



## Minutes Auckland Transport Board meeting (Open session)

<b>Date:</b>	27 June 2023	
<b>Time:</b>	10:00am – 1.39pm	
<b>Venue:</b>	Auckland Transport, 20 Viaduct Harbour (1.04)   MS Teams	
<b>Directors:</b>	Wayne Donnelly (acting chair) Mark Darrow Raveen Jaduram Henare Clark (via Teams)	Kylie Clegg Nicole Rosie Councillor Andrew Baker Councillor Mike Lee
<b>Board Intern:</b>	Isabella Horrocks	
<b>Executive Leadership Team Members and Management:</b>	Dean Kimpton, Chief Executive Andrew Downie, Governance Lead Mark Cressey, Enterprise Programme Director Natalie Marshall, Board Secretary Margaret Ansley, Board Secretary Mark Lambert, Executive General Manager, Integrated Networks Jenny Chetwynd, Executive General Manager, Planning & Investment Roger Jones, Executive General Manager, Business Technology Rodger Murphy, Executive General Manager, Risk & Assurance Stacey van der Putten, Executive General Manager, Safety Mark Laing, Executive General Manager, Finance Andrew Allen, Executive General Manager Service Delivery Adrian Lord, Head of Cycling	Vanessa Ellis, Executive General Manager, Customer Experience Karen Duffy, Executive General Manager, Culture and Transformation Dan Lambert, Executive General Manager, Stakeholders, Communities and Communications Andy Richards, Group Manager Procurement Tim Brown, Investment Planning Manager Luke Elliot, Principal Planner, Rapid Transit Network David Bardsley, Group Manager Finance Grant Smith, Financial Planning and Performance Manager Mohammed Nalar, Head of Capital Performance and Projects Nicki Lucas, Head of Funding and Analysis Andrew McGill, Head of Integrated Network Planning Hamish Bunn, General Manager Investment Planning and Policy Nina Donaldson, Safety Assurance Lead



	Matthew Rednall, Manager, Strategic Projects Murray Burt, Chief Engineer Chris Creighton, Group Manager, Digital and Technology Delivery	Claire Gomas, Principal Advisor Annelize Engelbrecht (via Teams)
<b>External presenters:</b>	Geoff Upson Brandon Wilcox, Grey Lynn Residents Association Inc Committee David Batten, Grey Lynn Residents Association Inc Committee Paul Stephenson, Grey Lynn Business Association	Bryan Rehutai, Newton Central School Principal Gael Baldock

Item	Topic	Responsible
1.	<b>Welcome/Acknowledgements</b> The acting chair welcomed participants to the meeting.	
2.	<b>Apologies</b> None noted.	
3.	<b>Update from the Chair</b> The acting chair opened the meeting and welcomed attendees.  The acting chair welcomed two new members to the Auckland Transport (AT) Board (board), Mr Jaduram and Mr Clark.  The acting chair acknowledged the huge efforts of AT staff and councillors to finalise the 2023/24 budget. He also noted that the budget came at a cost to both community organisations and staff, with 142 AT staff leaving the organisation due to budgetary constraints. The acting chair acknowledged the work of management to lead the organisation through this difficult period.	



	<p>The acting chair acknowledged Ms Horrocks who would complete her board internship at the end of June 2023. Ms Horrocks made a formal address, which included giving her thanks to the board and Executive Leadership Team for their guidance, noting that the board’s work is incredibly impactful on the people of Auckland. Ms Horrocks stated that the biggest return on social investment is to improve access to public transport for low-income Aucklanders. Ms Horrocks provided three suggestions for future improvement, these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holding board meetings in the community.</li> <li>• Measuring equity ensuring an equitable perspective is used in decision making; and</li> <li>• Implementing a Citizens Assembly.</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Late Items for General Business</b></p> <p>There were no late items for general business requested.</p>	
5.	<p><b>Interest Register - Declarations/Conflicts</b></p> <p>With respect to item 14 on the meeting agenda, Mr Darrow declared his role on the advisory board of a company that has a lease on a property on Great North Road.</p>	
6.	<p><b>Approval of Draft Open Session Minutes – 30 May 2023</b></p> <p>Councillor Baker raised a matter regarding item 16 (Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway (TERP)) of the minutes from the meeting held on 30 May 2023 and questioned how the board representatives for the Reference Group for this programme would be chosen. The acting chair noted that there will be three representatives from the board, but the selection process still needed to be determined.</p> <p>The board approved the minutes from the meeting held on 30 May 2023.</p> <p>Moved: Mike Lee, Mark Darrow. Carried.</p>	
7.	<p><b>Action Register</b></p>	



	<p><i>2022December04:</i> The Executive General Manager (EGM) Planning and Investment advised that TERP benchmarking was occurring through regular course of business activities and recommended that this action could be removed from the action register.</p> <p><i>2022December05:</i> The EGM Planning and Investment advised that this action remains open as the framework is being built into the Statement of Intent (SOI) monitoring framework.</p> <p><i>2023February02:</i> This action was noted as now being closed, with the EGM Service Delivery to respond to Ms Sampson following a decision from the local board in July 2023.</p> <p><i>2023February03:</i> The EGM Integrated Networks advised that the Integrated Networks team would respond to Dr Maleki following a decision on the 2024 budget. The action was marked as closed.</p> <p><i>2023Mar02:</i> The EGM Safety advised that this action is partly included in the Safety Report and that the Safety Committee would go through a more concise list of controls. This action was also marked as closed.</p> <p><i>2023May01:</i> The EGM Safety advised that a morning tea would be arranged between board members and the officers involved.</p>	
<b>Statements from Members of the Public</b>		
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>Mr Geoff Upson: Rural Road Maintenance</b></p> <p>Mr Upson noted that although he is a member of the Rodney Local Board, the views he would present were his and not necessarily reflective of those of the Rodney Local Board as a whole.</p> <p>Mr Upson stated that he was attending the meeting to express his concerns about the roading network. Mr Upson noted several issues he had experienced with the roading network including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Speed limits:</b> Mr Upson stated that some speed limits are being reduced without adequate notice to freight companies or other users of these roads. Mr Upson stated that this lack of notice can lead to an increase in crashes.</li> <li>• <b>Potholes:</b> Mr Upson referred to a photograph of a pothole in his local area as an example of lack of adequate road maintenance.</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Speedbumps:</b> Mr Upson noted that AT needs to better consider truckers, logging companies and other heavy road users when deciding whether to implement speedbumps.</li> <li>• <b>Development close to highways:</b> Mr Upson expressed his concern that property developers are being allowed to build houses along main roads that have a movement function, which in turn lowers the speed limits.</li> <li>• <b>Overgrowth of foliage:</b> Mr Upson noted that there are several overgrown trees in his area, with the effect that trucks are trimming these trees as they drive past.</li> </ul> <p>The acting chair thanked Mr Upson for his presentation.</p>	
9.	<p><b>Landowners and Contractors Association</b></p> <p>There was no attendance by representatives from the Landowners and Contractors Association.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Mr Peter Bourke, Hauraki Express Limited: Bike Ferries</b></p> <p>Mr Bourke was an apology as he was unable to attend the meeting.</p>	
11.	<p><b>Grey Lynn Business Association: Great North Road (GNR)</b></p> <p>Mr Paul Stevenson, the Chair of the Grey Lynn Business Association (GLBA) spoke on behalf of the GLBA. Mr Stevenson stated that GLBA had engaged extensively with businesses in the area and that most businesses are supportive of carrying out the full programme of proposed works on GNR. Mr Stevenson stated that GLBA is concerned that if the full programme of works is not carried out, then the result will be inferior in the long term.</p> <p>Mr Stevenson outlined four areas that supported undertaking the full programme of works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strategically:</b> GNR is a key transportation corridor in Auckland that supports many businesses and communities. This is a rapidly developing and growing area, but if the GNR safety upgrades do not proceed, this may cease to be the case.</li> <li>• <b>Operationally:</b> GNR businesses are supportive of a one-off upgrade but do not want to experience a delayed, ongoing works spread over time.</li> <li>• <b>Financially:</b> it is more financially viable for AT to do a one-off upgrade than spread it out over time.</li> <li>• <b>Reputationally:</b> there is a significant reputational risk if AT decides to backtrack on the plan that it has consulted with the community on for a long time.</li> </ul>	



