you don't just represent a group you represent the whole community and whatever input you can get with meetings in the community is encouraged. That's how we'll get the real feedback.

Mr Heywood said he is being approached by groups and has been asked to attend them.

Cr Norriss said financial decisions have to go back to Council. There are five councillors on this committee and he would like to think Council will listen to the opinions of the councillors on this committee.

2. Government Policy Statement

Copies of the document have been sent out to all committee members.

Reference to the earlier GPS “targets” has been replaced with “impact statements”. Activity classes and funding ranges have also been amended.

2. Revised Assessment Framework and Prioritisation

In response to revised GPS the NZTA has released a revised draft assessment and prioritisation framework.

Mr Thomson said given the short notice we didn't think it was worth trying to reprioritise all our projects.

D Hume agreed with that advice. Some things aren't as high up the list as we thought they were. N-funding is important for the region.

Cr King said Council has been through the LTCCP, saved money on contracts and reallocated it to cycling/walking and resealing. Are you saying they're unlikely to receive NZTA funding?

D Hume said extra subsidy above what you've had approved is likely to not be funded.

Mr Thomson said the shared pathways are in our budget for next year on the assumption that we will get subsidy.

Cr King said if we leave it in we're going to rate people and then if we don't get the subsidy we can only do half the works. The key debate at Council was to make funding decisions based on projects that were likely to attract subsidy and not prioritise projects that didn't.

D Hume said you might want to do it differently.

Cr King said this is a disaster and we've done our decision-making on the basis that we've listened to the community's feedback.

Cr Norriss said a real concern we have is those projects that can be put in with construction of the Ruby Bay Bypass. He said it is ludicrous not to subsidise them and construct them at the same time as the Ruby Bay Bypass. The cost of constructing them in the future will be ten-fold.

Cr King said we were assured that there would be no drop in local income. We made a calculated decision to do extra services that people wanted with the money saved in contracts.

D Hume said the baseline is not dropping, but anything extra on top is gone.

Cr Norriss said intersection upgrades are gone and that will have significant impact on our district. There were a few planned. We have been brave as a Council to put the savings into the subsidised programme, walking and cycling especially, to find, unless we can pick up money from the government's \$50 million national cycleway funds that we won't have the money to progress it.

D Hume said Council is relatively advanced with cycling/walk plans and have put commitment into it.

Mr Heywood asked in relation to special circumstances surrounding Ruby Bay Bypass and commonsense in overcoming community separation it creates can D Hume fight for us? It is a very easy one to argue and we would be happy to lend weight as part of this committee to you going and battling for us.

D Hume said there are possibilities to submit. You will not be the only people with the view.

Mr Thomson said one of the things Council has done is we've taken the risk of decreasing funding. Appendix 3 in first 3 years we've handed back over \$750,000 to NZTA directly in N-funding. Council has said in achieving savings in maintenance then we would like to see additional work done on walking and cycling and shown additional funding, particularly around Ruby Bay bypass, the net balance is a significant shift of N-dollars back to NZTA.

D Hume said it will be hard to put in N-dollars, but somewhere you might be able to negotiate.

Cr Bryant asked if a study to investigate state highway passing lanes will still be included and are we likely to be funded or not.

D Hume said it likely won't be funded.

Cr Bryant said it was to look at potential passing lanes across the district's state highways.

Mr Heywood said the opportunity out of maintenance is perhaps the only way to get some funding and it should be pursued.

D Hume said it will be important for NZTA to communicate with councils where the maintenance funding is at.

C Musgrave asked whether improvements on shoulders of roads comes in as maintenance as work done there could appease cyclists.

Cr Norriss said it could come out of maintenance.

Mr Thomson said it has been raised directly with NZTA staff at State Highway Liaison meetings to ensure better edgelines and shoulder surfaces, particularly when reseals are being undertaken, to give thought for vulnerable roadway users.

D Hume asked for letter from Mr Thomson expressing disappointment and outlining what is particularly troubling.

**Moved Crs Bryant/King
RTC09/06/03**

THAT:

- a) the attached Tasman Regional Land Transport Programme 2009/2010 – 2011/2012 dated 10 June 2009 be approved by the Tasman Regional Transport Committee; and
- b) the approved Tasman Regional Land Transport Programme 2009/2010 – 2011/2012 be recommended to the Tasman District Council for adoption and to be submitted to the New Zealand Transport Agency prior to the 1 July 2009.

CARRIED

3 REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY

The agenda contained a report to present a working draft of the new Regional Land Transport Strategy (RLTS) “Section 1 Purpose, Vision and Objectives” to committee members.

Mr Peet gave a powerpoint presentation on the strategy and the Committee reviewed the objectives.

Cr King left the meeting at 12.15 pm.

**Moved F te Miha/Cr Dowler
RTC09/06/04**

THAT the Regional Transport Committee receives the working draft of the new Regional Land Transport Strategy Section 1 and notes its ongoing development.

CARRIED

The meeting concluded at 12.21 pm.

Chair:

Date: