

MEETING OF THE CANTERBURY REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

TO THE CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Cr J M Waters (Chairperson) Environment Canterbury

Cr A J Blackie	Waimakariri DC	Cr J Morten	Selwyn DC
Cr H Broughton	Christchurch City Council	Cr M Oldfield	Environment Canterbury
Cr T K Burke	Environment Canterbury	Cr M Oliver	Timaru DC
Mayor J Coles	Waimate DC	Mayor J O'Neill	Mackenzie DC
Ms J Curtis	Land Transport NZ	Cr B Seddon	Kaikoura DC
Mayor G Jackson	Hurunui DC	Cr B Shearing	Christchurch City Council
Mr C Knaggs	Transit NZ	Cr B Tasker	Ashburton DC
Cr R I R Little	Environment Canterbury		

A meeting of the Subcommittee will be held on

Wednesday, 29 November 2006 commencing at 1.00 p.m.

VENUE: Council Chamber
First Floor
Pegasus Building
58 Kilmore Street
Christchurch

BUSINESS: As per Order Paper attached.

Dr Bryan Jenkins
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**RECOMMENDATIONS IN REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE TAKEN
AS COUNCIL POLICY UNTIL ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL**

58 Kilmore Street,
PO Box 345,
Christchurch,
Telephone: (03) 365-3828,
Fax: (03) 365-3194
Website: www.ecan.govt.nz



COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2002 DECISION-MAKING REQUIREMENTS

Except as below, a statement of compliance and a completed decision checklist is required for any agenda item on a council committee or the council recommending that a decision be made. This will be the responsibility of the person signing off the agenda item.

The compliance statement and checklist will not be used for:

- Recommendations that information be received or that the Council make a decision.
- Decisions taken under the Resource Management Act 1991 or the Biosecurity Act 1993 in relation to resource consents, decisions required when following the procedures set out in Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, other permissions, submissions on plans, or references to the Environment Court.
- Decisions taken to proceed with enforcement procedures under various primary or secondary legislation or regulations, including procedures under the Resource Management Act 1991, the Biosecurity Act 1993, the Local Government Act 2002, and Environment Canterbury Bylaws.
- Administrative and personnel decisions that are entirely internal to Environment Canterbury.
- Other decisions where the procedures to be followed are set out in Legislation.

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

The council committee (or the council) must formally certify that:

- (a) It is satisfied that it has sufficient information about the options and their benefits and costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being and the effects on community outcomes, bearing in mind the significance of the decisions.
- (b) It is satisfied that it knows enough about and has given adequate consideration to the views and preferences of affected and interested parties bearing in mind the significance of the decision.

INFORMATION CHECKLIST

(a)	A Statement of the Proposed Decision
(b)	A Statement of the Objective of the Proposed Decision and the Issue or Problem being addressed
(c)	A list of all reasonably practicable options, (including doing nothing).
(d)	For each option in (c): An evaluation of the Benefits and Costs, in terms of the region's social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.
(e)	For each option in (c): A statement of the extent to which community outcomes would be promoted or achieved in an integrated and efficient manner.
(f)	For each option in (c): A statement of the Impact, if any, on Environment Canterbury's capacity to undertake its statutory responsibilities
(g)	If the Proposed Decision is a significant decision in relation to land or a body of water, a statement of how Maori values have been taken into account
(h)	A Statement of significant inconsistencies, if any, with any Existing Policy, Plan or Legislation arising from the Proposed Decision.
(i)	A statement how the views and preferences of affected or interested persons have been given adequate consideration during the definition of the problem or issue, the objective, the assessment of options and the development of the proposed decision, including the particular contribution of Maori to the decision-making process.

Notes:

The significance of proposals and decisions determines how much time, money and effort is put into exploring and evaluating options and obtaining the views of affected and interested parties. The significance of proposals and decisions is determined through reference to criteria contained in the policy on significance.

