

# **Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan Variation**

## **Hearing Panel Report on Submissions**

**July 2015**

# Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan Variation Hearing Panel Report on Submissions

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Background.....	3
2.1. Purpose of Variation .....	3
2.2. Consultation process .....	3
2.3. Written submissions.....	4
2.4. Hearings .....	4
3. Simplified zone fares.....	5
4. Light rail .....	8
5. Ferry development plan .....	11
6. New Network .....	14
7. SuperGold concessions .....	15
8. Other issues raised .....	16
9. Summary of Panel Recommendations .....	18
Appendix A: Hearing Panel Minutes.....	20

# 1. Introduction

This report presents the recommendations of the Hearings Panel established by Auckland Transport (AT) to consider public submissions on the Variation to the Regional Public Transport Plan (RPTP). A total of 1,251 submissions were received.

The report summarises the key issues raised in submissions, and the Panel's response to the matters raised. It also identifies the changes that the Panel recommends as a result of the consultation process.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Purpose of Variation

The Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) requires AT to prepare and regularly review a RPTP for Auckland. The RPTP describes services that are integral to Auckland's public transport network; and sets out policies that apply to those services.

The current RPTP was adopted in 2013. At its 28 April 2015 meeting, the AT Board approved the public release of a variation to the RPTP, to address four public transport initiatives that have developed since the current RPTP was approved in 2013, as described below:

Initiative	RPTP changes required
Simplified zone fares	Amendments to the fares and ticketing policy section to provide for the new simplified zone fares system
Light rail	Inclusion of light rail in network and service descriptions; changes to some policies; consequential amendments to bus unit descriptions
Ferry Development Plan	Changes to ferry policies and unit/service descriptions to reflect the Ferry Development Plan
New Network	Changes to unit service descriptions & implementation timetable following community consultation

### 2.2. Consultation process

Following pre-engagement with key stakeholders (including those listed in section 125 (1) of the LTMA), a Statement of Proposal outlining the proposed variation to the RPTP was issued for public comment on 11 May 2015. Public submissions were invited up until 5 June 2015, and a total of 1,251 submissions were received. A parallel public consultation process on Simplified Zone Fares was also undertaken during this period.

During May, workshop presentations on the proposed variation and Simplified Zone Fares were made to local boards and the Auckland Council Infrastructure Committee.

A Hearings Panel heard oral submissions from 7 submitters on 12 June 2015. The Panel was Mark Gilbert (Chair), Cr Christine Fletcher, Peter Clark (Chief Strategy Officer, Strategy and Planning), and Mark Lambert (General Manager, AT Metro).

Following the hearings, the Panel met to deliberate on the matters that had been presented in submissions, and to consider the changes that should be made to the RPTP as a result. This report summarises the recommendations that have emerged from that process.

### 2.3. *Written submissions*

Table 1 presents a summary of the written submissions received by submitter type.

**Table 1: Submissions received by submitter type**

Submitter Group	Number of submissions
Council CCO	2
Local Boards	12
NZTA	1
Public transport operators	2
Kiwirail	1
Transport sector groups	5
Major destination groups	3
Advocacy groups	11
Community & resident groups	3
Iwi	1
Local business & other	2
Individuals	1,208
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,251</b>

Over 1,000 submissions related to the review of SuperGold fare concessions. Although this issue is included in the Fares and Ticketing policy section of the Statement of Proposal, the focus of the current variation is on the implementation of Simplified Zone Fares, and not on the specific application of fare concessions. The proposed RPTP wording proposes that AT undertake a review of concession fares, and this review should be treated as a separate exercise for the purposes of this variation. The submissions received on this issue, which are summarised in **section 7** below, will be taken into account in the review.

### 2.4. *Hearings*

The following submitters presented oral submissions to the hearings panel.

- Waiheke Local Board
- Kaipataki Local Board
- Manurewa Local Board
- Waitakere Ranges Local Board
- Franklin Local Board
- Howick Local Board
- Grey Power

The minutes of the Hearings Panel held on 12 June 2015, including a précis of the key points raised by each of the submitters that attended, is included at **Appendix A**.

### 3. Simplified zone fares

107 submissions referred to simplified zone fares (not including the submissions relating to SuperGold concessions, which are discussed separately in this report).

In addition to the RPTP submissions, the separate consultation on simplified zone fares generated 1,563 responses. The key themes to emerge from that process, where they are relevant to the RPTP variation, have been included in the discussion below.

Most submissions supported the introduction of simplified zone fares. There was strong support for the journey concept, enabling customers to transfer between services without incurring a fare penalty. Submitters were generally in favour of the zonal structure, although there were some concerns about the location of some of the zone boundaries (particularly the city zone), and the cost impact for customers making short trips that crossed fare boundaries, particularly for travel to and from school.

The following table summarises the key issues raised in submissions on Simplified Zone Fares, and the Hearing Panel response.

Issue raised	Panel response
<p>City zone boundaries. Some submitters (e.g. AA) consider that the city zone is too small, and that the boundary is not equitable. Some suggested extending the city zone boundary further out. A number of submissions (e.g. I Johnson, A McLaren, B Ross) objected to Orakei station being placed outside the City zone, necessitating a 2-zone fare for travel to the city centre. Other suggestions for adjustments to the city zone boundary were to include Westmere (Waitemata Local Board); and to exclude Mt Eden.</p>	<p>The size and location of the city zone was carefully considered by the AT Board in the development of the Simplified Zone Fares proposal. The decision to retain a fare boundary close to the existing 1-stage boundary enables revenues to be retained, while minimising impacts on existing customers. The proposed boundary addresses a current anomaly in the fare structure, by aligning the bus and rail fare boundaries. Orakei Basin forms a natural boundary at a similar distance to the remainder of the city zone boundary. For these reasons, the Panel recommends retention of the boundary as proposed.</p>
<p>Some submitters (e.g. T2 Consultants, IPENZ, G Knox) considered that there are too many zones, pointing to overseas examples of flat fares or 2 or 3 zone models.</p>	<p>The number of zones enables fare impacts on existing customers to be managed, while retaining a revenue-neutral approach. It may be possible for zones to be combined in future.</p>
<p>The location of some boundaries in relation to school travel was highlighted in some locations, (e.g. Rangitoto College, Onehunga schools).</p>	<p>The Panel acknowledges these concerns, and believes that there is potential to revisit some of the zone boundaries for specific adjustments for school travel to ensure that schools located close to zone boundaries are treated as if they were located at the boundary.</p>
<p>Zone boundaries mean that short trips that cross boundaries will pay a 2-zone fare, but longer trips</p>	<p>Any zone system will involve travel across a boundary, but the zones have been drawn to</p>