	<p>The acting chair thanked Mr Stevenson for the presentation.</p>	
<p><b>12.</b></p>	<p><b>Grey Lynn Residents Association: GNR</b></p> <p>Mr Wilcox spoke on behalf of the Grey Lynn Residents Association (GLRA). Mr Wilcox noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The full programme of works proposed for GNR was in line with the community led vision for GNR and that 44 community organisations have expressed their support.</li> <li>• That the current proposal for a reduced design has been not consulted on and would be hugely unpopular amongst the GNR community.</li> <li>• That a reduced approach would not create adequate safety improvements and that safety improvements are needed to protect the Newtown Central School children who walk the length of GNR about 10-20 times per year.</li> <li>• That AT should not let the “disaffected few” lead the board astray from the most popular option amongst the community.</li> <li>• That the full programme of works has adequate funding in place and that further delays will likely lead to higher costs.</li> <li>• That there is real reputational risk to AT in that failing to deliver the full programme of works may cause it to lose the support of the community.</li> </ul> <p>Councillor Lee raised GLRA’s previous letter to AT (in which GLRA criticised the GNR improvements project) and queried why GLRA had changed their position from the time of the letter to today. Mr Wilcox responded that GLRA are realistic and recognise the budgetary constraints that AT faces. Mr Wilcox noted that ‘perfect must not be the enemy of the good’ when deciding whether to undertake GNR improvements.</p> <p>The acting chair thanked Mr Wilcox for the presentation.</p>	
<p><b>13.</b></p>	<p><b>Board Discussion on Public Statements</b></p> <p>As a result of two public statement agenda items being unused due to non-attendance, the acting chair agreed that two additional members of the public could make statements.</p> <p>The first additional speaker was Mr Rehutai, the Newton Central School Principal. Mr Rehutai noted that his primary concern was the safety of the 330 children that attend Newtown Central School. He noted that there</p>	



	<p>are currently many unsafe intersections on GNR and that this should be addressed through the full programme of works.</p> <p>The second additional speaker was Gael Baldock. Ms Baldock raised several points that she believed could help make the GNR improvements safer and cheaper, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of loading bays.</li> <li>• Creating a permanent Bus Lane during rush hour.</li> <li>• Creating a signalised pedestrian crossing.</li> <li>• Keeping existing car parking.</li> <li>• Not using raised tables.</li> <li>• Improving existing cycleways.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Baldock raised her concern that AT had not personally engaged with her during the GNR process. She stated that she supported keeping GNR in its current form and was not in support of the full programme of works.</p>	
<b>Items for Approval</b>		
<p><b>14.</b></p>	<p><b>GNR – Connected Communities Update</b></p> <p>The acting chair introduced the item. The acting chair noted that the GNR project had been paused in November 2022 for an objective review because of concerns that the cycleway was unnecessary. The acting chair noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is not a low-cost option that adequately addresses all the issues raised.</li> <li>• The conclusion from the feedback today provided by members of the public is that there are deep concerns about the staged approach and overwhelming support for the comprehensive full programme of works.</li> <li>• Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) has approved funding for its share of the full programme of works although emerging capital constraints over the next four financial years for AT make delivery of the full scheme during this period uncertain.</li> </ul>	



<p>The acting chair noted that public consultation on this issue has now ended and that his intent is to put to the board that AT should follow the full programme of works as the preferred option.</p> <p>Ms Rosie noted that children are the fastest growing population segment in Auckland but that they are typically underrepresented in decision-making processes. Ms Rosie noted that the full programme of works was most supportive of protecting child safety. Ms Rosie also noted that another important population segment is the elderly, as this group use mobility scooters and that their safety will be best protected under the full scheme of works. Ms Rosie concluded that she is very supportive of the full programme of works.</p> <p>Councillor Baker noted that he has previously voted against the full scheme of works but only because he did not believe the approach goes far enough. Councillor Baker stated that AT need to look at the wider network that goes beyond GNR and assess safety with a wider network view. Councillor Baker stated that he did not believe the full scheme adequately addresses all the wider issues and so for that reason he would vote against the full programme of works.</p> <p>Councillor Lee noted that the GNR upgrade is a divisive project and that there was not full community consensus for the proposed work. Councillor Lee raised his concern that GNR is an extremely important transport artery and that any major changes need to be carefully thought out. Councillor Lee stated that there is ample room on the existing corridor for a cycle way if the existing footpath was employed and that the proposed design is not optimal. Councillor Lee stated that the full scheme of works is not financially prudent and that he would vote against the proposal.</p> <p>Ms Clegg noted that AT has consistently under-delivered on cycle ways and that the safety of children walking to and from school is critical. Ms Clegg stated that she was in full support of the full programme of works.</p> <p>Mr Darrow noted that this project had been a good example of democracy at work, with a spirited clash of views and opinions. Mr Darrow noted that the project has enjoyed majority support from the local board and that it aligned with the delivery of the objectives of AT. Mr Darrow noted that he did not support the interim solution as it does not adequately the issues at hand. Mr Darrow stated that he was in support of the full programme of works provided AT could obtain the necessary funding.</p> <p>Mr Jaduram noted that his view on balance was that AT should proceed with the full programme of works given it provides safer transit opportunities for children and it had been heavily consulted on. However, Mr Jaduram noted his concern about funding and noted that AT should attempt to procure the programme at a lower cost.</p> <p>Mr Clarke noted that the programme appeared to be expensive when considering the level of anticipated construction required. Mr Clarke stated that he was in support of the interim solution meaning that AT proceed with Phase 1 immediately and proceed to Phase 2 upon receiving more funding.</p> <p>The board:</p>	
--	--