The policy on significance together with Section 76 of the Local Government Act 2002 set out the Council's requirements in relation to decisions. Some decisions can only be made through the Long-Term Council Community Plan, or after the Special Consultative Procedures set out in the Act have been used, (refer to the policy on significance and the Act).

All decisions of Environment Canterbury are subject to the decision-making requirements of section 76 of the Act unless inconsistent with specific requirements of other legislation.

ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY
CANTERBURY REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT ADVISORY
SUBCOMMITTEE

ORDER PAPER

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 26 OCTOBER 2005
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

MATTER FOR COMMITTEE DECISION

5. ADVICE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF R FUNDS TO LAND TRANSPORT NZ
6. NOTICES OF MOTION
7. EXTRAORDINARY AND URGENT BUSINESS
8. QUESTIONS
9. NEXT MEETING
10. CLOSURE

CANTERBURY REGIONAL LAND TRANSPORT ADVISORY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR, ENVIRONMENT CANTERBURY,
58 KILMORE STREET, CHRISTCHURCH, ON WEDNESDAY,
26 OCTOBER 2005 COMMENCING AT 11 A.M.

CONTENTS

1. APOLOGIES
2. MINUTES OF MEETING – 23 MARCH 2005
3. MATTERS ARISING
4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

MATTER RESOLVED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE

5. RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALLOCATION OF REGIONAL FUNDS
6. NEXT MEETING – to be advised
7. CLOSURE

PRESENT

Cr J M Waters (Chairperson), Cr T K Burke, Mr L Griffen, Cr R I R Little, Cr J Morten, Cr M E Oldfield, Cr M Oliver, Cr B Shearing, and Cr B Tasker.

IN ATTENDANCE

Insp D Erasmus and Mr S van Dorsser.

MANAGEMENT AND OFFICERS PRESENT

Environment Canterbury:

Mr L McCallum (Energy, Transport and the Built Environment Policy Manager), Ms J Atkinson (Manager – Public Transport Portfolio), Mr N Bryan (Transport Policy Analyst), and Mrs R Pay (Administration Officer).

Christchurch City Council:

Mr S Woods

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were accepted from Cr H Broughton, Mayor G Jackson and Mayor J O'Neill.

2. MINUTES

Resolved

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2005, as circulated, be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Cr Waters – Cr Oldfield

3. MATTERS ARISING

Nil.

4. DEPUTATIONS AND PETITIONS

Nil.

MATTER FOR SUBCOMMITTEE DECISION

5. RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALLOCATION OF REGIONAL FUNDS

The Subcommittee met following the conclusion of an informal workshop for Regional Land Transport Committee members.

Nick Bryan presented the report. The purpose of the report was to respond to the requirements of the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP) guidelines to undertake an assessment of regional issues and recommendations on the allocation of regionally distributed funding and provide comments to Land Transport New Zealand.

The Technical Officers Group (TOG) undertook a review of issues for the region, and a draft letter to Land Transport NZ was prepared. This letter was attached to the agenda papers. Comments in the draft letter were grouped under the following headings:

- Detailed funding issues
- Approach to dealing with issues is reactive
- Specific safety issues
- Specific social issues
- Integration between road and rail
- Uncertainties outside the region's control

The TOG agreed that recommendations on the allocation of R funds to specific projects should be limited to those projects that can start in the current financial year and the draft letter included recommendations of nine projects that should be progressed immediately. Criteria for allocation of remaining available funds were detailed.

It was noted that the recommendations in the letter are an indication only at this stage, and they will need reviewing when Land Transport NZ releases indicative allocations in March 2006 (and in future years).

It was noted that significant levels of ongoing N funding would still be required for Canterbury projects.

There was wide support from subcommittee members for the draft letter, and the whole issue was seen as one of national importance. There was also support for the submission to be strengthened expressing concern that N funding is not coming to the Canterbury region.