<p>within a zone will only pay a 1-zone fare. This inequity could be overcome by either a distance-based fare, or by expanding the zone overlap areas (e.g. Henderson-Massey, Kaipatiki, Devonport-Takapuna Local Boards, IPENZ, M Robitzsch)</p>	<p>minimise the amount of short cross-boundary travel. Most boundaries have been drawn to coincide with existing stage boundaries and/or major travel destinations, and proposed fares for 1 and 2 zones are close to the existing 1 and 2 stage fares. This means that the vast majority of HOP customers will pay the same or less than their current fare. However, the Panel recommends a further review of zone boundary overlaps prior to implementation, to address the issues raised by submitters. To provide future flexibility to adjust boundaries to address issues that may arise in future, the Panel also recommends that the zone map is not included in the final RPTP, but instead is maintained by AT and published on its website.</p>
<p>The zone boundaries mean that fares for some short trips will be higher than some long trips. Some submitters (e.g. S Tjokro, N Fraser) favoured distance-based fares.</p>	<p>The Panel notes that distance based fares were considered as part of AT's investigation of fare systems, but rejected because they would create uncertainty for all but regular customers, and raise serious challenges for bus drivers in determining correct cash fares.</p>
<p>The zone names should be replaced by a numbering system; and zones should be drawn as concentric rings (N Spencer)</p>	<p>Feedback in focus groups indicates that named zones are easier to understand than numbered zones; and that concentric ring boundaries added unnecessary confusion and was not intuitive for customers to work out their expected fare.</p>
<p>Ferry services should be more fully integrated into the Simplified Zone Fares system (e.g. Howick &amp; Waiheke Local Boards, T2 Consultants, IPENZ, Civic Trust)</p>	<p>The Panel agrees that a better integration of ferries is desirable, but the LTMA does not allow AT to apply RPTP policies, including fare policies, to all ferry services. This is because some ferry services, including Waiheke and Devonport are "exempt" services under the LTMA, and not subject to PTOM contracts with AT. Any fare integration involving these services would be subject to commercial agreement with the operators concerned. There would also be significant revenue implications if the proposed zonal fares were applied to other ferry services. Notwithstanding these constraints, the Panel understands that it may be possible to develop a technical solution that enables ferries to be incorporated into the zonal system (but not necessarily including fare parity), provided commercial issues can be adequately resolved. We recommend that this solution is progressed, and that if technically feasible, negotiations with operators to include exempt services are undertaken as soon as possible.</p>
<p>While the increased discount for AT HOP over cash was generally supported as a way of encouraging HOP uptake, some submitters (e.g.</p>	<p>The Panel agrees with these points, and recommends that particular attention be paid to initiatives that will enable and encourage greater</p>

<p>Manurewa, Papakura, Devonport-Takapuna, Kaipatiki &amp; Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Boards) highlighted the need to improve the availability of HOP cards through retail outlets, and to ensure that there is an effective information and awareness programme to enable existing cash customers to understand the changes and the advantages of switching to HOP (especially in lower income areas)</p>	<p>uptake of HOP cards, especially in areas where current uptake is below average.</p>
<p>Some submitters (e.g. Howick, Franklin, Kaipatiki, Devonport-Takapuna Local Boards, A Wilkins) raised concerns that the proposed limits on transfer times (30 minutes), journey time (2 hours) and the number of trips that constitute a journey (3), would be too restrictive in some instances, especially if services were delayed or cancelled.</p>	<p>The Panel understands that these limits can be adjusted within the ticketing system without undue cost. We recommend that a review of these limits is undertaken to ensure that they are sufficiently flexible to cater for unexpected journeys, especially in circumstances where transfer times may be impacted by service delays; and that the limits are closely monitored post-implementation to ensure customers are not being penalised.</p>
<p>The Bus &amp; Coach Association noted the need to ensure that services have sufficient capacity to cater to the expected increase in demand resulting from the new fare system</p>	<p>The Panel acknowledges this concern but believes that the existing policies in the RTPP relating to service level adjustments should be sufficient to address it. AT will continue to monitor patronage and ensure that adequate capacity is available to respond to demand.</p>
<p>Monthly pass: a number of submitters objected to the proposed cost of the single monthly pass, which is more expensive than the existing Zone A pass (e.g. A Wilkins).</p>	<p>The Panel notes that research into existing pass use patterns shows that most existing Zone A pass users will be better off using stored value for their travel under Simplified Zone Fares, as the removal of transfer penalties will reduce the cost of travel which requires transfers. This needs to be more effectively communicated to existing pass users, together with the rationale for simplifying the monthly pass offering.</p>
<p>Daily pass: some submitters considered the cost of the daily pass to be too high (e.g. G Knox); and others (e.g. ATEED, Te Runanga Ngati Whatua) considered that a wider offering for visitors should be provided (e.g. 72 hours, 7 days, or combined tickets that include PT and admission to tourist attractions).</p>	<p>The Panel notes that the proposed product offering is designed to simplify the range of products that is available, but acknowledges that there may be opportunities for enhancements in future, especially for the visitor market.</p>
<p>Annual fare review is too frequent: should be every 2-3 years (Herne Bay Residents Assn)</p>	<p>An annual fare review allows AT to make more regular, modest adjustments to fare levels. This enables AT to respond to changes in costs in a timely manner, maintain farebox recovery targets, and keep the size of any fare increases to a minimum, thereby limiting any adverse patronage impact. The Panel recommends retaining an annual fare review, but amending the policy to remove reference to a January fare adjustment, to provide greater flexibility.</p>
<p>Some submissions expressed support for fare</p>	<p>The Panel agrees that fare caps have</p>

caps in preference to passes (e.g. G McCabe, A Wilkins)	advantages for customers, but notes that they would present some technical and commercial revenue apportionment challenges with implementing caps if introduced from Day 1. The Panel recommends that AT look at fare caps once the new system has settled in, and the new network and PTOM contracts are in place.
---	---

