

Auckland Transport
Katoa, Ka Ora Conversations

Speed Management Plan for Tāmaki
Makaurau Auckland

Technical Workshops Engagement
Summary Evaluation of Feedback
May – June 2022

Mene Solutions Ltd

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Background	4
Engagement Process.....	4
Key themes from workshops and submissions	6
Themes from workshops	6
Themes from submissions	9
Key findings.....	12
Appendix 1 - Agenda and Run Sheet	13
Appendix 2 - Participants in workshops	19
Appendix 3 - Virtual Workshop One Miro Board Transcription and notes	20
Appendix 4 - Virtual Workshop Two Miro Board Transcription and notes.....	27
Appendix 5 - Workshop Three Worksheet Transcription and notes	40
Appendix 6 - Workshop Four Worksheet Transcription and notes	43
Appendix 7 - Feedback from participants on workshops.....	47
Appendix 8 - Submissions following workshops	48
Appendix 9 - Late Submission from Transporting NZ	64

Executive Summary

Mene Solutions Ltd (MSL) have been engaged by Auckland Transport (AT) to facilitate four virtual and face to face workshops designed to understand the public feedback and aspirations on how AT makes decisions on selecting roads/areas for speed changes (prioritization methodology) and how AT decides what infrastructure to implement to complement these speed changes (infrastructure treatment methodology) to enable an informed, transparent and equitable decision-making process.

This report includes a summary of the outcomes delivered and a thematic analysis of the feedback collated. The body of the report contains comments and themes emphasized through comments from feedback offered in the four workshops and submissions from one individual and three organisations. These were the New Zealand Automobile Association (NZAA), Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) and Transporting New Zealand (TNZ).

A thematic analysis produced the below key findings from the feedback through the engagement process:

1. General support for the approach of Auckland Transport to achieve Vision Zero / Road to Zero and desire for ongoing collaboration including communications and monitoring.
2. Need for strong evidential data and insights to inform decision making.
3. Safety for all addressing equity and our most vulnerable community members to harm from speed especially children, youth, pedestrians, cyclists, those using micro mobility and residents.
4. High appetite to focus on schools, Kōhanga reo and early childhood centres and other community gathering places ie Marae, faith based places of worship
5. Importance of targeted education, communications, safety and health promotion to achieve a social license and behaviour change
6. Consistency of language and meaning in ongoing communications and engagement
7. Consideration of all risk factors in a complex systems approach
8. Balancing safety interventions and infrastructure with impact on journey times for commuting, commercial interests, freight movement and maintaining response times for emergency services
9. Balancing investment in design, deterrence, and enforcement

The key findings section provides further detail on these themes including specific feedback on adjustments to draft working principles, draft problem statements (including weighting) draft criteria to assess options (including weighting).

Background

Mene Solutions (MSL) were engaged by Auckland Transport to provide Independent Facilitation and Analysis services specifically for stakeholder and community engagement to gather feedback on the development of Katoa, Ka Ora, a Speed Management Plan for Auckland 2023-2026.

The purposes of the engagement programme were:

- To introduce thinking so far on Katoa, Ka Ora, a speed management plan for Auckland
- To share and discuss how short list options have been created and assessed
- To share and discuss next steps for preparing an option for public consultation

Engagement Process

Planning and preparation

Planning and preparation for the workshops was undertaken through April and May 2022. This involved the detailed development of agenda's, run sheets and workshop rehearsals. An exemplar agenda with run sheet is attached in the appendices.

Facilitation

Two virtual and two in-person workshops were facilitated between 28th May and 1st June 2022. Chris Mene was the lead facilitator with note taking support from Ella Guillemot-Mene. Senior members of Auckland Transport, technical experts, engagement and communications team members were involved in each of the workshops.

The workshops, dates and number of participants were:

- Workshop 1 – virtual (x9) Saturday 28 May
- Workshop 2 – virtual (x32) Monday 30 May
- Workshop 3 – In person (x10) Tuesday 31 May
- Workshop 4 – In person (x10) Wednesday 1 June

A full participant list is included in the appendices.

Lessons learned

Below are comments made by team members during the debriefs following each of the workshops. Learning and insights from each workshop informed the following and adaptations enhanced each subsequent workshop.

The comments have been themed by those that were positive, those requiring a work on and themes that emerged from workshops.

Positive	Work on	Interesting / themes
<p>Respect for views came across strongly</p> <p>Great presentation from Ping and Facilitation method from Chris</p> <p>Letting the different people in the room discuss with each other provides the most valuable</p> <p>Using the presentation to get people engaged in the dialogue and to start thinking together- provided great flow into the dialogue</p> <p>Multiple ways to contribute feedback- great way to prompt the facilitation and encourage the discussion</p> <p>Supportive group dynamic</p> <p>Preparation really came through, not perfect and a few clunks in the process, but worked well</p> <p>Respectful balance of acknowledging late participants</p> <p>Introductions at start of session great to establish who is in the room and establishing relationships</p> <p>Making sure scope and focus are clear</p> <p>Encouraging feedback particularly from the FENZ participants, appreciation for the process and feeling heard</p> <p>Facilitation method was very effective, met aspirations and the need</p> <p>Q/A session good approach</p>	<p>Technical aspect of navigating discussion, chat and Miro was difficult</p> <p>Strong discussion but may need to be more concise on Monday with a greater number of participants → 6 different breakout rooms on Monday with a subject matter expert and an engagement person to ensure depth in discussion</p> <p>Making sure the engagement people for Monday are capturing the chat so we can consolidate at the end</p> <p>Establishing a deadline for written feedback (Monday 13th June)</p> <p>4 breakout rooms would make sense for Monday</p> <p>Sound management- microphones, to ensure audio is picked up from the beginning</p> <p>Maintaining focus in conversations, in scope and mindful of personal agendas</p> <p>Post-it notes to act as ‘chat function’ to help control questions/comments during presentation</p> <p>Good option to allow the group to spread around the printouts to prompt discussion, less structured</p> <p>Communities struggle to differentiate</p> <p>Follow up email about survey</p> <p>Opportunity to hear everything the participants wanted to say diminished with post-it system. Did we fully grasp what they wanted to say?</p>	<p>Need for strong data and information really came through</p> <p>Speed and behavior change- speed in conjunction with other issues for road safety</p> <p>The three E’s: education, encouragement, and enforcement</p> <p>When you are taking something away from people, you need to give something back</p> <p>Make sure to remember it is part of a complex puzzle, not just a piece</p> <p>Speed reduction isn’t in isolation</p> <p>Don't want a one size fits all comms approach, target different communities</p> <p>High appetite for safe speeds particularly around schools</p> <p>Request for better attention to communication- the terminology, making it easy to understand</p> <p>Consistency in language</p> <p>Looking at mass, impact angle etc. making sure to acknowledge all aspects and not just speed</p> <p>Public health comparison- overestimating the negative impacts and underestimating the positives</p> <p>A lot of discussion surrounding behavior change, be more proactive with education on road safety and changing the understanding</p> <p>General support for the approach</p> <p>Social license, community support</p> <p>Learning from the health sector? Consultation report- separating feedback from people who have financial interest</p> <p>Categorize whose interest, upfront on what they are seeing in the report, perspective</p> <p>Why is it that at this phase majority of the people who show up to the engagement are primarily supportive of what is happening and then the people who don't agree wait until the end consultation</p> <p>Personas: what does it mean for the people I care about? E.g., Tradesmen: “I’m happy for my trip to take 3mins longer if it means my kid is safe walking to school.” Etc.</p> <p>Acknowledging the trade offs</p>

Feedback from participants was sought following each of the workshops. This information is held in the Excel document titled *Workshop Feedback - Auckland Speed Management Plan - Technical Workshops May 2022*. An analysis of this feedback is not included within the scope of this report.

Key themes from workshops and submissions

Below are the key themes from submissions received from the four workshops and submissions in the two weeks following.

Themes from workshops

Over the series of workshops, both virtual and in person, there were some recurring themes across two or more of the workshops through participant feedback. Below are tables that show the key points raised throughout each of the workshops. Each section contains a summary of points for each focus area that feedback was being sought. In some of the focus areas specific comments are made in relation to specific points ie Draft Working Principles, Problems or Criteria. More generic comments are also made.

There were several contributions that contained acronyms and technical jargon which will have specific meaning to technical experts. Direct transcription has been undertaken and typo's have been left as they are. How each of these points are addressed will be determined by the most appropriate Auckland Transport team member.

Comments in italics have been added during refresh of report taking into account transcription of conversations held in workshops, breakout rooms and digital chat.

1. Draft working principles (WP)

Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4
<p>Strong support System level view Schools, ECE, rural Principle 4 support based on evidence Acknowledgement of co-benefits</p> <p><i>Consider provide a <u>principle</u> for around schools - walkability, maraes, schools, playgrounds.</i></p>	<p>Support public acceptance. Speed limit reductions common sense to motorists. Straight designs will reflect design speeds. Consider principle around school speed limit areas. Or where lots of vulnerable users are for instance schools or marae. Universal design would be in addition to WP #7 Deliver inclusive access. Must mention vision zero. Speed management is housed within a wider safe system approach. Approach needs to unlock speed management. Progress must be monitored/communicated regularly as KPI's. Support for RASF use. Be specific with language. Ie <i>No road deaths instead of less road deaths; "Community acceptance" or "Community understanding"; Roads and streets instead of corridors</i> WP #6 clarify who the partners are. Reference Maori treaty partners. Support for emissions reduction and for active transport.</p> <p><i>Consider impact of changing vehicle fleet over time. Consider developing NZ case studies and pushing the ones we have more with the public, Harder for the public to dismiss NZ evidence than international evidence. Concern about volume of consultation on specific roads.</i></p>	<p>Prioritise rural roads. #2 is very important #6 should include education. #7 should be a key element how is this embedded in the process? #6 Strongly support Freight and trade emphasis important.</p>	<p>#7 health is more than individual emergencies</p> <p><i>Consider long term focus and planning to 2045</i></p>

2. Draft Problem Statements (PS)

Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4
<p>Road Safety Partners to provide public support Clarify community acceptance PS</p> <p><i>Acknowledgement that "stupid" isn't going to change with the speed limits</i></p>	<p>Be clear on how weightings were determined. And implications of weightings. PS1, 2 and 4 are inputs and PS3 and output. Suggest they be separated out. Community acceptance is too low post on compliance is important but must lead with safety.</p> <p>PS1 Define safe and appropriate. Should be higher PS2 Challenge to perceived vs real. Appears a soft measure PS3 Support for Vision Zero and Road to Zero Which is an all of government mandate. AT and Police need to step up. Must take the public with us. PS3 needs greater clarity. Note the political element in community acceptance. PS4 be clearer about strategies used so far. Is there a simpler way to say this focused on ie outcomes impacts.</p>	<p>Think exponential progress to dsi targets. Saturate first then build momentum. Number 3 community acceptance or education and understanding. Consider equity in cycling and walking access.</p>	<p>Nil</p>