	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Acknowledged the feedback received from Auckland Council (AC) Transport and Infrastructure Committee (TIC) members outlining support for the full Great North Road – Connected Communities scheme or implementation of a reduced scope along with suggestions for delivery.</li> <li>b) Acknowledged that the \$28.1m full scheme design (exclusive of \$3.3m Council funded storm water separation) has received \$12.5m Waka Kotahi funding approval.</li> <li>c) Noted a Stage 1 of the potential full scheme has been identified to be installed for a three-year trial period, which would require capital funding up to \$19.4m (exclusive of \$3.3m AC funded storm water separation) that provides enhanced amenity and safety for bus users, pedestrians and cyclists compared to a do-nothing or any other considered lower cost option. This can be monitored and evaluated over a three-year trial period prior to completion of the full scheme as Stage 2 as capital funding becomes available. Safety monitoring and potential remedial safety improvements during the three-year monitoring period may be required and would need to be funded from the capital Safety Programme.</li> <li>d) Noted that the investment for this scheme will need to be spread across two financial years and will need to be managed within available budgets.</li> <li>e) Endorsed the full scope option. Delegation is provided to the Chief Executive to execute works contracts.</li> </ul> <p>For: Wayne Donnelly, Henare Clark, Mark Darrow, Raveen Jaduram, Kylie Clegg                  Against: Mike Lee, Andrew Baker                  Carried.</p>	
<b>Comfort Break</b>		
<p><b>15.</b></p>	<p><b>Ground Transportation Systems New Zealand Limited Support and Maintenance Renewal for AT HOP</b></p> <p>The EGM Business Technology introduced the report.</p> <p>The acting chair queried AT’s right of renewal under the contract. The EGM Business Technology responded that AT is committing to a two year-extension at which time it has another right of renewal for a further period of two years.</p>	



	<p>Ms Horrocks queried whether there had been issues with service levels of performance under the contract. The EGM Business Technology noted that this had never been a problem.</p> <p>The board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Approved renewal rights for a two-year extension to the Auckland Integrated Fares System contract with Ground Transportation Systems New Zealand Limited (formerly Thales New Zealand Limited) for AT HOP at an expected cost of up to \$23 million.</li> <li>b) Delegated authority to the Chief Executive to sign the final contract variation documentation.</li> </ul> <p>Moved: Kylie Clegg, Mark Darrow</p> <p>Carried.</p>	
<p>16.</p>	<p><b>SOI (Final)</b></p> <p>The EGM Planning and Investment introduced the report and noted the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decision sought was board endorsement in principle for the revised SOI.</li> <li>• The revised SOI is shorter and more concise than previous iterations.</li> <li>• Management has been working with AC to include greater focus in the SOI on Māori outcomes, including increasing the level of procurement funds available for Māori.</li> <li>• Building a comprehensive yet succinct performance measurement framework for AT will take time as data sets and benchmarks need to be established. The measures in this SOI represent the start of that process, which will be continuously improved in subsequent SOI's.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Horrocks raised her concern that there was no equity measurement or target in the SOI and noted that AT needed to show more leadership in understanding sources of inequity in the transport system. Ms Horrocks also noted her disappointment that the target metric for how Aucklanders view AT is only increasing from 30 to 36%.</p> <p>Mr Darrow noted that management had met the board's challenge around producing a more succinct and purposeful document.</p>	