### **Panel Recommendations**

*The Panel recommends the following actions in response to the submissions received on Simplified Zone Fares:*

- *Confirm the policy approach for Simplified Zone Fares taken in the Statement of Proposal*
- *Confirm the general location of zone boundaries, but undertake a detailed review of zone overlaps and school bus stop locations to minimise the incidence of short trips that must cross zone boundaries*
- *To enable flexibility for future amendments, do not include the zone map in the final RPTP, but instead publish detailed boundary maps on the AT website.*
- *Add an action that AT will develop a technical solution to incorporate ferries into the zonal fare structure; and negotiate with ferry operators to enable exempt ferry services to be included.*
- *Add an action to ensure that the implementation of Simplified Zone Fares includes specific initiatives that will enable and encourage greater uptake of HOP cards, especially in areas where current uptake is below average; and clear information on the options available for existing monthly pass customers*
- *Review the limits on maximum transfer time, journey time and trips per journey to ensure that they are sufficiently flexible to cater to expected journeys, especially in circumstances where transfer times may be impacted by service delays avoid undue impacts on existing travel*
- *Consider increasing flexibility with a more extensive range of visitor fare products*
- *Delete the reference to a 1 January fare adjustment as part of the annual fare review.*
- *Look at fare caps once the new system has settled in, and the new network and PTOM contracts are in place.*

## **4. Light rail**

97 submissions were received in response to the proposals for light rail in the Statement of Proposal. Most were supportive of light rail, but some stakeholders consider that including light rail in the RPTP at this stage is premature, given the lack of detail available on the investigations undertaken, costs, timing and impacts on local communities and the transport system.



The following table summarises the key issues raised in submissions on light rail, and the Panel's response.

Issue raised	Panel response
<p>Some key stakeholders (including Bus &amp; Coach Assn, AA, NZTA, NZCID, Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board), while supportive of investigating light rail, did not believe the information provided to date is sufficient to enable them to reach a conclusion on whether or not to support light rail implementation. Some therefore considered the inclusion of light rail in the RPTP to be premature at this stage.</p>	<p>The Statement of Proposal notes that light rail is still under investigation, and proposes changes to the RPTP to reflect this, and to identify the potential routes and impacts on existing bus services should a decision to implement light rail be made.</p> <p>The Panel believes that it is appropriate that the RPTP includes reference to the light rail investigations, and that it outline the changes to bus services that would result if light rail is implemented. However, it also acknowledges the need to ensure that information on routes, timing, costs, and impacts is made available to stakeholders and affected parties as the investigations progress. The Panel notes that additional information has recently been made available on the AT website, and recommends that this be forwarded to submitters.</p>
<p>Cost: some submitters expressed concern about the costs of light rail, and the potential for light rail to divert funds away from other public transport projects (e.g. Franklin, Kaipatiki &amp; Devonport-Takapuna Local Boards). Others (e.g. AA) were concerned that there is no provision for light rail in funding documents.</p>	<p>This matter is more appropriately addressed as part of the Regional Land Transport Plan. The Panel notes that a variation to that Plan would be required to enable light rail to be funded.</p>
<p>What has changed since the apparently robust 2012 CCFAS process, which discounted LRT? (NZCID)</p>	<p>The Government and other bodies expressed concerns that the level of congestion with the CRL and surface bus solution was not acceptable. AT was itself concerned that the rapid growth in public transport patronage in recent years, required a further solution.</p>
<p>The conclusion that light rail is the best option has not fully considered bus rapid transit (BRT) as an alternative (Bus &amp; Coach Assn)</p>	<p>A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) option using very high-capacity double-articulated buses was specifically considered but this option was found to be inadequate to meet public transport demand in the medium to long-term.</p> <p>The Panel recommends that the findings of the investigations on options are made available to stakeholders so that they can see how various options have been considered.</p>
<p>Light rail is not included in the Auckland Plan, and the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP) does not support the land use intensification that would be required alongside the proposed light rail corridors to maximise their patronage potential (e.g. NZCID, AA, IPENZ, Howick Local Board)</p>	<p>The Panel notes this concern, and we understand that that the issue of land use intensification on rapid transit corridors is being discussed with the Auckland Council, with a view to increasing densities along the corridors.</p>
<p>Wording of the Statement of Proposal suggests</p>	<p>The Panel does not agree with this view, as the</p>

<p>that AT has already made up its mind on light rail (Bus &amp; Coach Assn)</p>	<p>Statement of Proposal makes it clear that no decisions have been taken. The purpose of including the material on routes and possible timing is to make stakeholders aware of the possible implications of a future decision to implement light rail.</p>
<p>The suggestion that buses on routes replaced by light rail can be reallocated to other locations fails to take account of the procurement constraints of PTOM (Bus &amp; Coach Assn)</p>	<p>The Panel accepts that the wording of the Statement of Proposal may have been misunderstood in relation to how bus resources might be reallocated in future. Any changes to bus services will be made in accordance with the provisions of the LTMA and PTOM contracts, but AT does expect increased demand for bus services in areas outside the light rail corridors as the city grows. The Panel recommends that the RPTP clarify that light rail could enable the potential redistribution of bus resources to other areas, subject to PTOM procurement issues being addressed</p>
<p>Some submitters (e.g. T2 Consultants, IPENZ, AUT) asked for the rationale for selecting Queen Street and Dominion Road as the highest priority route</p>	<p>The Panel recommends that further detail be made available on the rationale for these routes being prioritised.</p>
<p>Some submitters (e.g. Balmoral Pharmacy, Dr Jack, AUT) expressed concern at the potential impacts of light rail construction on adjacent properties, and the potential need for residents to move out, and the costs of any resulting compensation.</p>	<p>The Panel understands that impacts on adjacent properties will be addressed as part of the on-going light rail investigations and that this will include more detailed consultation with adjacent property owners, residents and businesses. We would also expect these issues to be fully examined as part of the consenting process. However, the Panel is advised that light rail would be constructed generally within the existing road corridor, and so impacts on existing properties along the routes are expected to be limited.</p>
<p>The Statement of Proposal is vague about whether or not light rail will be extended to Wynyard Quarter. Waterfront Auckland and ATEED both support extension to Wynyard as part of the first stage. Viaduct Harbour Holdings Ltd also supports a connection to Wynyard, but notes the operational difficulties associated with some route options. Waitemata Local Board opposes any route through the public square in Lower Queen Street.</p>	<p>The Panel notes that more detailed work is required on the option to extend light rail to Wynyard Quarter, including on-going collaboration with Waterfront Auckland and Viaduct Harbour Holdings Ltd, before any decision about routing and timing can be made. The Panel also acknowledges concerns about light rail in Lower Queen Street and notes that work is underway on routing options in this area.</p>
<p>A number of submitters (e.g. Howick, Waiheke &amp; Henderson-Massey Local Boards) proposed other routes for light rail, including replacement for the Inner Link bus route; and connections to the North Shore, along the North-western Motorway, Panmure-Botany, Tamaki Drive, and Pakuranga Highway to Howick.</p>	<p>The Panel considers that the light rail investigations should be confined to the routes identified in the Statement of Proposal at this stage, as the other routes suggested are not being considered in the short to medium term. Future route extensions are possible, but would be beyond the implementation horizon of this RPTP.</p>