3. Draft criteria to assess options

Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4
<p>DSI % too low Include freight but low relative to DSI</p> <p><i>Consider roading productivity as a key outcome</i></p>	<p>Agree with the term 'understanding' suggest removing 'support'. DSI impact at 28% seems way too low. Could weightings be changed for different roads or areas?</p> <p><i>Lower speeds in town centres Consider differential speeds depending on vehicle types Differential weightings urban and rural Request for clear evidence on carbon emission reductions</i></p>	<p>consider areas of higher deprivation to reduce harm. Number six and seven at indirect benefits and less relevant. DSI involving vulnerable users should be on this list. location of rest homes and retirement villages not in good walking environments. Support community development and health promotion and safer environments.</p> <p>Number 4 low hanging fruit.</p> <p>include family members who have lost loved ones in public campaigns. number one is a long term goal. Look at other ethnicities in addition to Maori.</p> <p>Honour Te Tiriti O Waitangi.</p> <p>Clarify the process for determining accuracy of numbers post op</p>	<p>Would like to see one in four be holistic number four should be higher due to disproportionate outcomes for Maori. number one and #4 focus on the streets have a greater impact for health and mortality. Number five safe active mode use? Clarify if this means active modes are unsafe inherently?</p> <p><i>Support for education in secondary schools whilst gaining driver license.</i></p>

4. Short List Development

Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4
<p>Equity & emissions reduction aligned to road safety Clear narrative Collective Risk focus</p>	<p>support for active mode shift. Important not to cloud DSI focus with other matters to get best safety outcomes.</p>	<p>target high risk groups including young men. Separate cars and cyclists. Decrease VKT for both safety and climate benefits. Integrate the story. Factor in both cycling and public transport vulnerable users should be a focus along with high risk locations and residential areas. Preference for speed tables at school crossings then speed limit signs.</p> <p>Is climate change relevant when focused on speed?</p>	<p>Nil</p>

5. Draft Speed Management Tools

Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4
<p>Missing complementary and partnered road safety campaigns</p> <p>Be overt in plan how elements link to form optimal safe system (Support) raised pedestrian crossings in urban settings</p> <p><i>Outline rule categories 1 or 2 to designate schools</i></p>	<p>reallocate Rd space to active modes. Share the experience of setting 30 kilometre per hour speed limits. Clarify what electronic signs are in scope. Teaching safe speeds and schools. Need more on straights near schools. Gateway treatments good for urban villages. Consider other tools including planting filtering strats raised footpaths and planted built out foot pads. Look at a system of tools. Make speed limits safe and appropriate and align with environment. Ensure speed cameras are widespread and always in operation. Traffic calming should be standard on all suburban side roads as should 30 kilometre per hour speed limit.</p> <p>Urban - reduce traffic volumes and VKT modeshift, filtered permeability, better public transport.</p> <p>Rural - Protected cycleways are a great way to reduce speeds on roads.</p> <p><i>Concern around the need to ensure additional signage / infrastructure is placed with care so as not to impede footpaths use by pedestrians.</i></p>	<p>Technical placement to improve driver behaviour. Barrier protected parking spaces for mobile vans. Traffic calming midblock raised table crossing?</p> <p>Community led communications. Determine optimal signs, lines, coming to support speed limits. Raised tables work 24/7. Visibility in accessibility.</p>	<p>Consistent signs and road marking treatment outside schools. In 60 kilometre per hour areas please remove Kea crossings</p>

6. Draft enforcement tools

Workshop 1	Workshop 2	Workshop 3	Workshop 4
<p>Nil</p> <p><i>Policing of slow drivers</i></p>	<p>good design reduces the need for enforcement folks stop support a mix of options.</p> <p>Consider overseas best practice re speed camera's.</p>	<p>Education equity lens important hey. Enforce following distances and safe merging. Mobile camera vans priority. Speed up the safety camera transfer to Waka Kotahi and Auckland transport.</p>	<p>camera need incident numbers to process infringement exceptions. Use of bus lanes by FENZ. FENZ Vehicles not always going fast to an emergency folks stop if over limit but not emergency want to know. Maintenance of vehicles is higher cost when lots of slow speed bumps. How can 80 support response times? Lower limits will impact FENZ policy at a national level.</p> <p>Schools near hospitals. Lower limits will impact emergency responses. Main response routes request for no traffic calming measures. Including raised crossings and speed bumps. Speed cushions are OK for wide tracks.</p>

Comments potentially out of scope

- Condition and quality of footpaths and cars parking on them
- Concern about scooters travelling on footpaths at speed
- Banning drugs and alcohol
- Consider maximum speeds over limits for emergency vehicles

Themes from submissions

Below are the strongest themes and comments from one individual and three organisations who submitted feedback during the period through to 13 June 2022. Noting that one of the submissions arrived late due to a miscommunication.

Received by email 2 June 2022

1. Support treatment options to minimize negative impact.
2. Police enforcement of slow and unsafe driver behaviour.
3. Safety around school settings
4. Police enforcement targeting to high risk
5. Costs of infrastructure builds, upgrades and repairs
6. Balancing safety needs of various road user groups with efficiency.
7. Mental health impact
8. Consistent speeds and flow impact on emissions reduction
9. Balancing safety needs of various road user groups with efficiency.
10. Driver behaviour and mindset
11. Support for specific data informed changes
12. Consider impact on drivers involved in trade industry

Fire and Emergency New Zealand received by email 10 June 2022

Summary of priority points and themes follow from workshop 3 and two submissions.

Key points made during workshop three were:

1. Principles 1 and 7 expand scope to include people impacted by emergency situations
2. Principle 8 suggested wording change to allow monitoring and altering of treatments.

Key points from *Speed limit changes feedback* dated 28 March 2022 include:

3. Support for Auckland Transport's Vision Zero approach and the primary focus areas of Road to Zero
4. Supports the proposal of reduced speed limits on streets located across Tāmaki Makaurau that are close to:
 - Kōhanga reo and early childhood centres
 - Kura and schools
 - Marae
 - Places of worship.
5. Impediments including time delays in attending a fire or other emergencies may risk the safety of people, property, and the environment and increase the risk of death or serious injury.
6. International research and local evidence supports that the faster the emergency response time, the lower the number of road accidents fatalities.

7. Proposed speed limit changes in some urban and rural areas could negatively impact emergency response time
8. Increase the risk of harm to people, property and the environment contributing to poor community outcomes.
9. Request that Auckland Transport does not implement speed limit changes, or reduces the severity of speed limit changes:
 - on streets where fire stations are located, thereby reducing the level of interface between traffic calming measures and emergency response
 - on primary response routes to optimise the efficiency of response
 - on road within 8-10 km radius of a volunteer fire station, to support volunteers to reach stations in a timely manner, therefore reducing impact on response times to emergencies in rural areas.
10. Request to work with Auckland Transport in reassessing the speed limit changes in locations that are most likely to negatively affect emergency response
11. Welcomes the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport on information sharing on primary routes and the location of fire stations to support the reassessment of speed limits that are likely to have the greatest impact on emergency response. Also, to assess the cumulative effects of multiple traffic calming treatments on emergency response time in an effort to mitigate negative community outcomes in event of fire, medical, road accident or other emergencies.

Key points from *Safer speeds feedback* dated 10 June 2022 include:

12. Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau would like to work with Auckland Transport in early planning of traffic calming interventions to ensure positive community outcomes and an overall reduction of fatalities and injuries in Tāmaki Makaurau.
13. The road network is the primary mode of emergency response, particularly in the urban environment. Delays in attending a fire or other emergencies may risk the safety of people and their property.
14. Concern that changes to speed limits and physical traffic calming devices proposed by Auckland Transport through the Safer Speeds Programme will negatively impact emergency response time, which may result in loss of life and/or property.
15. Supports Auckland Transport's Vision Zero, to reach zero road deaths or serious injuries by 2050 and its associated Safe Speed Programme
16. During an emergency, Fire and Emergency is most efficient and effective when fire appliances have fast and clear access. Delays getting to and dealing with a fire may risk the safety of people and their property.
17. Traffic calming strategies can impact fast and clear access. Active strategies, which prevent or reduce movement of traffic through such things as volume control devices or physical barriers, have the greatest potential impact on emergency service response time.
18. Would like to work with Auckland Transport in the planning of traffic calming interventions to mitigate impact on emergency response

19. Welcomes the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport on information sharing and early planning of traffic calming interventions to ensure positive community outcomes and overall reduction of fatalities and injuries across Auckland.
20. Impact of speed limit changes in specific areas of Auckland.
21. Traffic calming strategies can impact fast and clear access. Active strategies, which prevent or reduce movement of traffic through such things as volume control devices or physical barriers, have the greatest potential impact on emergency service response time.
22. Recommended a 70 km/hr speed limit as an appropriate balance between traffic calming and emergency response.
23. Risk that physical speed calming devices, specifically speed humps, could result in delayed emergency response time.
24. Evidence of potential increased negative impact on response time in Manurewa.
25. General recommendation that primary response routes and protected routes should remain free of physical impediments (vertical or horizontal devices), such as speed humps, speed cushions, traffic circles and chicanes, or narrowing of roads.

New Zealand Automobile Association received by email 10 June 2022

1. Draft Problem Statement 3 - Give more than the 10% weighting to public agreement with, and buy-in to, road safety initiatives.
2. Focus on speed management around school settings.
3. Consider options for infrastructure with speed limits that suits 'look and feel'.
4. Support for speed management focus with clear evidence base supported by education and enforcement to achieve compliance.
5. Progress has been achieved and further change is required.
6. Consider options for infrastructure with speed limits that suits 'look and feel' – road characteristics to achieve compliance.
7. Must take the public on this speed reduction journey.
8. Focus on speed management around school settings.
9. Clarify what a school setting is (urban and rural context).
10. Clear communication needed to inform public of AT vision and likely impact.

Transporting New Zealand received by email 16 June 2022

1. Finding balance between what is practical to achieve, timeframes, mechanisms and behaviour change.
2. Support for lowering limits outside schools
3. Focus on locations used by more vulnerable road users.
4. Consider space constraints for cycle lanes especially where freight and passenger service volume is high.
5. Clear data / evidence needed.
6. Impact of growing trend for more smaller service and trade related vehicles
7. Micro mobility user considerations

8. Town center focus on active mode shift.
9. Prioritise urban centre access to delivery vehicles.
10. Data must reflect real behaviour of drivers.
11. Request for further information on Auckland Regional Fuel tax.

Key findings

Below are the key findings from the feedback through the engagement process. Key findings included:

1. General support for the approach of Auckland Transport to achieve Vision Zero / Road to Zero and desire for ongoing collaboration including communications and monitoring.
2. Need for strong evidential data and insights to inform decision making.
3. Safety for all addressing equity and our most vulnerable community members to harm from speed especially children, youth, pedestrians, cyclists, those using micro mobility and residents.
4. High appetite to focus on schools, Kōhanga reo and early childhood centres and other community gathering places ie Marae, faith based places of worship
5. Importance of targeted education, communications, safety and health promotion to achieve a social license and behaviour change
6. Consistency of language and meaning in ongoing communications and engagement
7. Consideration of all risk factors in a complex systems approach
8. Balancing safety interventions and infrastructure with impact on journey times for commuting, commercial interests, freight movement and maintaining response times for emergency services
9. Balancing investment in design, deterrence, and enforcement

Appendix 1 - Agenda and Run Sheet

Dates: 27 May – 1 June 2022

Time(s): 10.00am-12.00pm

Location(s): Virtual tbc / Physical tbc

Participants: Key stakeholders to be determined (by assessed level of impact and influence)

Project Team members:

Project Manager Speed Management Plan
 Comms and Engagement in Speed Management Plan
 Team Leader Road Safety engineering team
 Customer experience design team
 Flow Consultants – Project consultant
 Transport Safety Technical Lead, Overall programme lead
 Principal Consultant Engagement, Independent Facilitator
 Engagement Assistant

Subject Matter Experts: To be confirmed for each workshop

Workshops Facilitator:

Experiential objectives – participants will:

1. feel welcomed, respected and participation valued
2. experience a safe, supportive, and stimulating environment

Rational objectives – participants will:

1. arrive at the workshop having had the opportunity to be well informed on the workshop purpose, scope, and process.
2. understand expectations of their participation in the workshop and have clarity on the engagement process including what is negotiable, how and when they can submit their feedback
3. have had the opportunity to ask questions, seek clarity, share, and hear diverse perspectives
4. contribute to testing and refining current 2-4 options

Rational objectives - Project team members will:

1. Understand stakeholder and public feedback, concerns and aspirations on how Auckland Transport:
 - makes decisions on selecting roads/areas for speed changes (prioritisation methodology)
 - decides what infrastructure to implement to complement these speed changes (infrastructure treatment methodology)
2. Deliver a quality engagement process that enabled a well-informed, transparent and equitable decision-making process.