Issues raised included:

- Cr Oliver had some concerns about the percentages in the submission prepared by the TOG, and also about the 5% allocation for State Highway block projects.
- Several councillors expressed concerns about the 60%/5% recommended split in R funding between large state highway projects and block projects.
- Cr Tasker reminded territorial authorities of their responsibilities to have their programmes to an appropriate stage. She noted that Ashburton has to find 52% of its roading funds from within the district. She supported a stronger emphasis on N funding in the submission.
- Cr Burke agreed that the profile of N funding must be raised for longer-term projects in Canterbury. Several councillors agreed with Cr Burke's views. Cr Burke undertook to raise the issue at the meeting of Environment Canterbury scheduled for the next day.
- Cr Tasker suggested that it might be useful to have data on the amount of money that leaves the Canterbury region available for the Environment Canterbury council meeting. She suggested that a fixed percentage of this figure should automatically come back to the region. Staff will endeavour to obtain such data. Cr Tasker also reminded the meeting that the increase in petrol tax was put on to supplement N funding. Staff noted that this 5c/litre petrol tax increase is returned to regions on a population basis.

Resolved

- (a) *That the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee receives the report "Recommendations on allocation of regional funds".*
- (b) *That the attached letter, subject to amendments made by the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee, be recommended to Environment Canterbury for approval and then sent to Land Transport New Zealand.*

Cr Burke – Cr Tasker

6. NEXT MEETING – TO BE ADVISED

7. CLOSURE

The meeting concluded at 11.34 a.m.

CONFIRMED

Date _____

_____ Chairperson

AGENDA ITEM NO: 5	SUBJECT MATTER: ADVICE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF R FUNDS TO LAND TRANSPORT NZ
REPORT: Regional Land Transport Subcommittee	DATE OF MEETING: 29 November 2006
FILE REFERENCES:	PORTFOLIO: Regional Land Transport PROJECT: OUTPUT:
REPORT BY: Nick Bryan Transport Policy Analyst	ENDORSED BY: John Talbot Director Policy and Planning

PURPOSE

For the Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee to approve Advice to Land Transport New Zealand on the distribution of R funds in Canterbury.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft Advice on the distribution of R funds in Canterbury

BACKGROUND

Land Transport NZ has requested in the NLTP guidelines that regional advisory groups submit advice on the distribution of R funds to Land Transport NZ by the 6th November. A Draft Advice has been forwarded to Land Transport NZ subject to approval at this meeting of the Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee.

The TOG met in September to discuss the use of R funds in the Canterbury region. A number of funding opportunities were discussed. This process revealed that the R funding available will not meet all the aspirations of the approved organisations in the region. Therefore, a clear set of criteria for prioritisation is required to identify and reach agreement on the activities that should be funded.

Through these discussions it became clear that the principles previously adopted for the region, that formed the criteria for evaluation of activities, needed to be reviewed. This is largely due to the fact that they were drafted at a time when the message from central government was that the funds were to be used to purchase “additional activities”. However, it has become clear that R funding will have to be used to progress activities that were at that time not considered to be additional.

The TOG is developing the Canterbury Transport Regional Implementation Plan. This Plan will provide a strong framework for transport investment in the region and will therefore assist strongly in the prioritisation of activities and identification of appropriate funding mechanisms.

Given these considerations the TOGs recommendation for the Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee is to re-iterate the approximate splits agreed last year to Land Transport NZ. More detailed recommendations will then be made following a reassessment of the eligibility criteria for Canterbury and development of the Transport Regional Implementation Plan.

PROPOSAL

That the Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee approves the attached Draft Advice on the distribution of R funds in Canterbury to Land Transport NZ.