## Panel Recommendations

The Panel recommends the following actions in response to the submissions received on light rail:

- *Include reference to light rail investigations in the RPTP, as indicated in the Statement of Proposal*
- *Include potential unit descriptions for light rail (and affected bus units), but make it clear that these are subject to a decision to proceed with light rail, and subject to detailed consultation on routes via the New Network implementation process.*
- *Release available information on light rail investigations to stakeholders and affected parties as the investigations progress, including information on options, routes, timing, costs, and impacts*
- *Clarify that light rail could enable the potential redistribution of bus resources to other areas, subject to PTOM procurement issues being addressed*
- *Continue discussions with Auckland Council on the issue of land use intensification on rapid transit corridors*

## 5. Ferry development plan

142 submissions referred to the proposed RPTP changes to give effect to the Ferry Development Plan. Most were supportive of the proposals to improve ferry service levels and infrastructure, and of the need to better integrate ferry services into the wider transport network. Some submitters considered that further steps could be taken in this regard. The proposal to focus on existing services rather than extensions to the network was also generally supported, although there were some calls for services to new destinations to be considered. Submissions also identified the need for improved passenger facilities, and better intermodal connectivity at terminals.

The key issues raised in submissions on the Ferry Development Plan, and the Panel's responses, are summarised below.

Issue raised	Panel response
Some submitters (e.g. Waiheke Local Board) were concerned that the Ferry Development Plan had been prepared and approved without adequate consultation. T2 Consultants/IPENZ also questioned the status of the Ferry Development Plan and the need for it to be consulted on if the RPTP is to give effect to its contents.	As the RPTP is the public document where ferry policies are contained, the current process does provide an opportunity for stakeholder input. However, the Panel acknowledges that in future, a more direct engagement with affected stakeholders during preparation of such plans would be appropriate.
A number of submitters raised concerns with the treatment of exempt services in the RPTP. There was a view that services such as Devonport and Waiheke should not be treated differently to contracted services, as they are integral to the regional public transport network, and should therefore be subject to the same policies and controls as other services, especially in relation to	The Panel notes that there is some public confusion over the status of exempt services, which warrants further explanation in the RPTP. Exempt services (including the Waiheke, Devonport and Stanley Bay ferry services) are specified in legislation (LTMA 2003), and this means that the services are not subject to AT's policies as outlined by the RPTP. The RPTP