Virtual workshop agenda: (Note physical workshop agenda will follow)

Date / time	Activity	Notes, responsibilities and resources
Prior to workshop		
By 5 May By 5 May By 5 May By 6 May By 13 May?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop draft workshop agenda • Prepare presentation slide deck • Develop key messages, speaking notes and FAQ's • Submit draft workshop agenda with slide deck and comms (including Why document) • Achieve necessary endorsement(s) of agenda and collateral. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
By 5 May By 20 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the most appropriate platform for workshops • Rehearsal undertaken to ensure functionality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams vs Zoom vs / Standard call vs webinar • All team members supporting the workshop

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop roles for each of the team members specified and confirmed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background admin support Managing recording Triage questions into shared doc Respond to tech/admin questions in writing in the chat Monitor email to share instant join link Background platform tech support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - input from team members Note: Decision to use Miro. Use chat function and video record. transcribe, thematically arrange and organise questions, comments, clarifications from four workshops into draft independent facilitation report. - receive additional feedback up to 10 June (date tbc). To be consolidated and sent to Ella (and Chris) to integrate into draft independent facilitation report. Submit by 17 June.
By 26 May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final team check in to identify and work through any outstanding issues or risks needing to be mitigated. 	
Day of workshop (virtual workshops on Saturday 28 May and Monday 30 May)		
9.00am	Tech lead / support opens virtual workshop Tech platform tested	Tech lead (), Engagement lead (), Facilitator ()
9.30am	Team members arrive on virtual platform to ensure tech set up is operational and prepare for workshop	All team members supporting the workshop
9.45am	Senior AT person joins	
9.55am	Ensure clarity of audio, video, final check ins and ready to go live with participants.	
10.00am	1. Participants join workshop	
10.01am	2. Facilitator welcomes participants and invites karakia <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Karakia (tbc) Facilitator welcomes senior AT person (tbc) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome, thanks guests for participation and provides high level overview of session purpose, scope and process. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why the speed changes are being proposed The process including identification of draft shortlist options. Acknowledges and passes back to facilitator Facilitator provides overview of the workshop and opportunities for how participants will be able to ask questions, make comments and seek clarification on information. <p>Etiquette expectations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We ask that everyone is respectful of each other. Please bring your intelligence and passion and use appropriate language. If necessary, the facilitator 	Explain how the event will work. The schedule and format are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advise we are recording the presentation portion and Q&A to ensure discussion is captured. Presentation by team member(s) - Discussion will follow the presentation Event will finish by 12.00pm Attendees are invited to type their questions in to the chat (explain how to access the chat) Facilitator and team members will monitor the chat and get the questions answered by presenters or SME's.

		<p>can mute and/or remove anyone from the session.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please keep questions and comments succinct to value everyone's time. • Check if media present to ensure participants are aware • Support available in the event that content triggers emotion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator may ask for clarification of your question. • Facilitator may ask you to speak to your question on microphone/camera, this is optional for you to accept. • We will also have access to Miro – I'll introduce you to this after our presentation. • Reminder that your question or comments do not constitute a formal submission. • Feedback can be provided over the next 2 weeks by Monday 13th June. AT speed email address. <p>The method(s) for receiving questions and comments will depend on the number of participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saturday x14 (one group ideally) • Monday x36 (Up to six BoR's) • Tuesday x12 • Wednesday x12
10.10am	3.	<p>Facilitator welcomes presenters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation by team members 	<p>Content to be developed</p> <p>Links to resources provided by admin support</p> <p>Slide presenter –</p> <p>Own power point slides.</p> <p>20mins without interruptions</p>
10.30am	4.	<p>Instructions for Miro</p> <p>Question and response time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for participants to ask questions, make comments and seek clarifications on points 	<p>to provide access to participants</p> <p>Facilitator to manage questions, comments and time.</p> <p>BoR's for Monday</p>
11.45am	5.	<p>Facilitator to signal final question.</p>	
11.50am	6.	<p>Facilitator thanks participants and clarifies next steps.</p> <p>Invites closing comments from Senior AT person attending.</p>	
11.55pm	7.	<p>Invite participants to contribute to a short workshop evaluation to assist Project Team in improving workshop quality and experience for people attending future workshops.</p>	<p>Workshop evaluation</p> <p>Suggest a short poll or evaluation (>3 minutes) of workshop using a link put in the chat.</p> <p>Invite participants to self-assess the extent to which the experiential and rational objectives were met. This could easily be done against a five-</p>

		Close workshop with karakia (tbc)	point scale. Also inviting open text box comments to help the team review and improve process and content. <i>Check if AT already have a standard review process.</i>
12.01pm	8.	Post workshop debrief <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project team members reflect on workshop process against project team objectives. 	Note comments, consolidate and identify actions to improve next workshop.
12.15pm	9.	Close out workshop	

Facilitation risks and mitigations

Consider organisational, community/stakeholder and engagement process risks with this current engagement stage and workshops being designed and planned for.

Risk type	Risk	Mitigation(s)	Notes
Process	Capacity to deliver	Ensure adequate resourcing of engagement process	
	Capability and confidence to deliver and manage challenging participants.	Invest in external capability to build internal capability and confidence.	
	Experience in facilitating online and physical workshops.	Engage professional independent facilitator experienced in high public interest workshops.	
	Ensuring platform and physical workshop are fit for purpose	Platform selected and techniques adopted are fit for the engagement purpose and appropriate for the numbers of participants.	
	Ability to report on	Engage independent facilitator and support to ensure reporting has independent lens and integrity.	
	Data collection, analysis and security	Ensure data collection, security, recording, analysis tools and processes meet quality engagement practice standards.	
	Virtual platforms become a barrier	Select fit for purpose technology platform for virtual workshops. Provide support for people to connect and participate. Ensure that people know opportunities to attend physical workshops are available as another option.	
	COVID-19 policy change impacts. Another COVID-19 variant or other public health policy change impacts on ability to run face to face workshops.	Prepare to pivot face to face workshops to virtual also.	
	Stakeholders not identified and / or invited.	Stakeholder identification and analysis process undertaken to	

		ensure best opportunity to identify stakeholders.	
	Not enough notice given to stakeholders	Provide at least 2 weeks' notice of opportunities to participate.	
	Some stakeholders missed out on attending workshops.	Workshop presentation and Q&A from workshop 1 recorded and put on AT website for stakeholders who couldn't attend to review and provide feedback. Communicate that AT remains open to feedback and ongoing opportunity to engage in next stage(s).	
Community / stakeholder	Accessibility. Due to disability, impairment or being an English speaker of other languages. Access to the process and understanding are negatively impacted.	Ensure accessibility standards considered and applied to engagement tools, facilitation techniques and processes. Ensure AT's policies and practices in relation to accessibility are understood and adhered to by Project Team members.	When was the last accessibility audit of AT comms and engagement practices undertaken?
	Fears of contracting COVID-19 increase numbers wanting to engage online increase numbers.	Prepare for this scenario and contingency plan for scale up of workshop participants.	
	Relevance	Communications and engagement materials and content	
	Willingness to participate	Ensure stakeholders understand the invitation and opportunity to participate by being clear on purpose, scope and process.	
	Perception of fairness. Negativity or cynicism towards AT of predetermination and that not listening.	Project Team and AT leadership are well prepared and committed to a quality engagement process. Presence of AT leadership at each of the four workshops. Demonstrate listening in practices, communications and decision making.	
	Criticism of transparency	Project Team and AT leadership take an approach that, unless there is a clear reason not to share information, that it is made available to stakeholders and the public.	
	Criticism that not enough opportunities being provided	Be prepared with rationale that four workshops providing two face to face and two virtual opportunities balances resourcing with opportunities to engage in this stage of the process.	
Organisational	Negative stakeholder / community / media reaction impacts on AT reputation	Proactive key messages and FAQ's developed and made available. Ensure internal communications and engagement keeps all internal stakeholders informed.	

	Budget constrains quality engagement	Ensure sufficient budget to provide quality engagement.	
	Accountability	Demonstrate balance of accountability of public funding and responsible investment into engagement to ensure commitment to quality engagement.	
	Project outcomes not achieved	Ensure that engagement and facilitation objectives are aligned with and deliver to overall project outcomes.	

Equipment needed

For virtual workshops equipment needed includes:

- All team members having their own laptop or desktop computer, headset with microphone, high quality WiFi and a backup Hot Spot function.
- Being in a quiet space with minimal audio or visual distractions
- ...

For physical workshops equipment needed includes

- Projector and screen (if available)
- Large whiteboard
- Plenty of wall and window space
- Large post it notes
- Sharpie or similar narrow tip marker pens
- Blue tac
- Transparent tape (ie invisible tape, cellotape)
- ...