RECOMMENDATION

- (a) *That the Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee receives the report "Advice on the distribution of R funds to Land Transport NZ".*
- (b) *That the Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee approves the attached Draft Advice on the distribution of R funds in Canterbury to be provided to Land Transport NZ.*

Draft

29 November 2006

Jackie Curtis
Partnership Manager
Level 5, BNZ House
129 Hereford Street
P O Box 13-364
CHRISTCHURCH

Dear Jackie,

ADVICE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF R FUNDS FOR CANTERBURY

This advice has been produced in response to the National Land Transport Programme Guidelines for 2007/08.

The Regional Land Transport Advisory Subcommittee endorsed the contents of this advice on 29th November 2006. The Advisory Subcommittee consists of those members of the Canterbury Regional Land Transport Committee that represent approved organisations.

The Regional Land Transport Officers Group (TOG) met in September 2006 to discuss the use of R funds in the Canterbury region. A number of funding opportunities were discussed and it is clear that the R funding available will not meet all the aspirations of the approved organisations in the region. Therefore, a clear set of criteria for prioritisation is required to identify and reach agreement on the activities that should be funded.

Through these discussions it became clear that the principles previously adopted for the region, that formed the criteria for evaluation of activities, needed to be reviewed. This is largely due to the fact that they were drafted at a time when the message from central government was that the funds were to be used to purchase "additional activities". However, it has become clear that R funding will have to be used to progress activities that were at that time not considered to be additional.

The TOG is currently developing a Canterbury Transport Regional Implementation Plan. This Plan will provide a strong framework for transport investment in the region and will therefore assist strongly in the prioritisation of activities and identification of appropriate funding mechanisms.

Given these considerations the advice to Land Transport NZ is that the approximate splits submitted to Land Transport NZ in 2005 are still an appropriate indication of how the funding should be spent in the region. More detailed recommendations will be made following a reassessment of the eligibility criteria for Canterbury and development of the Transport Regional Implementation Plan.

Table 1 presents the advice for allocating R funding within the Canterbury region.

Our Ref: PL5C/00109
Your Ref:
Contact: Nick Bryan

Draft

Table 1: Advice on recommended level of funding by activity class

Activity Class	% R funds
Improvement & replacement of local roads	20%
Large State highway projects	60%
State highway block projects	5%
Transport demand management projects	1.5%
Passenger transport infrastructure projects	10%
Walking & cycling projects	3.5%

The commentary that was provided in support of these recommendations in the Advisory Committees submission in 2005 is attached. The commentary outlines the rationale behind the recommendations on how R funds might be used. Assumptions on N funding are also provided and the discussion reiterates the region's concerns regarding the overall shortage of funding, especially for the state highway network. This discussion remains relevant but it is now recognised that the development of a Regional Implementation Plan will further inform priorities for the region, which may in turn result in changes to this advice.

The approved organisations in Canterbury thank you for this opportunity to provide input to the development of the National Land Transport Programme (NLTP). We appreciate that the allocation of funding is not a straightforward process given the complications brought about by regionally distributed funding.

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Nick Bryan on (03) 3717130 or by e-mail to nick.bryan@ecan.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely

John Talbot
DIRECTOR POLICY AND PLANNING

**Commentary on recommended level of funding by activity class
Extracted from Advisory Committees 2005 submission**

Improvement and replacement of local roads

Within this activity class there is strong support around the region to make funds available for minor safety works and the strategic purchase of land to protect future transport systems. Minor safety works are often small projects but collectively they will have a significant impact on safety issues around the region. Land purchase is required in order to protect key parcels of land that might otherwise be 'lost' to development. An indicative level of funding for these activities has been estimated to be in the order of around a million dollars per year over the 9-year period for each type of activity.

There are many local road projects, especially within Christchurch City, with significant benefits. It is assumed that such projects will continue to receive N funding at a similar level to recent years. The allocation of 20% to this activity class recognises that there are local improvement and replacement projects with a significant regional benefit that may not receive N funding. Examples include seal widening Thompsons Track or upgrades to Factory Road, which provides access to the Clandeboye dairy plant.