<p>fares, services levels and vessel standards (e.g. Waiheke Local Board)</p>	<p>recognises the Devonport, Stanley Bay and Waiheke-Matiatia ferry services as integral to the network, but these services are not allocated to a Unit and are not subject to PTOM contracts. As a result service levels and fares are not within the control of AT, as they are determined by the operators.</p>
<p>Several submitters considered ferry fares to be too expensive, and called for ferry fares to be more fully integrated with rest of the public transport network; and for exempt services to be subsidised to keep fares down. (e.g. Waiheke Local Board)</p>	<p>The Panel acknowledges the concerns that ferry fares are not well integrated with bus and rail fares, but notes that the new monthly pass will provide some improvement. Further options to integrate ferry fares are under investigation (as discussed in the Simplified Zone Fares section above). As noted above, current legislation limits the capacity of AT to subsidise exempt services in order to keep fares down.</p>
<p>A number of submissions raised issues related to ferry infrastructure and terminal facilities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to AT wharfs for Explore Waiheke services appears inequitable, and Fullers monopoly over access at the Downtown Ferry Terminal (Waiheke Local Board)</li> <li>• Need to accommodate faster loading and unloading</li> <li>• Improved provision for cycling and walking connections (Waitemata Local Board)</li> <li>• Shelter – passenger waiting areas are needed. Improvements noted included Downtown, Pine Harbour, Gulf Harbour and West Harbour; and bus shelters for locations with bus connections e.g. Waiheke Island</li> <li>• Park and Ride provision (Henderson-Massey Local Board)</li> <li>• Downtown Ferry Terminal upgrade should be a priority (ATEED); Waterfront Auckland has noted that this needs to consider the future plans for Queens Wharf</li> <li>• Pump out facilities are inadequate (Waiheke Local Board); also needed at Half Moon Bay</li> <li>• The need for terminals and approaches to comply fully with accessibility standards (Blind Citizens NZ)</li> </ul>	<p>The Panel notes that the Ferry Development Plan aims to address a number of these issues, with a plan to steadily improve facilities and terminals as funding comes available. However, the fiscally constrained environment highlights the need to carefully prioritise improvements.</p> <p>The Panel also notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to AT terminal facilities is currently being reviewed following expiry of a legacy access agreement. Until these issues are resolved access is assessed on the space available.</li> <li>• Facility improvements are being designed with accessibility, cycle and walking, shelter and park and ride provisions in mind</li> <li>• The proposed Downtown Ferry Terminal redevelopment should lead to all-round improvement for ferry berthing and passenger facilities.</li> <li>• AT is required to provide sullage pump out facilities and is investigating Half Moon Bay requirements for SeaLink.</li> <li>• AT needs to engage with Waterfront Auckland, as part owner of Queens Wharf, on the redevelopment of the Downtown Ferry Terminal.</li> <li>• The RPTP should refer specifically to compliance with accessibility standards</li> </ul>
<p>A number of submissions raised the need for improved connections with buses, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus connections at Gulf Harbour, Pine Harbour, West Harbour and Waiheke Island</li> </ul>	<p>The Panel notes that timed bus connections are already provided to ferry services at a number of locations. Waiheke Bus Company's timetables are being updated from July 2015 with 135 extra bus trips per week to connect with Explore Ferry sailings at Matiatia at peak times. Gulf Harbour</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better bus/ferry timetable integration</li> </ul>	<p>will have a timed bus feeder service from October 2015. New Network bus planning is working to retain and enhance these bus-ferry connections, including further improving connections to Explore Ferry sailings at Matiatia. Pine Harbour bus-ferry connections will be considered in the forthcoming review of Beachlands-Maraetai bus services.</p>
<p>Service Development. Submissions were generally supportive of the increase in services in the Ferry Development Plan (FDP), but some considered that further improvements are needed. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional provision for tourist services (ATEED)</li> <li>Concern that the patronage estimates provided in the FDP do not reflect expected growth in some areas; and that the service development proposals outlined in the FDP do not match expected patronage demand estimates (Kaipatiki Local Board, Top Harbour Ltd)</li> <li>A general desire for more services in all areas, especially weekends, interpeak and later evening sailings (e.g. Howick Local Board). Specific timetable options were provided for Pine Harbour</li> <li>A number of submissions were received from Gulf Harbour users noting the need for funding in the short term for additional sailings, larger vessels, terminal improvements, and bus services (e.g. Top Harbour Ltd).</li> <li>Some concerns were raised re vessel quality and capacity. Services mentioned as needing more capacity were West Harbour, Pine Harbour, Gulf Harbour.</li> </ul>	<p>The Panel notes that funding and demand will determine when services can be improved through increased frequency and capacity. The service levels in the RPTP, which are based on those in the Ferry Development Plan, provide for minimum service levels.</p> <p>The Panel acknowledges the importance of tourism to the region's economy and the role of ferries in this, and AT will make terminal facilities available to tourist services whilst prioritising regular passenger services. However, the Panel notes that under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 public transport services for the sole or primary purpose of tourism are considered to be exempt services and hence not able to be publicly funded, nor subject to the objectives and policies of the RPTP.</p> <p>The Panel agrees that the passenger demand model needs to be reviewed to take into account the increased housing developments across the region. It also suggests that the service improvement proposals in the Ferry Development Plan are reassessed in light of future integrated transport solutions, demonstrated demand, and updated information on growth in origin areas, as part of the next review of the RPTP</p>
<p>While a number of submissions supported the focus on improvements to existing services (e.g. AA), there were submissions in favour of further development of the ferry network to include new connections, including consideration of new infrastructure/services in the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manukau Harbour (Franklin Local Board)</li> <li>Tamaki River (Howick Local Board)</li> <li>Island Bay (Kaipatiki Local Board)</li> <li>East Auckland, Browns Bay, Takapuna, Te Atatu</li> <li>Wynyard Quarter (Waterfront Auckland, Viaduct Harbour Holdings)</li> </ul>	<p>In the short to medium term, the Panel considers that the current strategy of focussing limited resources on improvements to existing services will be more cost-effective than expanding the ferry network to new locations. However, the RPTP will provide for future proposals for new services to be assessed using the new service assessment criteria outlined in the Ferry Development Plan.</p>

## **Panel Recommendations**

*The Panel recommends the following actions in response to the submissions received on the ferry development plan:*

- *Confirm the approach to ferry development outlined in the Statement of Proposal (i.e. a focus on improvements to existing infrastructure and services, ahead of any network extensions)*
- *Clarify the position of exempt services in the RPTP*
- *Ensure that the future preparation or review of the Ferry Development Plan and similar documents involves a more direct engagement with affected stakeholders*
- *Engage with Waterfront Auckland, as part owner of Queens Wharf, on the redevelopment of the Downtown Ferry Terminal.*
- *Amend RPTP action 7.1 (b) to add the words “and ensure compliance with accessibility standards”*
- *Ensure that the passenger demand model is reviewed to take account of the increased housing developments across the region*
- *Reassess the service improvement and infrastructure proposals in the Ferry Development Plan in light of future integrated transport solutions, demonstrated demand, and updated information on growth in origin areas, as part of the next review of the RPTP.*

## **6. New Network**

30 submissions referred to the New Network section of the RPTP variation. Although the Statement of Proposal stated that further submissions on the New Network were not being sought in areas where community consultation has already taken place, some comments were received. The Panel recommends that these are taken into account as services in these areas are reviewed.

Some comments were also received on the New Network in areas where community consultation has not yet taken place (e.g. North Shore and Central and East Auckland). These comments will be passed on to the team undertaking community consultation in those areas. A number of submitters expressed interest in taking part in the New Network consultation processes in those areas.

### **Panel recommendations**

*The Panel recommends that the comments received on New Network issues be taken into account in upcoming service reviews and New Network consultation processes.*

## 7. SuperGold concessions

Over 1,000 submissions were received in relation to SuperGold fare concessions, particularly the proposal to review the availability of free travel for SuperGold card holders during the afternoon peak period.

The submissions note that the Fares and Ticketing Policy included in the Statement of Proposal refers to a review of concession fares, which will consider a possible change to SuperGold card availability to remove free travel during the evening peak period. They note that this would severely curtail free SuperGold card travel, with the concession being cut between 3.00-6.00pm.