Appendix 2 - Participants in workshops

Workshop One - Virtual 28/05/2022	
9 Participants	
Workshop Two - Virtual 30/05/2022	
32 Participants	
Workshop Three at The Maritime Room Auckland 31/05/2022	
10 Participants	
Workshop Four at The Maritime Room Auckland 1/06/2022	
10 Participants	

Appendix 3 - Virtual Workshop One Miro Board Transcription and notes

Draft Working Principles	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8
The system element is key here- speed is one intervention in a broader suite of interventions- albeit a very important one		Absolutely support point one	Strongly support 4. This is a good basic principle based on evidence and Vision Zero principles.		Great acknowledgement of co-benefits
Fantastic approach to principles- strongly support					
And for what it's worth, I'm all for reducing speed limits, both in general, and around schools, with many of our safety concerns being directly related to the speed of vehicles (particularly rural) that pass MoE buses that are stopping to pick up / drop off children, and outside of schools themselves.					
Rahmon Gude Transport Contract Manager Te Puna Hanganga, Matihiko Infrastructure & Digital					
Draft Problem Statements	0	1	2	3	4
		This is how important this part of the problem statement is https://journalofroadsafety.org/article/32265		All the road safety partners need to support this publicly and in the media not just AT Ngairere: is the problem statement around community acceptance a problem you are trying to address with the plan, or is it a problem "caused" by the implementation of the plan?	
Draft Criteria to Assess Options	0	Benefits	Risks		
I think the Death and Serious Injury % here is too low			These are important if you cant deliver the speed reduction it will be completely ineffectual		
Need to include freight in this - fuel, vehicle maintenance, time. But the percentage allocated to freight productivity needs to be low relative to the Death and Serious Injury criteria. This leads to a conversation about how much freight productivity is a life or serious injury worth. One of the foundational principles of the safe system is that you should not be trading human life and health for other benefits in society such as freight productivity.					
The social cost of road trauma in Aotearoa is in the order \$6.5 billion annually. This cost is borne by the community and by the government and by victims and their families - its largely not borne by those who falsely believe that their business interests are best served by higher travel speeds					
https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/resources/economic-analysis-of-optimum-speeds-on-rural-state-highways-in-nz/Economic-analysis-of-optimum-speeds-on-rural-state-highways-in-nz.pdf					
This link is to another paper that explores optimal speeds on rural New Zealand Roads taking into account a range of considerations - the optimal speeds are lower than you might think					
Short List Development	0	Māori Outcomes	Active Modes	Greenhouse Gas	Community Support
I just want to be super clear here Equity and Emissions Reduction are aligned to Road Safety not things that work against Road Safety					
The narrative that use when we talk about speed management with the community is crucial					
Collective Risk focus is so important - we cant be distracted with extreme examples of poor personal individual behaviour - we are doing this for everyone					
Draft Speed Management Tools	0	Urban	Rural		
In both toolboxes I think we're missing complementary and partnered road safety campaigns - it's not the only tool we should use but it is a tool.		Raised pedestrian crossings. I also suggest not using a photo of "speed bumps" for traffic calming.			
We need to be overt in the Auckland Speed Management plan as to how these elements link together to form an optimal safe system approach					
We need to be overt in the Auckland Speed Management plan as to how these elements link together to form an optimal safe system approach					
Draft Enforcement Tools					

Workshop 1 facilitation notes from discussion

Below are facilitation notes taken during the session including discussion from the chat function. Themes from these notes that are in addition to those transcribed from the Miro board are identified in the second column. In other words this is a point by point review to determine whether there are any additional key themes or agreed actions that were captured from the workshop notes and the subsequent three workshops.

Notes	Additional themes to Miro board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • : linkages and joining up in a system perspective, sharing info with WK and state highway plans, good opportunity for learning and sharing information from the good work AT has done, data being shared is KEY, disbenefits of speed reduction is overstated, positives for the freight sector aren't being highlighted enough • : supportive of the plan framework and the speed management system, the frame is key in communicating the vision, 'selling the cake instead of the ingredients' • : productivity time loss, depends on age of fleet, emission rating etc., Fonterra example on rural roads- reduce maintenance and fuel bill, WK & AT and any other speeding management need to bring the public with them, some fluffy data, betterment changes, questioning accuracy, speed, distraction, must consider ALL factors, most accidents caused by alcohol, inattention, as opposed to speed, great work but can't be a distraction from all the other work going on, accurate data vs transport theory • Question Response: will revisit and share the information from the local board feedback, and sharing of a full report • : work with St Johns and democracy advisory panels, pedestrian crossing supported by community but was suspended by AT, would like to see this project reinstated, and to see AT being more welcoming to projects like this, concern of it being unsafe results in more people driving their kids to school, 	<p>Action: share the information from the local board feedback, and sharing of a full report</p>

raised pedestrian crossings to and from schools makes it so much safer for kids to walk to school and would like to see more budget allocation to this

- AT: support for AT to be more welcoming and making it safer for kids to walk to school, acknowledgement of value, no specific comment on the postponement of the project mentioned
- AT: happy to follow up re what is happening, the investigation has occurred to implement the crossing project now just awaiting budget approval
- : rural schools along 100/80km roads, time-based speed reductions, walking to school isn't really feasible, purchase of land for potential temporary parking space (a field, spare land) for a safe drop off space away from traffic, looking at being on the same side of the road as the buses, too many deaths because of kids running across the road
- : RE Comments on rural schools: personal safety re other social factors in the area that can influence safety, not just speed issues. Rural context- "stupid" isn't going to change with the speed limits- even at 80 or 60km people might still go 130km. Being clear with the community and why the changes are happening is VITAL. Consider all factors- if someone loses a license there isn't public transport etc. Franklin board on board with urban but think rural needs a lot more focus. Thinking 30/40km for school areas. Appreciation for all the work that is being done
- : speed isn't the only factor, you can crash at any speed, but the higher speed when crashing has a massive influence on the outcome. Looking to reduce the most serious outcomes: death, serious injuries etc. Helping manage/minimize damage of poor personal choices
- : attached report in chat function, about the underappreciation/understanding of speed relationship to crashes - cause and effect. Reckless extreme behaviors at one end of the spectrum, instead focusing to move the bulk of people into a safer space
- : importance of the data

Action: to follow up on request for a (raised) pedestrian crossing project to be reinstated

Acknowledgement that "stupid" isn't going to change with the speed limits

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • : looking at the roads but also areas, where there are more elderly, more pedestrian crossings, Māori and DSI's, equitable focus to support the reductions • : thanking xxx for her comments on rural areas, there is no cure for stupid, have found that it is equally the slow driver that can cause issues, results in risk taking to pass etc., encouragement for AT to provide signage for this issue 'pull over the slow driver' • : talking about people losing their license, sudden changes, and various speeds over the same types of roads resulting in confusion in the communities • AT: some questions about rural schools. Outlining options as an authority. Under the rule, can designate schools are category 1 or 2, most considered as 1- which means 30km permanent or temporary based on time. Second option is 2- means documented justification must be provided. Speed to a maximum of 60km. Taking parking off site so it is away from the roads. If category 2 must be re-evaluated and justified. Question: Are there specific schools that should be designated category 2? • : do we know how many rural schools in the area and around the country are on 80/100km roads? • AT: no specific answer but knows more are at 60km than they used to be. Can provide maps and more information • : can the same be considered for rural Maraes? Local school is 60km, has off street parking but on the wrong side of the road, has a pedestrian crossing but kids still run across the road [Marae comment supported in chat by] • : we are talking about equity- question of Māori and non-Māori, but also rural vs urban • AT: comment to, behavior change initiative is offered and would be happy to discuss offline • AT: schools demand for offline parking can't have spillage, rural schools in the peri urban space reach new complications with increased demand [supported in chat by] 	<p>Policing of slow drivers</p> <p>Outline rule categories 1 or 2 to designate schools</p> <p>Action: to provide more information on rural schools, Marae on 80/100km roads currently</p> <p>Action: to follow up with re behaviour change initiative</p>
---	---

- AT: wanting more information about rural Marae, potential to consider variable speed limits under the new regulations that would operate similarly to schools [response from that it would be a case-by-case basis]
- : interesting discussion and to hear different thoughts and perspectives, acknowledgement that the principles have captured a lot of what people are talking about, encapsulating where people are wanting this to go
- : always impressed by the complex understanding of the safe system that people are trying to achieve, appreciates AT approach for consultation, road safety theory - moving through the evidence, ensuring speed management is...

Chat Function Discussion

- : Establishing linkages between this plan and infrastructure, speed camera and enforcement is crucial from a system perspective
- : Welcome Ken, thanks for joining us this morning. Ping is presenting and we'll have discussion following. You're welcome to put questions or comments into this chat box.
- : ^as is the consistency with the state highway speed management plan
- : very supportive of the framing of speed management as a system, this is great work
- : All the road safety partners need to overtly support these key elements to the safe system
- Monitoring and evaluation are critical - AT should be looking to share its success in this space with Waka Kotahi and MoT to share learnings so that WK do not have to reinvent the wheel as they confront the same challenges that AT have faced- data and evidence is key in this
- : Roading productivity is a missing key outcome
- : Which local boards raised concerns about there being too many changes? I don't recall my local board, Orakei, asking for local feedback.

- RE: 'Roading productivity is a missing key outcome' I am thinking about the freight sector- fuel costs, vehicle maintenance costs, the time disbenefit for example
- Certainly, support the reduction to 30kms around schools. Will AT be more likely to be agreeable to local community support for introducing more means to make it safer to walk to school e.g., raised pedestrian crossing over busy roads?
- Rural schools are generally car centric. There are many of these that have an opportunity to have off road car short term parking to improve safety.
- Speed contributes to the outcome of all crashes, even though more significant causes may come through in individual crashes.
- Agree with you. Franklin was one of those boards
- Speeds above safe and appropriate speeds are a factor in 70% of fatal crashes in New Zealand.
- Agree
- Agree with rural schools being at 30km/h also - I note that  in AT's proposal the 60km/h would be by exception.
- I agree - rural schools are not poor cousins to metro schools- we should be offering the same level of safety- the challenge is the drop from 100km/h to 30km/h in a rural context can be challenging. We need to understand the difference between personal and collective risk. This report is key to what we are talking about <https://journalofroadsafety.org/article/32265>
- Having grown-up in rural NZ, I'm very supportive of call to reduce speed around rural schools to 30kms rather than 40kms, plus other ideas suggested around better thinking applied to where parents can park for drop-offs and pick-ups, so that their children aren't running across roads. To attempt to address the 'stupid', more pointed comms around, for example, 'want to keep your license, then don't speed.'

Consider roading productivity as a key outcome.

Note article provided.

- The key issues for rural schools could also be affordability to enlarge car parks as population grows in the area... which in itself is an equity issue ultimately, should the speed limit be over 30km