<p>Ms Rosie noted that there appeared to be a level of disconnect between AT's ambitious targets and what constituents are willing to put up with to achieve those targets. Ms Rosie also queried whether investment levels specified in the SOI would be sufficient to maintain AT's eroding asset base.</p> <p>Mr Jaduram noted that there appeared to be no connection to AT's purpose and strategy in the SOI and that as such, the document lacked inspiration. Mr Jaduram also noted that some of the new measures outlined in the SOI are unclear, not sufficiently customer centric, difficult to understand and may need to be reworded.</p> <p>Mr Clarke noted that he was unclear on some of the measures and queried whether the social procurement metric of 2% was accurate.</p> <p>Councillor Lee noted that some of the measurements employed were somewhat vague and that benchmarking with comparable cities had not been undertaken.</p> <p>The acting chair concluded that this SOI represented a transition, and whilst it was not perfect, it did demonstrate a fundamental change in approach for the organisation. He also noted the difficulty in meeting both political and operational aspirations sufficiently in the same document.</p> <p>The board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Endorsed the updated draft SOI 2023 - 2026, (provided as Attachment 3) as a true and accurate reflection of AT's intent for 2023/24 to 2025/26 in response to the Letter of Expectation issued on 21 December 2022, and subsequent feedback received from AC on 25 May 2023, subject to minor amendments being made for accuracy and clarity before 31 July 2023.</li><li>b) Noted that the final SOI will be presented to the board for approval via circular resolution using the voting mechanism in Boardbooks prior to 31 July 2023.</li><li>c) Noted AC's feedback received during the development of the SOI and that this has been addressed in the SOI.</li><li>d) Requested that management note the feedback on the SOI provided during this meeting.</li></ul> <p>Moved: Mark Darrow, Kylie Clegg</p> <p>Carried.</p>	
---	--



<p><b>17.</b></p>	<p><b>Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP)– Draft for Consultation</b></p> <p>The EGM Planning and Investment introduced the report. She noted that the RPTP is being refreshed to reflect AT’s current context including budgetary constraints and that the report has been subject to extensive engagement with the TIC. The EGM Planning and Investment also noted that the next step in the process is for the report to go out for public consultation.</p> <p>Mr McGill noted that the engagement is in its third phase, with the first two phases having been engagements with key stakeholders and a survey of approximately 1,300 Aucklanders. Mr McGill noted that the RPTP has been developed based off this input and Council direction and that the goal of the RPTP is to create a better public transport system that is aligned with Aucklanders’ needs.</p> <p>Councillor Lee questioned why AT is not having public hearings on the RPTP. Mr Gill outlined both the legal and practical consideration of holding public hearings, and that the recommendation not to hold them was based on the efficacy of other methods to ensure public feedback is heard, and the limitations of the public hearing method. Ms Chetwynd also noted that Council itself had opted not to hold public hearings on the LPT process for similar reasons.</p> <p>Councillor Baker noted that hearings work well in some locations such as the city centre but not for people who live in more rural regions such as Franklin and Rodney.</p> <p>The EGM Planning and Investment thanked the board members for their feedback and advised that management is attempting to engage with as many people as possible with the limited resources available.</p> <p>The acting chair noted that AT needs to exert greater effort into reaching communities that are typically overlooked and that this requires a more granular approach than formal hearings.</p> <p>Ms Horrocks noted that this is the kind of situation where a Citizens Assembly would work well as it would allow AT to effectively engage with a representative and diverse group of people.</p> <p>Mr Darrow noted that management should take a creative approach in how it reaches people for consultation, and that AT should not just adhere to its minimum obligations but focus on doing the right thing.</p> <p>The board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Approved the release of the draft 2023 Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP) for public consultation.</li> </ul>
-------------------	---