A large number of submissions made the following points:

*“Seniors in Auckland are recognised by Government as having to travel considerable distances to health care and to connect with relatives and activities that maintain their cultural links across the region. The provision to extend the SuperGold card after 3pm was a decision not taken lightly. It should not be removed at a time when seniors are asked to pay an additional transport levy on top of their rates; a third of which is going to pay Auckland Transport to get Aucklanders to workplaces. By utilising off-peak travel on public transport, extra vehicles on the road at that time to add to the already heavy traffic congestion will be eliminated.*

*“Seniors are the glue that keep families functioning and communities humming, as they are the volunteers, the emergency child care and the support folk for many services. If they have to pay to travel during the evening peak time many will be forced to curtail their volunteering”.*

Although the issue of SuperGold concessions was included in the proposed *Fares and Ticketing* policy section of the Statement of Proposal, the focus of the current variation is on the implementation of Simplified Zone Fares, and not on the specific application of fare concessions. The proposed RPTP wording retains the policy and actions from the existing RPTP, which requires AT to undertake a review of concession fares.

The Government has recently announced changes to the SuperGold Card public transport scheme. Providing clarity on the difference between AT’s senior evening peak concession and the national SuperGold free off-peak public transport scheme is of particular concern to NZTA. NZTA seeks a consistent application of SuperGold concessions across the country which does not include concessions for evening peak services. The Panel notes that a review of concessionary fares will commence in 2015. It is important that the review proceeds, as AT needs to determine whether any policy changes are necessary in response to the above issues. The review should however be treated as a separate exercise for the purposes of this RPTP variation, and any proposed RPTP amendments that may arise from the review should be brought forward as a new Variation.

The Panel acknowledges the widespread concern that this issue has raised in the community, and recommends that the submissions received are taken into account in the review.

## 8. Other issues raised

### ***Span of operations***

Although not strictly within the scope of the current variation, a submission was received that the hours of operation for public transport services are not indicated in the RPTP, with only a vague mention of a 7am to 7pm span for frequent services.

The Panel agrees that this is a policy omission in the RPTP that should be addressed with the inclusion of the following policy:

*Ensure that all-day services focussed on the city centre generally adhere to the following hours of operation:*

	<i>Weekdays</i>	<i>Saturdays</i>	<i>Sundays &amp; public holidays</i>
<i>First inbound service arrives in city centre before:</i>	<i>7.00am</i>	<i>7.00am</i>	<i>8.30am</i>
<i>Last outbound service departs city centre after:</i>	<i>11.00pm</i>	<i>11.00pm</i>	<i>10.00pm</i>

*Note: for other services such as local, crosstown, peak-only, night, and rural services, operating hours will be driven by demand*

*As the New Network for public transport is rolled out, implement more consistent spans of service for those layers of service with all-day operation, with other services spans (e.g. peak only and rural services) continuing to be tailored to demand.*

### ***Panel recommendations:***

- Include the above span of services policy in the RPTP*
- Develop a more detailed service span policy as part of the next full review of the RPTP, to describe the minimum span of service that AT aims to implement for each service category*

### ***Park and Ride***

The park and ride policy is currently inconsistent with the recently adopted 2015 Auckland Parking Strategy. This policy document went through a long public consultation process and had over 5000 submissions in 2014 and 2015. Further submissions have been raised about park and ride as part of the RPTP variation consultation. Submissions included:

- Take steps to develop and operate Park-and-Ride facilities at selected peripheral locations to extend the catchment area of the public transport network and encourage patronage growth, such as Glen Eden (Waitakere Ranges Local Board)
- Parking charges at park and ride may be detrimental to uptake (Howick Local Board)



**Panel Recommendations:**

- *Minor changes to the park and ride policy in the RPTP are made to align with the park and ride policy in the 2015 Auckland Parking Strategy.*
- *Ensure alignment with the Auckland Parking Strategy which outlines provision of future Park and Ride facilities and apply the Parking Strategy principles to prioritise sites for Park and Ride provision.*

**Other issues**

A number of submissions raised issues that are beyond the scope of the current variation. These issues, which are listed below, should be taken into account as part of the full review of the RPTP that is planned for 2016/17.

- Support for extension of rail services from Swanson to Kumeu (Henderson-Massey, Rodney & Waitakere Ranges Local Boards)
- Difficulty for blind people at ticket machines: audio response would be helpful (Blind Citizens NZ)
- AT should consult with tertiary providers on student concessions (AUT)
- Lack of adequate bus stops on Waiheke (Grey Power Waiheke)
- Opportunity to include business case approach in the next RPTP review (NZTA)
- Increased park and ride spaces needed at Glen Eden (Waitakere Ranges Local Board)
- Delay to Reeves Road flyover will be detrimental to Panmure-Botany busway and Pakuranga town centre redevelopment (Howick Local Board)
- Safety issues need to be urgently addressed (Papakura and Manurewa Local Boards)
- Recognise seniors in planning (e.g. Government Positive Aging Strategy) (Grey Power)
- Align key documents with Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan (Waikato-Tainui)

**Panel recommendations:**

- *Address the other issues raised in submissions and summarised in this section as part of the next full review of the RPTP,*
- *Invite submitters to take part in the consultation process for the next RPTP review at the appropriate time.*

## 9. Summary of Panel Recommendations

The Panel's recommendations are summarised below:

### ***Simplified Zone Fares:***

- *Confirm the policy approach for Simplified Zone Fares taken in the Statement of Proposal*
- *Confirm the general location of zone boundaries, but undertake a detailed review of zone overlaps and school bus stop locations to minimise the incidence of short trips that must cross zone boundaries*
- *To enable flexibility for future amendments, do not include the zone map in the final RPTP, but instead publish detailed boundary maps on the AT website.*
- *Add an action that AT will develop a technical solution to incorporate ferries into the zonal fare structure; and negotiate with ferry operators to enable exempt ferry services to be included.*
- *Add an action to ensure that the implementation of Simplified Zone Fares includes specific initiatives that will enable and encourage greater uptake of HOP cards, especially in areas where current uptake is below average; and clear information on the options available for existing monthly pass customers*
- *Review the limits on maximum transfer time, journey time and trips per journey to ensure that they are sufficiently flexible to cater to expected journeys, especially in circumstances where transfer times may be impacted by service delays avoid undue impacts on existing travel*
- *Consider increasing flexibility with a more extensive range of visitor fare products*
- *Delete the reference to a 1 January fare adjustment as part of the annual fare review.*
- *Look at fare caps once the new system has settled in, and the new network and PTOM contracts are in place.*