Appendix 4 - Virtual Workshop Two Miro Board Transcription and notes

Draft Working Principles	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8
Very keen to see the idea of ensuring the public are on board with speed limit changes incorporated into the principles. The best road safety result will be where speed limit reductions are common sense to motorists because they'll naturally comply	This NEEDS to mention Vision Zero. This was launched with great fanfare at AT in 2019 - why is no-one talking about it in 2022?	Speed limits are consistent with the agreed outcome for a particular area.	"Engineering treatments" - do we mean street designs? Or other types of interventions? Please let's be specific and not use jargon.	Apologies, I now won't be able to attend this meeting. The key point I wanted to make is that the Speed Management Plan needs to contribute to achieving emissions reductions in Tāmaki Makaurau, by making most streets safe for walking and cycling. The long-term goal needs to be a 30 km/h default speed limit in urban areas, with the exception of certain arterials and other specific street types/segments. Kind regards Jamie Hosking, University of Auckland	
What is the longer term vision for speeds eg. "in busy places where there are lots of people moving around on foot or bike (ie outside of vehicles) we will move speed limits to 30km/h"; "in new urban housing developments we will move speed limits to xx km/h"	Agree we need to reference Vision Zero - both as the guiding principle but also that Speed Management is housed within a wider safe system approach.	Good to see RASF being used	#6 Partnership with who? Please can we name, and please can we include reference to working with Maori treaty partners (which is consistent with new Rule).	Is there an opportunity to add something around accessibility (or "inclusive access" as per GPS) into principle #7?	
9. (but should be first) Speed management is informed by a Vision Zero approach	Easy to understand, and efficient to administer - the approach needs to unlock speed management not make it too complex via multiple inputs. Progress must be monitored and communicated regularly as KPIs.				
Street designs will reflect design speeds (i.e. a road with a 30km/h limit will have tight geometry, narrower lanes, etc)	Agree this should reference Vision Zero				
Consider principle around school speed limit areas, or areas where there are lots of vulnerable users (and also when VSLs might be considered for school or marae)					
Universal Design would be a useful addition to point 7. Need to deliver inclusivity through design.					
Reference guiding principle of NZ's road safety strategy (R22) and alignment with Government Policy Statement on land transport					
Draft Problem Statements	0	1	2	3	4
It would be helpful to understand more clearly how the weightings were determined for the problem statements and what the implications of the weightings are	will the target audience understand what "safe and appropriate" means? does it need a definition?	Are these also real high vehicle speeds right now? Not just perceived?	Vision Zero and Road to Zero need to be emphasised as programmes that are happening anyway. You can't just "opt out" of speed limits if they don't suit your preference.	It would be helpful to have more clarity about what the strategies have been so far, if any? Maybe there is a more simple way to say this, that's more focused on outcomes/impacts than what the inputs have/havent' been so far	
Problem statements 1,2 and 4 seem to relate to inputs to the safe system, whereas problem 3 seems to relate to an output of the system around public understanding and behaviors. these may need to be separated out.	This should be 90% at least!	"perceived" does make it sound as though traffic speeds are an imaginary problem - they're not. People get killed and injured by cars, a lot.	I hear the arguments but really think this needs to be higher. Police need to step up but can't be everywhere. If not enough people comply we will still have the DSIs. We need to take the public with us. We can be out front a little but too far means things won't work.		
I think community acceptance is way too low if people don't comply we won't get results	Seems way too low given this is the main/ sole focus?	Seems a bit of a soft measure to equate for 25% of criteria given need to make changes where they will most likely save DSIs	There needs to be more clarity in this problem statement. Is there an expectation that safe speed limits won't be applied unless there is community acceptance? Or just that it's something to consider for delivery?		
I agree, compliance is important, but we need to lead with safety - set the safe speed limits and then use all the speed management tools that we have to work on improving compliance over time.		Please remove the "perceived"	Is Auckland Transport intending to be a leader here? Seems like AT prefer people were seriously hurt and killed on our roads, rather than become a target by the AM show.		
		Think this needs rewording to avoid using 'perceived' given speeds in many areas are higher than what is safe for walking and cycling	No-one likes enforcement when it happens against them (parking fines, speeding tickets, etc). But tough! We need rules for a free society. The aim of this programme is to deliver freedom for people and if this requires enforcement, then AT should do it and needs to lead.		
			Community acceptance isn't the only acceptance issue. There is a political element to this too which needs elected member buy-in, and a reminder that Vision Zero is an all-of-government mandate, and that we have a collective responsibility to work towards the VZ goal.		
Draft Criteria to Assess Options	0	Benefits	Risks		
Agree with the term "understanding" here - suggest removing 'support'.					
DSI impact at only 28% seems way too low given focus of SMP.					
Agree that 28% seems too low for DSI					
Will this criteria be the same for the whole programme, or could weightings be changed for different roads/areas? e.g. active mode journeys to school may not be relevant in areas that don't include a school and residential area, but important for those roads/areas where there is a school					
Short List Development	0	Māori Outcomes	Active Modes	Greenhouse Gas	Community Support
Good to see active mode shift here.				Think it's important not to cloud DSI focus with other matters to get best safety outcomes	

Draft Speed Management Tools	0 Urban	Rural
<p>If road space is reallocated to active modes, that will contribute to speed management (reduction)</p>	<p>Reducing traffic volumes and VKT. Less traffic = less crashes.</p> <p>Mode shift Filtered permeability Better public transport</p>	<p>PROTECTED cycleways are a great way to reduce speeds on roads</p>
<p>Garnet Road in Westmere is a great example of a wide road with flush median that could be removed and have separated cycle lanes both sides added. This would also contribute to a lower speed environment Andrew C</p>		<p>Yes - and more comfortable than "using the cyclists to slow the traffic down" (which KEEPS coming up as a "European" solution) - reader, it isn't!! No-one wants to be a human speed hump. Separate space for walking, cycling and motoring PLEASE.</p>
<p>Interested to know what your experience of setting 30 km/h speed limits is (with and without infrastructure support)?</p>		
<p>Keen to understand what electronic signs are in scope? (for both urban and rural)</p>		
<p>how about teaching safe speeds in schools, starting with primary schools and keeping it going. Kids are likely to get in their parents' ears for going to fast if we drill it in to them we need more of these on streets near schools plus speed breakers.</p>		
<p>Especially because most (maybe none) of these streets do not have speed cameras. Through streets become racing strips at night - noisy, unsafe, nuisance. Speed breakers should be able deter such activities.</p>		
<p>Pt Chev particularly bad for that</p>		
<p>Ti Rakau Drive too Gateway treatments are excellent for our urban villages such as Mt Albert, Mt Eden, Balmoral, etc. Speed limits should be lowered through these areas as well as the visuals Andrew C</p>		
<p>It would be good to see other tools in here including planting, filtering streets, raised footpaths (across streets) and planted built out footpaths to both slow traffic and ease crossings. We need to look at a system of tools. Make the speed limits safe and appropriate and ensuring the environment explains this speed before enforcement</p>		
<p>Curious re. hierarchy of treatment across these tools (to get the 'right' mix) For speed cameras to be effective they need to be very widespread and always in operation. NZ Police not really interested in this for urban areas so it makes sense for WK to control or even RCA's like back in the old days. Mainly suitable for arterials</p>		
<p>Traffic calming should be standard on all suburban side roads, as should a 30km/h speed limit. This is where children play and animals cross the street but often drivers will simply use it for a rat run, which needs to be discouraged. Also looking to close off through routes in side streets is good for reducing non-essential traffic volumes Andrew C</p>		
<p>Fully agree with this - Tanya M</p>		
Draft Enforcement Tools	0	
<p>If design takes care of most of it then we will need less enforcement. Good to see a mix of options. Assume red light is included in 'safety cameras'?</p>		

Workshop 2 facilitation notes from discussion

Below are facilitation notes taken during the session including discussion from the break out rooms and chat function. Themes from these notes that are in addition to those transcribed from the Miro board are identified in the second column.

Notes	Additional themes to Miro board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeking response to question in Chat, AT: In scope the road directly outside schools, along residential area - personal or private spaces such as driveways is NOT in scope and cannot be influenced. Operating speeds for key roads can provide data, through GPS, engaging with people for specific feedback • Seeking response to questions, AT: we are considering all factors, looking at a safe system and the whole system, but looking specifically at the impact of speed- it is a speed management plan as one piece of the puzzle • Seeking response to Caroline question, AT: doesn't have a specific answer but happy to go back and investigate it • : question mainly based on Active Travels, could be differences between different areas and roles, specifically weighting of urban vs rural • AT: noticing urban vs rural different by nature, • Seeking response to question, AT: we will be required to make a long-term regional plan that will require consultation, re-consultation will not be necessary. What this doesn't cover is any specific engineering information that may be needed • Seeking response to question, AT: there is very strong evidence around speed management. We know there is widespread mixed community reactions. If we apply in a widespread blanket way, there are groups in the community that won't understand the purpose. Workshops are to understand the nuance of aspirations and demands. What is the right place, what is the right time, and what is the right way? Reference to rural insight needs of community from Saturday's workshop. • : Transport NZ, representing the freight sector. 	

- Seeking response to question, AT: Interested in discussing further.

Discussion: Breakout Room 1 (Draft Principles)

- Welcome from AT, and opening the facilitated discussion
- : are the draft principles being consulted on?
- AT: intention to put them in the plan and consult on them, as soon and as transparently as possible
- : follow up on the potential issue on having to reconsult
- AT: outlining in the plan the principled approach, the principles are important but don't replace the need for consultation legally
- : came into the back of the conversation, risk-based assessment, as opposed to a speed setting across the board?
- AT: aren't legally able to make a default speed limit change, however, can create a more consistent or integrated speed approach. How WK has described it, looking at infrastructure, safe and appropriate speed limits
- : considerations of practicality, segregation where appropriate
- AT: we know a lot of strategic freight routes
- : wellbeing, Key Street
- : concerned about the focus on speed, the condition and quality of footpaths. The groundwork isn't safe. Car's parking on footpaths, not safe for kids to walk, we need to look at the wider environment if we want active transport, do communities feel safe in their areas? Would like to see at it looked at in more depth. Also, we allow scooters to go over 30kms on footpaths, we need to make EVERYTHING SAFE
- : supporting everything Gillian said. Also concerned about how rural schools are treated different, as well as Marae areas
- AT: acknowledging comments. Footpath speeds are not in scope

Condition and quality of footpaths and cars parking on them (Out of scope?)
 Concern about scooters travelling on footpaths at speed. (Out of scope?)

- : also issues around footpath lighting and safety- also supporting comments about footpath and rural safety
- : is there some principle or tweaking of a principle that approaches speed management in a way that makes sense to people and the public can agree with the need
- : people tend to accept what is easy - people don't appreciate the lack of consistency - multiple speed changes in a small area etc. people tend to be happier if it's intuitive. What about roads that LOOK like they should be 100km but they are 40km?
- AT: most schools are around 30km. Acknowledging comments as something they hear a lot, consistent feedback
- : variable speed limits are something that make sense- if people say they want slower speeds around schools, we can't know if that means they want that 24/7 as a blanket rule, or if it is just drop off pick up days etc. All comes down to road type and location
- AT: lots of variable requests, from councils etc. around schools, parks
- : so different depending on the location, community, other roads around it. Completely understands the complexity of variable speed limits. Appreciates the map imaging that was provided
- : does it lead into the opportunity to provide a principle for around schools - walkability, maraes, schools, playgrounds. Understands that there may be a reduction in the need for variable speed limits if there is already a reduced speed in the area
- : factoring in rural areas, as a principle, agrees with reducing the speeds or using variable speeds in rural areas. Some of these discussions feel like being tunneled into public transport. Reduction of speeds could make it quite impractical for those who must commute etc. when they already must spend hours on the roads. Keeping people moving and moving safely is a strong focus
- : key principles with other conversations, freight need space to move/turn etc., office environments requiring goods and supplies, when you have vehicles

Consider provide a principle for around schools - walkability, maraes, schools, playgrounds.

trying to get into loading zones etc. can provide risks in urban areas, impacts on shifting of loads, strategic placement to avoid adverse effects of interrupting traffic, looking at different infrastructure that benefits emissions and productivity

- AT: summarizing some of the points covered and the themes, calling for any additional comments?
- : where it is signaled, around schools etc. don't know if there needs to be a generic speed limit when the nature of start/stop traffic helps to achieve that anyway?
- : experience with an arterial route location, request from the school for a variable speed limit, not standard school hours, flashing lights were very successful in indicating movement of school kids, for general traffic and freight. Under the new rule for requirements, some of the schools used as community hubs outside of school so additional peak times
- : also need to consider consistency in message and application- during school holidays, adjusting to daylight savings etc.
- : use to require manual adjustment but now believe they can be done automatically
- : school variable speed signs, can desensitize traffic/people if used too often, making sure the messaging is clear about the times and raising awareness- encouraging people to be vigilant at the right times, being specifically cautious around relevant school times
- : raise the profile that this flows out of the vision zero approach. Position this as a tool towards potential transport harms. Importance of bringing the public along, and how public acceptance is evidence of doing the right thing but also not waiting for approval to do the right things
- : a large, widespread city- there are lots of issues surrounding traversing the city in a way that is both safe and effective. In a rural setting, putting his daughter on the train takes 2 hours. If the speeds were reduced TOO much it could be a huge risk for some people.