	<p>Moved: Andrew Baker, Mark Darrow</p> <p>Carried.</p>	
<p><b>18.</b></p>	<p><b>2023/24 Budget</b></p> <p>The EGM Finance introduced the report and provided the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Operating Budget has undergone significant rework and reflects substantial reductions in funding received from AC (\$32.5m).</li> <li>• The Operating Budget reflects the recent departure of staff leaving AT (142 FTE), which impacts AT’s project delivery ability.</li> <li>• AT has funding in place to fund public transport until 30 June 2024 but nothing confirmed beyond that time. The uncertainty created by this one-off funding model is a significant issue when running an operational business.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Jaduram queried AT’s spend on professional services and whether AT could implement more work using internal staff. Mr Bardsley noted that AT does not have all the necessary expertise in-house (particularly for engineering) and that a lot of the professional services fees are in the pipeline for future work.</p> <p>Councillor Lee queried capital expenditure (capex) and whether management have unrealistic expectations in terms of the capex budget. The EGM Finance noted that management is expecting to spend close to the capex budget and more has been spent on renewals but less on walking and cycling projects than expected.</p> <p>The acting chair acknowledged the hard work of the Finance team to deliver a budget that provides the organisation with certainty leading into the next financial year. The acting chair also acknowledged Mr Darrow for all his work and guidance in respect of the Budget.</p> <p>The board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Approved AT’s 2023/24 budget.</li> <li>b) Noted this budget delivers on AT’s existing \$24 million cost challenges and a \$22.5 million reduction in AC funding (previously \$32.5 million).</li> </ol>	



	<p>c) Noted that AT is sufficiently funded for the 2023/24 financial year, subject to Waka Kotahi confirmation of co-funding, however significant funding uncertainty exists beyond 30 June 2024.</p> <p>d) Noted that we are still finalising budget allocations and requirements to reflect the agreed organisational changes and while the overall budget requirements will not change, there may be some minor movements between cost categories in the final published budget.</p> <p>e) Noted the need to continue to identify further cost savings and revenue growth opportunities and to report back on those by September 2023. Work will be undertaken to identify potential opportunities.</p> <p>f) Noted that this budget has been aligned to the Letter of Expectation and AT's draft SOI.</p> <p>Moved: Raveen Jaduram, Mike Lee Carried.</p>	
<p><b>19.</b></p>	<p><b>2023/24 Capital Programme Update</b></p> <p>The EGM Finance introduced the report and noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a record level of investment for the coming year and AT has carried out a significant amount of prioritisation work, with a focus on renewals</li> <li>• The combination of the reduction in AC funding, the impact of severe weather events and inflation means that the \$1,058m of capital funding does not go as far as may be imagined.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Darrow acknowledged the hard work that has gone into this report and acknowledged the tough decisions that had to be made. Mr Darrow noted that he had two areas of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rate of renewals, in that AT has several depreciating assets which are not being replaced at the rate of depreciation.</li> <li>• That AT is making multiyear capital decisions without the assurance of funding beyond next year.</li> </ul> <p>The EGM Finance advised that management is aware of risks around funding and that the risks will be actively monitored, with continued prioritisation and sequencing of work likely to be required. The EGM Integrated Networks advised that asset conditions will deteriorate over future years because of the lack of required funding but that AT will maintain assets to the appropriate level of safety.</p>	