### ***Light rail:***

- *Include reference to light rail investigations in the RPTP, as indicated in the Statement of Proposal*
- *Include potential unit descriptions for light rail (and affected bus units), but make it clear that these are subject to a decision to proceed with light rail, and subject to detailed consultation on routes via the New Network implementation process.*
- *Release available information on light rail investigations to stakeholders and affected parties as the investigations progress, including information on options, routes, timing, costs, and impacts*
- *Clarify that light rail could enable the potential redistribution of bus resources to other areas, subject to PTOM procurement issues being addressed*
- *Continue discussions with Auckland Council on the issue of land use intensification on rapid transit corridors*

### ***Ferry Development Plan:***

- *Confirm the approach to ferry development outlined in the Statement of Proposal (i.e. a focus on improvements to existing infrastructure and services, ahead of any network extensions)*
- *Clarify the position of exempt services in the RPTP*

- *Ensure that the future preparation or review of the Ferry Development Plan and similar documents involves a more direct engagement with affected stakeholders*
- *Engage with Waterfront Auckland, as part owner of Queens Wharf, on the redevelopment of the Downtown Ferry Terminal.*
- *Amend RPTP action 7.1 (b) to add the words “and ensure compliance with accessibility standards”*
- *Ensure that the passenger demand model is reviewed to take account of the increased housing developments across the region*
- *Reassess the service improvement and infrastructure proposals in the Ferry Development Plan in light of future integrated transport solutions, demonstrated demand, and updated information on growth in origin areas, as part of the next review of the RPTP.*

**New Network:**

- *The Panel recommends that the comments received on New Network issues be taken into account in upcoming service reviews and New Network consultation processes.*

**Other matters:**

- *Retain a policy action in the RPTP to undertake a review of SuperGold concessions; that this be treated as a separate exercise to the current RPTP variation; and that any RPTP amendments that may arise from the review be brought forward as a new proposed RPTP Variation.*
- *Ensure that the submissions received on SuperGold concessions as part of this consultation process are taken into account in the SuperGold concession review.*
- *Include the above span of services policy in the RPTP*
- *Develop a more detailed service span policy as part of the next full review of the RPTP, to describe the minimum span of service that AT aims to implement for each service category*
- *Minor changes to the park and ride policy in the RPTP are made to align with the park and ride policy in the 2015 Auckland Parking Strategy.*
- *Address the other issues raised in submissions and summarised in Section 8 as part of the next full review of the RPTP,*
- *Invite submitters to take part in the consultation process for the next RPTP review at the appropriate time.*

# Appendix A: Hearing Panel Minutes

## RPTP Variation Hearing Panel – minutes

12 June 2015

Rangitoto Room, Mercure Hotel, 8 Customs Street, CBD

### Present as Hearing Panel:

Mark Gilbert	AT Board (Chairperson)
Cr Christine Fletcher	AT Board
Peter Clark	Auckland Transport, Chief Strategy Officer
Mark Lambert	Auckland Transport, General Manager, AT Metro

### In attendance:

Christine Herbert	Senior Account Manager, Ferry Services
Darren Davis	Principal PT Planner
Colin Homan	PT Commercial Manager
Ben Fernandez	Integrated Fares Project Director
Carol Greensmith	Communications Manager - CRL & HED
Liz Halsted	Plans, Policies & Sustainability Manager
Dirk Osborne	Senior Transport Planner
Mathew Stewart	Team Leader Consultation
Eleanor Cooley	Events Manager

The Chairperson opened the Hearing, introduced the panel and attendees, and outlined the proceedings for the Hearing.

## HEARING OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS

### WAIHEKE LOCAL BOARD 8.40 am

Shirin Brown on behalf of the Waiheke Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Welcome a reduction in fares
- Buses on Waiheke Island:
  - Want incentives to use buses on Waiheke Island
  - Want orbital rather than central bus routes only
  - Loss of Seaview bus road
  - Bus routing needs to be simplified to reduce travel time
  - Rocky Bay bus survey 2008 (tabled) - opportunity for setting up a bus route from rocky bay
  - Welcome bus route consultation to improve service
- Suggest use Oneroa and Backpool as a park and ride as shortage parking at Matiatia

- Waiheke Island and the Ferry Development Plan
  - Claims significant secondary flow of service personnel to island in am peak, not just commuters to city
  - Volume of ferry use is greater than anywhere else
  - Ferries shouldn't be exempt service. Want non-exempt and non-subsidised service and wants to work with Auckland Transport on this
  - No level playing field between Fullers and Explore ferry operators. Same prices and frequency but bus services do not link with Explore and you cannot use your HOP card or your Gold card with them
  - Wants a review of exempt services
- PTOM
  - Where does the authority lie to determine exempt or non-exempt services ?
  - Bus transport and tour operators should be able to link in and work together
  - Access to PT – competition is good, but Waiheke is not a level playing field
  - Subsidy for PT not transparent and neither is procurement of services
  - Why are Waiheke bus services negotiated and not tendered?
- Wants a small working group (bus companies, Auckland Transport, key agencies and Waiheke Local Board) to improve PT situation

Shirin Brown responded to questions from the Panel Members.

#### **KAIPATAKI LOCAL BOARD 9.00 am**

Richard Hills and Lindsay Waugh on behalf of the Kaipataki Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Really happy with the liaison with Auckland Transport
- Keen to continue to work with Auckland Transport on the safe cycle route for Northcote
- RPTP – supportive of the direction and the simplified fares
- Fare zone boundaries – wants northern Kaipataki included into hatched zonal area (e.g. Totaravale to Albany now 2 stages)
- Want as early introduction as possible of fare cap on HOP card and other passes
- Concerned about 30 minute journey gap proposed being insufficient and only 3 services in a journey
- Promote HOP card to encourage cash users to switch so less cost differential
- Light Rail – want more publicised about the benefits that CRL and LRT will bring to the North Shore because creates more capacity for North Shore buses in the CBD
- Ferry Development Plan:
  - Kaipataki area doesn't have good connections to the busway as on the western side of the motorway

- Don't believe modelling projections for west inner ferry growth. Much greater capacity for population growth west of the motorway than Takapuna (an accident of geography) with special housing areas going in
- "Ferries are the rail" of Kaipataki residents - wants parity of fares
- Promote advantages of ferry patronage from area to reduce congestion on roads, and requires no maintenance of roads/ bridge
- Onewa road cannot take any more buses and want more ferry services as insufficient capacity (people being left behind); Northcote ferry terminal is unreliable
- The total cost of the ferry service is not being considered –perhaps life cycle analysis could be looked at (whole life cost).
- Want Island bay to be considered as another ferry terminal
- Ferry links on the airport bus is important and needs to be promoted more

Richard Hills and Lindsay Waugh responded to questions from the Panel Members.