- : agrees that public opinion is important but shouldn't interfere with making the right thing happen. Making sure changes don't confine people to having to use private vehicles. Baffled at why Vision Zero has almost been swept under the rug- where is Vision Zero? We want it back!
- : speaking to the second principle- an easy to implement approach. Really clever work and good thinking behind this all. Appreciates the agency, the engagement, but raising concern that there might end up being 8 different algorithms it has to go through. From a public health approach, sometime simplifying makes it better even if it loses some of the nuance.

Discussion: Breakout Room 2 (Option Development- Problem Statements, Criteria and Shortlist)

Question time:

- - rural and urban are of different nature, are we consider different criteria for different area
- : wants to understand how we decide the weight of each statement
- : also want to understand the weighting, why first statement is only 50%; thinks the community is important. 1 and 3 should be increased weighting
- : shifting the language about some death to align version zero. We are too caring about the community, we should increase education. We shouldn't have 10% for community
- : community is a very interesting topic, waka kotahi has the same discussion. thinks it should not be community acceptance, it should be community awareness and understanding. We should make it clearer what is the objective, she understands that we are not stopping what we do, but lower support will create difficulty
- : try to take too many things into consideration
- : we want to see the lower speed in all town centre

- : we should try to do this in a complicated form, the KPI should be moved to the best practical speed on the roads
- : what about working with level with board street function and activity. Will that be able to consult all arterial roads with some AADT, rather than individual area, roads.
- : national level, last year, WK has introduce ONF classify roads' movement and place function. WK are working on linking SAAS to land use, place, and activity. e.g, thinking area of people out of the cars. Unless some situation apply a higher speed.
- AT: our RASF has more attributes in our local system. We have cross checked the ONF and RASF. All arterial is different around Auckland, due to land use and cycling facility. AT also consider the step approach.
- : SAAS is a term we use a lot, it explains, the safety risk and also the speed suit the place function (also in Miro board)
- : how weighting come cross, are this cross all Auckland or in different situation
- (her earlier question about rural and urban), can there be different plan for different area.
- : we try to clear, the appreciate is for different type of people, the placement, land use and movement
- Traditionally is appreciate is for efficiency, now we shift the approach is non-safety is not effective
- : for Health side. How we deal with change of vehicle size, e.g. truck. Severity also link to mass not just speed. Are we thinking about these questions?
- The evidence shows the speed does matter, but the result shows from different vehicle type. Can we show the change of vehicle in the area. It's not been capture well in the communication. e.g. 4wheel drive is different to smaller cars.
- : WK are aware this, many place in the world for VRU DSI is going up. Where we can maximise
- 30km/h make a safer outcome no matter what type of VRU or Vehicle

Lower speeds in town centres

Consider differential speeds depending on vehicle types

- People want to keep themselves safer, but other ARU involve will be more likely to result in serious injury. This need to be a community piece
- : want to see more thought about equity part
- : there's people interested in Equality transportation, can forward some more information about Uni research
- Consider more about freight routes
- How did we derive weighting of assessing options/ problem statement? Need clarity. Why DSI is only 50%, seems too small ()
- Consider language from less road deaths to “No road deaths” ()
- We need to consider evidence-based approach rather than thinking about the community acceptance. There is evidence that speed management works. ()
- More evidence is needed for the success of the programme ()
- Education is key part of the success, and more emphasis is needed (Tanya)
- Awareness of the change also very important for better outcomes
- We need to be cautious about the language “Community acceptance” or “Community understanding”. Clarify the terminology ()
- Love to see low speeds in everywhere ()
- High appetite for safe speeds
- Support low speeds and delays in infrastructure for cycling ()
- Unsafe system is more inefficient - Need to get this message out ()
- Do we have better understanding of the risks of the speed to mass. How do we deal with the changes of vehicle fleet. How the severity of a crash at the same speed of a Toyota corolla vs new heavy ford ranger ()
- Communication is needed about how the old fleet affects the crash outcomes. How do we deal with change of vehicle fleets.
- We are overestimating the negative impacts and underestimating the positive impacts of safe speeds. We need to correct that.

Discussion: Breakout Room 3 (Infrastructure and Enforcement)

Weighting of DSI tool small
Language: No road deaths instead of less road deaths.

Language “Community acceptance” or “Community understanding”

Consider impact of changing vehicle fleet over time.

There was a question about our approach to treating slip lanes, which AT answered

- Our preference is to remove them in areas of high ped demand, in locations where they can't practically be removed we can consider measures like raised table ped crossings to control speed.
- – Talked about the effectiveness of past traffic calming areas in residential areas around Mt Eden
- There was some general discussion around how do we improve public awareness and understanding of survivable speeds for vulnerable users? How do we overcome the sense of entitlement that some drivers have?
- – Advocated for more comms, aimed at changing driver attitudes and behaviour
- Some discussion around evidence and selling the case.
- - advocated around developing NZ case studies and pushing the ones we have more with the public, Harder for the public to dismiss NZ evidence than international evidence.
- - Pointed out that the reality of travel time impacts of speed change is far less than the perception. Mentioned some examples of perception vs reality measurement that WK had done. Reducing speeds had much lower amount to travel time increase than expected because most roads don't allow traveling at the posted limit continuously. Also experience from the 110km/h speed limit in the Waikato expressway was that drivers hugely over-estimated the change in travel time when actually they gained only a very small amount of time.
- Walking advocate () raised a concern around the need to ensure that the additional signage/infrastructure is placed with care so as not to impede footpaths use by pedestrians.
- (SADD) commented around making the messaging work for the target audience, pointed to SADDs experience engaging with young people as an example.
- Discussion on the effectiveness of speed cameras:

Consider developing NZ case studies and pushing the ones we have more with the public, Harder for the public to dismiss NZ evidence than international evidence.

Concern around the need to ensure additional signage / infrastructure is placed with care so as not to impede footpaths use by pedestrians.

- View that static cameras have only a limited area of effect as drivers know where they are and speed up once past them.
- Some discussion on the potential move to using point to point camera tech, dual mode redlight/speed cameras, etc
- Best practice oversea involves much wider use of speed cameras than we have at present and uses a mix or approaches including covert cameras.
- Discussion on comms and getting into primary schools with behaviour change messaging
- Discussion on making short journeys more safe and practical for active modes.

Note: The conversation flow jumped around a fair bit with some time on the infrastructure/enforcement topic but also heading off into discussion of comms/selling behaviour change (as an alternative to forcing change through infrastructure / enforcement)

Chat Function Discussion Transcription

: Welcome everyone. You are invited to use this chat function along with Miro (I'll explain about this soon) to complement the dialogue we'll have through the workshop.

: Welcome to those of you who've joined in the last few minutes. AT is presenting currently, and you're welcome to ask questions and make comments in the chat. AT will be speaking for about 15 minutes more. Your feedback is welcome over the next 2 weeks through to Monday 13th June.

: Following AT presentation we'll have an open forum to give you an opportunity to share initial thoughts and ask questions of AT. Please ask questions and comments here in the chat. I'll invite you to speak to your question.

During Presentation

Consider overseas best practice re speed camera's.

- Q: Kia ora AT and everyone. As a lot of mishaps also happen on streets around schools, residential areas, driveways etc. are those areas part of the scope? How does one monitor that besides raising awareness through educational advertisements?
- Q: Are we banning drugs and alcohol or are these not a cause for accidents?
- A: As AT has mentioned following the open forum, we'll go into three breakout rooms. Room 1 will focus on the Guiding Principles. Room 2 on the Option Development- Problem Statements/ Criteria/ Shortlist. Room 3 on Infrastructure and enforcement. Thanks for your questions, I'll come to your questions first in the open forum.
- Q: Re the criteria to assess options, can those weightings differ by area? E.g., urban weightings could be different to rural?
- A: Great to see the customer and other requests/feedback being so directly integrated into the process.
- Q: Will this plan reduce the need for endless consultation of specific roads?
- A: We have all the evidence we need, and you've reached out to everyone who can support - what else do you need to get this over the line as fast as possible? Specifically, what do you need from us, today, in this room?
- Q: a key for our member is the Strategic function of the corridors and network. In particular relating to freight.
- A: Please let's talk about roads and streets, not "corridors" 😊
- A: It would be good if you can turn your camera on if you're speaking- thanks
- Q: I do have a follow up... Are there mixed community attitudes to death on the roads?
- A: When can we move beyond community views that oppose clear evidence to help prevent deaths and injury?
- A: (Women in Urbanism) this public attitudes to road safety research may be of interest <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/public-attitudes-to-road-safety>
- A: And present clear evidence of carbon emission reductions...

Banning drugs and alcohol (out of scope)

Differential weightings urban and rural

Concern about volume of consultation on specific roads.

- ; Totally agree with
- [Chat action of individual responses to which room people want to go into]
- ; Unfortunately, I missed the rural discussions. There are concerns that many Aucklanders have moved further out of town due to housing and accommodation. Will the reduced speeds affect people's ability to commute to work within effective timeframes? Especially when public transport is unable to meet these needs.