	<p>Mr Jaduram noted that the SOI should reflect the concerns outlined by the Capital Programme Update and the 2023/24 Budget.</p> <p>The board:</p> <p>a) Noted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. AC consulted on an Annual Plan which provides \$1,058 million of capital funding for AT for 2023/24 and on 9 June 2023, the AC Governing Body approved the AC Group 2023/24 budget; and</li> <li>ii. That AT’s capital programme will be approximately 50/50 funded by local and central Government.</li> </ol> <p>b) Approved the proposed capital programme for 2023/24 as set out in Attachment 1.</p> <p>c) Noted that certain contracts that extend beyond June 2024 may not be able to be awarded, until further certainty around funding is obtained. In the event assurances are not received, the shape of the proposed capital programme may need to be altered.</p> <p>Moved: Mark Darrow, Mike Lee.</p> <p>Carried.</p>	
<b>Standing Items</b>		
<p><b>20.</b></p>	<p><b>Chief Executive Open Business Report</b></p> <p>The Chief Executive welcomed the new directors (Mr Jaduram and Mr Clark) to the board and acknowledged the departure of AT staff who will be leaving the organisation in the coming weeks.</p> <p>The Chief Executive highlighted the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Customer satisfaction:</b> a combination of bad weather and technology issues has led to lower customer satisfaction for the month of May 2023 for bus and rail users (although customer satisfaction increased for ferry users).</li> <li>• <b>Public transport usage:</b> the new concession rates for under 25s is designed to increase patronage numbers amongst young people. By end of July, all suspended bus services will be restated. Management wishes to grow public transport patronage such that there will be 100 million monthly patrons in the short term, which is intended to grow to 200 million by the end of the decade.</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>SOI:</b> the SOI is an important document for AT and there needs to be greater progress made in getting this document finalised.</li> <li>• <b>Funding cycle:</b> AT makes long term investments but operates on an annual funding cycle. This is not a sustainable business model and there needs to be greater board engagement on this matter.</li> <li>• <b>Three Waters:</b> the board needs to have better understanding of Three Waters separation and what that means for AT in the future.</li> <li>• <b>Digital payments solution:</b> this solution will go live in 12 months.</li> </ul> <p>Councillor Lee noted that the punctuality of ferries has increased significantly in recent weeks. Councillor Lee observed the seasonal impact of ferry usage and that while the current fleet capacity works well in winter it is unlikely to be adequate in summer.</p> <p>Ms Horrocks queried how the number of public transport trips will be measured and reported back to the board. The EGM Safety responded that the goal is to develop a clear and visually appealing dashboard which will be presented monthly to the board.</p> <p>The board:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Received this report.</p> <p>Moved: Raveen Jaduram, Mike Lee.</p> <p>Carried.</p>	
<p><b>21.</b></p>	<p><b>Business Report – Monthly Transport Indicators</b></p> <p>Mr McGill introduced the report and noted that the number of deaths and serious injuries (DSI) on the road network remains high.</p> <p>The board:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Received this report.</p> <p>Moved: Mark Darrow, Mike Lee</p> <p>Carried.</p>	





<i>Items for Noting</i>	
<b>22.</b>	<p><b>Safety Business Report</b></p> <p>The EGM Safety introduced the report. The EGM Safety highlighted the following areas of the report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Dashboard:</b> the dashboard has been redesigned to provide clear safety information and provide better understanding of safety performance and insights</li> <li>• <b>Violence, Threats and Aggression (VTA):</b> VTA remains high. Management is encouraging staff to report any incidents and seeking to better understand where these incidents are happening. There are some safety changes coming into effect including driver doors and protection screen.</li> <li>• <b>DSI:</b> DSI figures remain high. The previous baseline used was set in 2018 which is now outdated.</li> <li>• <b>Motorcycle deaths:</b> there is an upwards trend in motorcycle deaths, with time of day and weather being key contributing factors.</li> </ul> <p>Ms Rosie noted her concern around safety and wished to be assured that there are sufficient safety measures in place following a recent serious incident on the Te Huia line to Auckland. Ms Rosie also noted her concern around the exponential increase in violent action, particularly against government employees involved in public consultation. Ms Rosie noted that there is desire for increased public engagement but at the same time there is increased risk of VTA for those employees involved in engagement processes.</p> <p>The EGM Safety noted that AT has introduced a risk assessment for consultation and there is a need to ensure the right consultation protocols are followed.</p> <p>Mr Darrow raised his concern that the DSI numbers are higher in Rodney and Franklin than all other areas combined and queried what AT can do to remedy that issue.</p> <p>The EGM Safety replied that AT has tried to introduce several different initiatives including increased fines and penalties and increased cell phone monitoring but that these initiatives have been difficult to implement. The EGM Safety noted that road safety requires management to use multiple levers, including improving infrastructure, speed changes, and a proper policing regime but that there is not sufficient public support for this magnitude of change. The EGM Safety noted that AT needs to think about safety holistically rather than just roads and that AT needs to work closely with its partners as part of a broader system response.</p>



	<p>Councillor Baker noted that safety changes are statistics driven, meaning that AT tends to be reactive to accidents as they happen. Councillor Baker questioned how management can get ahead of the curve and be more proactive in its approach to road safety. The EGM Safety replied that licensing is being looked at in this regard and is a big focus in the road to zero policy.</p> <p>Ms Clegg and the acting chair acknowledged the work of the EGM Safety and her role in elevating the approach to safety across the organisation.</p> <p>The board:</p> <p>a) Received this report.</p>	
<p><b>23.</b></p>	<p><b>General Business</b></p> <p>None noted.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 1.39pm.</p>	
<p><b>Next meeting: Tuesday 29 August 2023</b></p>		

Approved by Board as a true reflection of the proceedings.