#### **MANUREWA LOCAL BOARD 9.20am**

Simeon Brown on behalf of the Manurewa Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Very supportive in general of fare structure and integrated approach to increase patronage
- Concern effect on seniors use of off-peak use SuperGold card due to concessionary fare review
- Want more people to use HOP cards and integrate between buses and train
- Concern anomaly in fares of same journey Puhinui-Manukau by train 1 zone but by bus 2 zones?
- Hourly bus service to Wattle Downs frequency too low as it's a peninsula and one way in/out
- Problem with difference between cash and HOP card fare disparity. Worried it will stop people using public transport
- Concerned about safety and cancellations on the rail network on the southern line leading to loss of confidence. There is lack of certainty and confidence in the network
- Rail services drop off south Manukau as eastern line only going to Manukau – would like to see more services further south

Simeon Brown responded to questions from the Panel Members.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**9.40 am** The Chairperson adjourned the Hearing until 10.00 am.  
**10.00 am** The Hearing reconvened.

### **WAITAKERE RANGES LOCAL BOARD 10.00am**

Greg Presland on behalf of the Waitakere Ranges Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supportive of the RPTP variation in general
- Waitakere Ranges area largely rural area with lots small villages which are public transport poor. Recognise that it is hard to serve but feels ratepayers who pay transport rate should get something and keen to see more services
- Support shuttle services and want one investigated e.g. Kowhai connection with services to Piha / Bethells beach
- Support more park and ride
  - Glen Eden park and ride is full at 7:30 every morning. Doesn't support charging as decongestion benefits higher than if more central park and ride facility.
  - Unfair to charge for park and ride when the hinterland is so poorly serviced with public transport
- Supports investigation potential to extend Light Rail out west e.g. Glen Eden to Titirangi or possibly down North Western motorway
- Supports rail services Swanson to Kumeu

Greg Presland responded to questions from the Panel Members.

### **GREY POWER (Waiheke Is) 10.20am**

Bill Rayner on behalf of Grey Power spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Zone director for Grey Power – claims membership of 10, 000 members Greypower Auckland
- Concerned Auckland Transport wants to cut the pm peak concession fare to seniors ... very grateful for and understands its unique to Auckland and that NZTA wants to end this subsidy
- Hugely beneficial impact on senior citizens as ability to 'just travel' to break isolation
- Claims impact on Auckland Transport budget relatively small and seniors paying rates for years helped pay for infrastructure
- Warns of political impact on elected representatives – possible that 10,000 seniors will march down queen street
- Wants SuperGold card peak subsidy to be extended to the rest of the country
- Wants Auckland Transport to be more conscious of seniors in their planning e.g. siting of bus stops
- Flags condition of bus stops on Waiheke Island where even basic off-road facility does not exist
- Auckland Transport design killing Devonport heritage - need to be sensitive to area's character e.g. light poles

Bill Rayner responded to questions from the Panel Members.

**FRANKLIN LOCAL BOARD 10.40am**

Andrew Baker on behalf of Franklin Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Supportive most of the RPTP variation, especially simplified zone fares – very happy with this
- Waiuku low fare likely to attract patronage
- Concerned about 30 minutes interchange and 2 hour journey time as trips from Franklin may be the exception
- Light Rail – supporter but don't want it to be at the expense of other needed public transport projects
- Ferry development plan – urgently need more services for Pine Harbour. Wants Auckland Transport to increase services. People are being refused entry already onto this ferry service
- Manukau harbour – ports of Auckland needs to retain/safeguard wharf or land for future ferry services in the harbour

Andrew Baker responded to questions from the Panel Members.

**HOWICK LOCAL BOARD 11.00am**

David Collings and Steve Udy on behalf of Howick Local Board spoke to their written submission and in particular:

- Please note that there are two separate submissions; one on RPTP variation and one on Simplified Fare Zones
- Frustrated wider process of what is in/out the transport packages. Need more transparency so can keep track as Local Board
- Community represents 10% of Auckland's population, poorly served public transport and applaud that now is changing
- Reeves road flyover issue
  - Local Board not happy that Reeves road flyover postponed for busway as no grade separation. With it town centre would work better as removes traffic and busway work better as well
  - Developer bought Pakuranga plans to invest \$500m in hotel, retail, etc.
  - Certainty around Reeves flyover is thus important – open to supporting PPP to do flyover and working with Auckland Transport on this
- Light Rail – felt proposal came out of 'left field' but are not against it. What about intensification land use needed to support light rail?
- Ferries
  - Claim that 900 people per day use Half Moon Bay ferry – park and ride is inadequate
  - Happy that Half Moon Bay ferry terminal is progressing
  - Need better sync bus and ferry services
  - Holistic approach how people get to terminal and maximise intermodal connectivity. Cycle and walkways to be built to the marina



- Need more evening ferries
- Community pressure to increase ferry services
- Suggest a loop bus around Howick village, Botany and Pakuranga linking into ferry services
- Want SuperGold card services to be continue
- Need better services to Highbrooke / East Tamaki
- Simplified zone fares
  - Well done establishing HOP card and integrated fares
  - Don't want elders or youth disadvantaged in fare products
  - Zone boundaries: e.g. Howick to airport is cheaper than Pakuranga to Silvia park
- Park and Ride
  - investigate linking park and ride to the HOP card
  - Want more park and ride

David Collings and Steve Udy responded to questions from the Panel Members.

The Chairperson adjourned the Hearing about 11.30 am.

--END--