It is important to ensure that the investigations put forward for funding in 2005/06 are progressed in order that activities can be identified that will effectively address the region's transport issues. Once these investigations are complete the region will be in a better position to identify specific activities that may require R funding. It is likely that there will be a limit to the number of local road projects that have regional benefits. Given the above factors it may be desirable to review the level of funding in this activity class, especially once a review of state highway block projects has been undertaken (see below).

Large state highway projects

In the 2004 submission to Land Transport NZ it was requested that national funding subsidy be provided for activities already identified in community plans or other work programmes of approved organisations. This request did not appear to have been taken into consideration in the formation of the 2005/06 NLTP. Whilst this has affected others in the region, Transit and the regions state highway network appear to have been hardest hit by the replacement of N funding with R funding in their programmes of identified activities.

There is a strong feeling in Canterbury that state highways form a national network and should be funded using national funds.

Transit New Zealand's state highway forecast 2005/06 – 2014/15 identifies 8 large projects that will require R funding to proceed in the next 10 years, namely:

- Christchurch TDM Implementation
- Christchurch Southern Motorway Extension (Stage 1)
- Sawyers Arms to Memorial Ave 4L
- Yaldhurst Rd to Waterloo Rd 4L
- Memorial Ave to Yaldhurst Rd 4L
- Christchurch Northern Arterial Rural
- Mingha Bluff to Rough Creek
- Okarahia North Realignment

The total value of these projects amounts to \$194.15m. If projections for R funding are correct it will not be possible to fund all of these projects, as there will be a shortfall of around \$20m¹ based on the recommendation to use 60% of regional funding for this activity class.

This list will also be extended to include further projects identified as a result of investigations that are currently being completed. The resulting shortfall is a significant concern to the region, as many regional issues will only be addressed if the function of key strategic corridors is protected into the future.

[†] revised from \$37 in 2005 submission to reflect R fund projections in 2007/08 NLTP guidelines.

State highway block projects

Transit have identified approximately \$30m of block projects in their programme that could be progressed between 2005 and 2010 that are not expected to receive N funding. It is reasonably safe to assume that this level of shortfall is likely to continue throughout the 10-year window for R funding. The recommendation to use 5% of regional funding for State highway block projects amounts to around \$13m over 10 years. Therefore, some further prioritisation of activities within the block programme is required.

A detailed breakdown of block projects was not available in time to include a full prioritisation for incorporation in this submission. It has been agreed that this work will be completed over coming months and that a regional view will be able to inform submissions on the draft NLTP in March 2006.

The RLTC has expressed strong support for safety initiatives and passing lanes and have expressed a desire to see more funding allocated to these activities. Given the importance of this work it is hoped that some of the shortfall in available funds to complete the block projects will be made up with N funding. If this is not the case there may be a case to increase the recommended allocation of R funds to this activity class.

Transport Demand Management

The level of investment in Transport Demand Management (TDM) projects is unclear as this area of work is still developing. At this stage an estimate has been made as to the level of R funding that might be required within the region. Therefore, this recommendation may need to be revised in future years as TDM projects and programmes are instigated.

Passenger Transport Infrastructure

There are a number of PT infrastructure projects currently in the planning stages that may require R funding. These include:

- Christchurch bus exchange expansion
- Christchurch suburban interchanges
- Priority bus routes for Christchurch
- Park and Ride sites

The total estimated cost of these activities is around \$50m. The recommendation to use 10% of regional funding for this activity will provide around \$26m over 10 years. A significant amount of N funding will be required if they are to all be delivered. In setting this recommendation it has been assumed that N funding will be available for some of these projects.

Walking and Cycling

The level of investment in walking and cycling projects is still being established as strategies for active modes are developed around the region. At this stage an estimate has been made as to the level of R funding that might be required within the region. This recommendation may need to be revised in future years as district strategies and the regional cycle network strategy, cycling in Canterbury, are progressed and levels of N funding are known.