Language: Roads and streets instead of corridors

Request for clear evidence on carbon emission reductions

Appendix 5 - Workshop Three Worksheet Transcription and notes

Draft Criteria to Assess Options	Draft Problem Statements	Draft Enforcement Tools	Short List Development	Draft Speed Management Tools	Draft Working Principles
Effect on reducing harm in areas of higher deprivation	Think exponential progress to DSI targets rather than upfront model trajectory to give us that- Hamish M	Education? Gain ownership	Target high risk groups. Young men for example who are overrepresented	MOE enforcement. Drugs/alcohol- Geoff	Rural roads no centre line unmarked width- narrow. Prioritise these roads
Colin S- are 6&7 relevant- they are not directly related to safety benefits- they are indirect benefits	Town centres and most people a no brainer. Saturate first, then build momentum. Then slowly pick off more difficult ones- Hamish M	Concides equity when focusing on punitive responses- strategic placement must be considered so adjustments aren't just reactive	Major road changes for cyclists. Separate cars and cyclists in the death stats.	Tactical placement to improve driver behaviour	Tractors, leaving dirt and gravel on rural roads prioritisation
Colin S- with 67% of DSI involving vulnerable users then effect on overall DSI for vulnerable users should be on this list	#3- is it community acceptance or education/understanding or even ownership?- Colin	JT- Police: General Deterant Strategy- RIDs: Restraints, Impairment, Distraction, Speed	Be a leader. Responsible. Invite them to be onboard. You need to own this. Responsible. Messaging.	Barrier protected parking space for mobile vans	Speed bumps are a concern for trades-people, also increase of response time for police/ambulance etc. also bad for climate change- Geoff
Whaea Vaiongo- 1. Healthy community. 2. Be part of community, watch them when go shopping, say hi when they go past my road. Healthy promotion. Feel safe as you walk, good lights. I walk, sit, and enjoy my time on the chair, good things to look at. Really hope this is my dream, be around if I can.	Perception of speed massively impacts youth and women. There is inequity in cycling and walking access = should be considered, community led strategies?	Geoff: Enforcement approach, slow driving issue, specific localities. Why is there no enforcement of following distances/safe merging etc. Coatesville riverhead camera just for revenue, put on longest straightest part of road. If it was for safety Would be near a school or somewhere that was unsafe.	H.M: decrease VKT for both safety and climate benefits. Integrate story	Traffic calming mid block.raised table led crossing?	Colin- #2 is a very important- a 30km/h road needs to feel like 30km/h i.e. placemaking, and/or supporting infrastructure so that it is self-enforcing. It's a 10 year plan- need to look @ integration residential/commercial. Greenfield + ? Developments in the future. Refer to safe system approach i.e. exposure, likelihood, severity, use this and retire your principles. #6 include education
Location of resthomes and retirement villages, not in good walking environments		Geoff- less focus on speed more focus on more import laws such as road user rule 21. Why trial texting cannot again but impliment law changes need to be faster. Slow support from government. Mobile camera vans priority. Speed up the safety camera transfers to NZTA and AT? Why is this taking so long?	How to factor in both cycling and public transport	Community led communications	#7 should be a key element- how is this embedded in the process?
H.M: Long term societal perceptions will change. Need more short term strategy about peoples understanding. Tried to do it cheaply and experimenting drivers' understanding of road context needs to have more prominence in planning design and delivery use period when doing relatively easy ones to plan how to manage more difficult ones e.g. road that doesn't feel like a 60, take testing spread 28% across the other ones, particularly #8, maybe also #6 and #7. Areas we already get support, #4 could be low hanging fruit		Whaea Vaiongo- <i>Speed Cameras</i> : 1. Way of education message/warning to slow down. 2. Have an accident or injure someone, kill someone, you'll be a leader, you'll guide our community, we'll look up to you. Teenage- it's they all come with different behaviour, behaviour need to change. Do you want to pay \$120 they should fine, heavy fine. Australia have very heavy fine. Good on you Aussie! We are a bit soft hearted. I hear there are some points. I don't know if they works, they don't see this. Education- start from school road safety, behaviour, responsible person, you'll be our leaders tomorrow. We'll vote for you! Bring them to be a leader, be a responsible people up there. I'm a valued person, I value myself, if you grown up with responsible grandparents, parents, that's your strength, sad stories come at school you belong to this group, we value you	Residential, day care, schools- local <u>speed bumps</u> day care, school, retirement villiages, who decides? How many and where?	H.M: need to determine optimal signs, lines, calming scheme to support speed limits --> max impact for min cost. Not yet known	Hamish M- a) possibly have programme to saturate easy to understand locations first to cement city wide buy in. b) might not get greatest DSI reductions upfront, but might in the long run. Get buy in, ramp up later on. Strongly support #2. With staged approach, saturating, easy to understand first
Faceless campaign- missing voices of whānau who have lost whānau due to speed.			Vulnerable users should be a focus	Raised tables work 24/7	Fredight and trade emphasis important- Geoff
#1 is long term goal, bottom line, not immediate action plan- Hamish M			Residential area, Irene, volumes, high risk locations	Visibility and accessibility	
Look at other ethnicities			I prefer speed tables at schools crossings than speed limit signs- ideally both		
Mel- Māori, other groups? Honouring Te Tiriti. Other high risk groups upfront messaging			Is climate change relevant this is about safety, climate change is one of many indirect benefits		
Colin- Risk: Applies accuracy in numbers, precise numbers %'s. What was the process for determining them?					

Workshop 3 facilitation notes from discussion

Below are facilitation notes taken during the session. Themes from these notes that are in addition to those transcribed from the Miro board are identified in the second column.

Notes	Additional themes to Miro board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • : Query re: consultation for infrastructure, freight industry etc. • AT: is included/considered in the full pack, just not in the specific slides being shown in presentation • : where have the numbers come from? Questioning of accuracy, inference of specific numbers, risk implying accuracy of specific numbers • AT: process to date, consultation, estimated based of various factors, need to be tested • : question of why Māori are exclusively a priority group? • AT: equity response, are considered other groups that are overrepresented in the stats. Māori DSI highlighted there specifically due to Te Tiriti- doesn't mean they aren't considering other groups and context of area, level of harm • : Think that is answered by Te Tiriti full stop • : There are other high-risk groups- it is important for advertising etc. to know who they are targeting and make sure everyone is represented <p><i>introduction to the open discussion, as well as the physical worksheet tool to gather thoughts, feedback, questions etc.</i></p> <p><i>Open Facilitated Discussion:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • : inconvenience for trades, rural, traffic- question to police about police enforcement of speeds? Noticing slower drivers being dangerous, inconsistency- specific locality 	<p>Prioritising honouring of Te Tiriti O Waitangi</p>

- NZ Police: general deterrence strategy for road safety (speed etc.). RIDS, Restraints, Impairment, Distraction, Speed, key focus acronym. Only so many resources, a lot of road safety factors that need to be monitored- enforcement of speed management is not exclusively police
- : appreciates comments about speed consistency, it can be really confusing with all the various speeds
- : building on comments, strongly supports the speed management program, need to take care to ensure target is clear and the evidence of how we are getting to the target is obvious, being careful that speed limits make sense to people
- : looking at schools and malls, daycares, elderly etc. what do you do to keep communities safe- who decides where to put speed bumps, it feels like there are more on main roads and not on roads where there are higher risk communities/spaces? *Who decides what infrastructure goes where?*

AT: residential areas where there is increased foot traffic and lower speed limits, potentially there are more speed bumps to encourage slowing down- some main roads have them to mediate high risk locations to help control the traffic. Happy to have a conversation about specific locations.

Appendix 6 - Workshop Four Worksheet Transcription and notes

Draft Criteria to Assess Options	Draft Problem Statements	Draft Enforcement Tools	Short List Development	Draft Speed Management Tools	Draft Working Principles
Would like to see 1 & 4 be holistic. If intervention results in an increase of harm in another domain, success is reduced		Camera AI while list exceptions. KPI's for response times		Consistent signs/roadmarking treatment outside school	#7 Health is more than individual emergencies
ARPHS- 4 should place higher due to disproportionate outcomes for Māori. 1 & 4 focus on the streets have a greater impact for health and mortality		Camera- need incident # to process infringement exemptions		Street furnitures near crossing --> less distracting	
#5 Safe Active mode use? Does this suggest most Active modes are unsafe inherently?		Use of bus lanes by FENZ. AT requires an incident # avoid them- but very ... way of processing infringement exceptions. speed and bus lanes FENZ vehicles		Legislation changes (new speed limits) requires a key enforcement plan/system to be successful. Safety cameras play a part but what other tools are there	
		FENZ vehicles not always going fast to an emergency- if over limit but not emergency want to know		Innovating streets projects that may have impacted learning on traffic calming measures	
		St Johns infringements process- if an emergency is cancelled		60km/h area. Please remove Kea crossings. I believe they are hazardous	
		Maintenance of vehicles is higher cost when lots of slow/speed over bumps			
		Waitakere LB- request to address emergency response. Lincoln Road at 30 would be a serious impact. Additional noise of large appliances slowing plus speeding back up			
		How can AT support response times? ATOC- more "green waves"- stretches of green light + on on-ramps ATOC can turn lights green on more blockage			
		Lower limits will impact FENZ policy. Policy is set at a national level, very challenging to change			
		Schools near hospitals. Lower limits will impact emergency responses. FENZ policy on going over posted limit. Especially in overnight emergencies			
		Main response routes. Request no traffic calming measures. Unexpected consequence- speed bump reduce police patrols. Will avoid bumps			
		Raised crossings + speed bumps are bad for us. Speed cushions are OK for wide trucks but trucks (urban) are being reduced/narrowed...			
		City modifying. Apartments, narrower roads, no parking. Impacts FENZ --> shift to narrower smalled engines 5-10 years			
		Move to electric vehicles. Buildings with battery charging --> generating higher fire risk			

Workshop 4 facilitation notes from discussion

Below are facilitation notes taken during the session. Themes from these notes that are in addition to those transcribed from the Miro board are identified in the second column.

Notes	Additional themes to Miro board
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • _: what stage is the project currently at? Know there has been engagement with communities etc. is the consultation happening again? • AT: Technically Phase 4. Phase 1 done in 2020, Phase 2 ..., Phase 3 consultation period has ended and going through feedback etc. Speed management plan is Stage 4, to compare it is 3 years of changes so significantly more work, bigger picture • _: Implementation of lower speed changes- what is the community engagement once the speed has changed? Would be happy to help with promotion, working with comms because believe in what is being done • AT: Because of the new rule in April, under new legislation, ... Would love the help with the community engagement. Waka Kotahi will advise on the actual speed changes, baseline feedback that many roads are not appropriate speed limits and will be lowered but not all. • _: does safety of people refer just to around the road network or the general community safety? • AT: Context- a people centered transport network. Conversations about other purposes road spaces have, priorities etc. First priority is safety of people around roads and streets. Broader theme of safety for all • AT: Getting to people to support wellbeing and safety, as well as evacuation etc. is key so having the road network supporting this to allow emergency vehicles to get where they need to be. Ensuring there are no unintended ..., think the general safety is more important • _: distinguishing rural and urban 	

- AT: at a first level, roadside development. Forward looking plan, what development is likely to occur. Borderline rural areas tend to lean towards urban consideration
- _: forecast for population to explode- 2045- when consulting around areas of high-density urban growth, and with the plan based on 2027, what happens beyond that? Are you focused on a limit, how strong is the future focus?
- AT: in 2024 required to produce a future plan- development, population, new schools etc. Set to adapt if a rural area is likely to end up being more urban/residential.
- _: have you tested in specific areas/communities? Arterial roads etc. what does the criteria look like when testing the change? What are the considerations? What are the priorities? Equity and places of high risk
- AT: all the options haven't been put together yet. The current stage is helping to figure out how we put this all together to create the best plan- welcoming all informal direction
- _: asking about schools specifically. What infrastructure and communication are planned for schools/school areas? Will it be the same for all schools, consistency model...?
- AT: Under the new rule there are 2 options- permanent 30km/h or varying 30km/h- there may be some variation but unlikely. Automatic speed signs (will show 30km/h speed limit at peak school times). There will still be case by case decisions for the type of school etc.
- _: maps of hospitals, lots have schools near them. These 30km/h would drastically impact
- _: Mapping provided by FENZ does not include St Johns pathways- although FENZ attend many health emergencies it does not cover them.
- AT: some information or mapping would be great to receive from St John
- _: speed limit does not impact emergency vehicles by law- hopefully the safer speeds will have better control on traffic which should in theory make it easier for emergency vehicles. The policy may have a different

Consider long term focus and planning to 2045

- _: ambulances can only go 30km/h above the limit
- AT: the targeted rule will affect all locations.
- _: it is only 25km/h over limit for other emergency vehicles
- _: local knowledge vs. uber drivers, couriers etc. What is in place to support people who don't know the route, know to slow down etc.
- AT: themes we have heard consistently, people who know a certain area/live there have a different view on driving than people using that route just to move
- _: lockdown 2020- level 4 & 3 etc. FENZ respond to ... each day nationally. In lockdowns this dropped down to 4. Is this influencing the stats?
- AT: 2020 stats for this were included,
- _: Education. Some schools teach/support getting your license at school. This would be a good thing through all the schools. From a health and safety perspective- the change in behavior is the hardest. Could this be mandatory?
- AT: young people are the future- it's a huge opportunity. AT has some Programmes along these lines. Want to support people at whatever age with this education.
- _: Infrastructure vs speed- infrastructure is effective but requires much more time. Speed management is important to effect this change faster. Only time you will see speed limits increase is when infrastructure is already in place for example, but typically better to lower speed limits.
- _: #7 & #8, in relation to disproportionate stats for Māori and Pasifika in Fire and Emergency, what is the equity response, and does it consider wider equity issues? Are there mechanisms to support mutually beneficial outcomes for emergency services?
- AT: would the mapping work provided by FENZ help represent this?
- _: could provide additional information to represent the other equity issues. Depending on the scale of incidents, response could come from other areas- different appliances based on availability and scale

Consider maximum speeds over limits for emergency vehicles (Out of scope?)

Support for education in secondary schools whilst gaining driver license.

Appendix 7 - Feedback from participants on workshops

Which Speed Management Plan Technical Workshop did you attend? (Please tick the relevant box)	What is the one key 'takeaway' you have from the workshop you attended?	Auckland Transport is trialling different ways to involve our stakeholders. Please share your views on these technical workshops, as a way to contribute feedback before the Draft Auckland Speed Management Plan is shared with Auckland.	Did you attend an online workshop? If "Yes", how did you find it? What suggestions do you have that might improve the experience?	Do you have any other comments or observations?	Would you be willing to be contacted to share your ideas?	Name	Business/Organisation	Email Address	Phone Number
Saturday 28 May, 10am-12pm - Online workshop	Very complete presentation	I needed NZSL interpreters to properly engage	Yes - I struggled a little because there was a lot talking and I needed Nzsl interpreter	Thank you for the offer to attend	Yes, please feel free to contact me.	Ursula	DISABILITY ADVISORY PANEL	ursula.thynne@gmail.com	021877852
Saturday 28 May, 10am-12pm - Online workshop	It was overrun by AC / AT personnel. I felt that the input from guest attendees was largely seen as not credible, or irrelevant by the AC / At attendees.	Workshops were held at totally inconvenient times for attendance by most people. Weekday mornings rule out almost all working people and Saturday mornings or most are either work days or child sport days. some evening sessions may have been better attended..	Some of the "tools" like the Miro Board and the messaging between attendees were totally foreign to me as a very occasional online meeting user and I was not able to access that information, so the usefulness of the session was severely minimised.	I have provided written comment and requested information and assistance from the ATSpeedProgram, AT SaferSpeeds and AT Street for People and received no response. Don't talk the talk if you will not walk the walk !!	Yes, please feel free to contact me.	Ken Cowan	Piha Ratepayers & Residents Assn.	info@piha.org.nz	09 812 8658
Wednesday 1 June, 10am-12pm - In person workshop, Auckland Maritime Museum	We all agreed that the incidents of accident and injury needs addressing	Face to face is the way to go	no	I was a little concerned that statistics offered by FENZ were challenged	Yes, please feel free to contact me.	Shaun Pilgrim	Fire and Emergency	shaun.pilgrim@fireandemergency.nz	0272832825
Tuesday 31 May, 10am-12pm - In person workshop, Auckland Maritime Museum	High Dependency on MOT and NZTA actions eg Mobile Speed camera vans and other regulatory changes	Good for stakeholder engagement	N	The Raised table pedestrian crossings have been an excellent investment in road safety that work 24hrs a day not just at School hours they are better than temporary speed limits	Yes, please feel free to contact me.	Richard Scott	ACC	richard.scott@acc.co.nz	+64211958609
Saturday 28 May, 10am-12pm - Online workshop	Speed is part of a much bigger set of problems	It was a good method to connect	Informative but also troubling	We need better data, more and overonger time frame's.	Yes, please feel free to contact me.	Bill Cashmore	Cashmore Farms Ltd	wbcmakemyday@yahoo.co.nz	0210517118
Monday 30 May, 10am-12pm - Online workshop	The unwavering passion and commitment of all attendees to better road safety outcomes	Good for collaboration. Not as a means to provide indepth analytical feedback.	Probably not best to introduce a new software tool for people to use during a workshop. Better facilitation of "rooms" to get results would be good. It doesn't work to get people to write and talk/ listen at the same time.	No	Yes, please feel free to contact me.	Martin Glynn	AA	mglynn@aa.co.nz	021 757 238

Appendix 8 - Submissions following workshops

The below submissions were received following the four workshops.

Received from	Submission text	Key themes
<p>1. received by email 2 June 2022</p>	<p>Hi ,</p> <p>Thanks again for the invite, it's great to have a little bit more of an insight into the inner workings of these processes.</p> <p>I genuinely hope that we can work towards alternatives to speed bumps on some of our important transport routes to minimize the disruptions to all types of vehicles including tradies, freight, emergency services and any other motorist who simply doesn't have access to public transport or other alternative modes of transport. I know there was a bit of talk about the need for the speed bumps to get drivers to slow down to 30km/h but I can assure you that I'm not able to safely cross them at even half that (15km/h) in many instances. And alternatives such as lane narrowing using traffic islands (mountable obviously for specialist vehicles wider than the normal 2.5m width)</p> <p>And as I mentioned we need police enforcement of the slower speed areas because at the moment I feel as though I get stuck behind slow drivers who then speed where it's not safe to do so. (Such as passing school buses dropping off kids and schools at school time)</p> <p>At the moment it feels like the only enforcement is the "low hanging fruit" the easy to target revenue or the "bread and butter" revenue for police by parking on the motorways where it is safe to travel above the posted speed limits and therefore easy to issue tickets but I don't think I have ever seen or heard of a police officer pull someone over for exceeding 20 past a school bus (and I have even seen a police officer, in a traffic patrol police car, travel at 80km/h past a school bus that was dropping off kids)</p> <p>As for the enforcement side of things such as cameras... they need to be moved away from "High revenue" areas and moved to the "high risk" areas such as outside the schools instead of the longest straightest part of a road that has an inappropriately slow speed limit.</p> <p>I note that there was also concerns around the budget and costs regarding road upgrades but a raised pedestrian crossing can cost upwards of \$200,000</p> <p>This is a significant amount of money while the consultation document also states that there won't be any high cost repairs and upgrades to the roads so that's a bit of a conflict there.</p>	<p>Support treatment options to minimize negative impact.</p> <p>Police enforcement of slow and unsafe driver behaviour.</p> <p>Safety around school settings</p> <p>Police enforcement targeting to high risk</p> <p>Costs of infrastructure builds, upgrades and repairs</p>

	<p>While in some cases the slower speed limits and making an area more pedestrian friendly by prioritizing pedestrian, cyclists and scooters etc is doing a great thing with positive outcomes for many... it's also important to consider the negative impacts for drivers by hindering movement between suburbs and even regions by removing important transport networks or making the network less safe and less efficient.</p> <p>I'm sure there will be a point where the number of speed bumps become a concern for mental health of those of us who don't have the option to leave our trade vehicles at home and walk.</p> <p>Speeding up and slowing down all the time also uses more diesel or petrol than driving at a consistent speed so I expect to start seeing opposition to speed bumps from the carbon emission and climate change protestors as time goes on.</p> <p>There is no argument that we all want the roads to be safe and sometimes people claim I want the speed limits to be "unsafe" by asking for faster speed limits but this is not the case at all, often slower speed limits come with negative impacts such as increased travel time, increased frustration and fatigue and a massive reduction in driver engagement as the slower speed limit promotes distraction such as phone use</p> <p>Some roads have had an increase in crashes following the slower speed limit and the figures currently being used to justify the spending on the slower speeds program are manipulated by averaging the numbers out over a time frame that gives the best results for the reports.</p> <p>I'm sure I could offer more feedback and do some more in depth studies and reports etc but remember this is all voluntary for me and I still have other work commitments too.</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to participate</p> <p>Cheers</p> <p>P.s today I traveled approx 190km collecting and delivery trade materials and traveling to and from home/ suppliers/ work sites.</p>	<p>Balancing safety needs of various road user groups with efficiency.</p> <p>Mental health impact</p> <p>Consistent speeds and flow impact on emissions reduction</p> <p>Balancing safety needs of various road user groups with efficiency.</p> <p>Driver behaviour and mindset</p> <p>Support for specific data informed changes</p> <p>Consider impact on drivers involved in trade industry</p>
--	---	--

<p>2. FENZ received by email 10 June 2022</p>	<p>Kia ora</p> <p>I feel pretty confident that Fire and Emergency feedback has been captured during the session and in our previous feedback to the Safer Speed Programme. I have re-attached our previous feedback on the Safer Speed Programme as I feel this still applies in relation to the potential impacts of speed limits changes and traffic calming interventions on emergency response.</p> <p>Key points we made on the day included:</p> <p>Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of Principle 1 - A preference for Tiakitanga, the safety of people, to be expanded beyond road users and acknowledge that the roads are also a vehicle to keep people safe (in the event of getting responders to an emergency, or evacuating people from an emergency) • Support for principle 7 – the support of health and equity, and what this may mean beyond direct road uses. We will seek to share additional information on location and type of call outs • Support for principle 8 – monitoring changes but would like to seek the wording changed to “respond agilely when different treatments are needed” This would allow AT to alter treatments that may have unintended consequences. <p>Ngā mihi</p> <p>---</p> <p>ATTACHMENT 1</p> <p>28 March 2022</p> <p>Ref: Auckland Transport Safer Speeds Proposed Speed Limit Changes</p> <p>1.0 Fire and Emergency NZ responds to 23,000 incidents a year across Tāmaki Makaurau</p> <p>1.1 The primary objective of Fire and Emergency NZ is to reduce the incidence of unwanted fire and the associated risk to life and property.</p>	<p>Note two pdf attachments dated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 March 2022 and • 10 June 2022 <p>Principles 1 and 7 Expand scope to include people impacted by emergency situations</p> <p>Principle 8 suggested wording change to allow monitoring and altering of treatments.</p>
---	---	--

	<p>1.2 The main functions of Fire and Emergency NZ are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promote safety and provide fire prevention response and fire suppression services • stabilise or render safety incidents involving hazardous substances • rescue persons who are trapped as a result of transport accidents or other incidents • provide urban search and rescues services¹ <p>1.3 Through a Memorandum of Understanding with St John, Fire and Emergency NZ also responds to medical emergencies. We provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-response to all immediate or life-threatening calls • first response to: • immediate or life-threatening calls • potentially life threatening or time-critical calls, and; • urgent or potentially serious calls.² <p>1.4 Fire and Emergency NZ attends an average of 23,9183 incidents across Tāmaki Makaurau per year, this includes an average of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4,925 fires • 4,150 medical emergencies • 2,163 vehicle accidents • 1,391 rescues and public assists⁴ <p>1.5 Incidents trends were increasing between 2018 and 2020 and dropped slightly in 2021. Fire incidents, in particular the number of vegetation fires have decreased over 2021. This is mostly likely from COVID restrictions across Tāmaki Makaurau keeping people close to home. Fires for land management purposes may have been more closely monitored, and reduced travel and use of open space is likely to have lowered the risk of unwanted fire or fire spreading.</p> <p><small>1 Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 section 11 2 Fire and Emergency New Zealand and St John New Zealand, Interagency Support Memorandum of Understanding 28 September 2020 3 Four year rolling average 2018-2021 4 Four year rolling average 2018-2021</small></p> <p>2.0 Fire and Emergency NZ in Tāmaki Makaurau supports Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero approach</p> <p>2.1 Fire and Emergency NZ acknowledges that on average, one person is killed every day on New</p>	<p>Support for Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero approach</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Zealand roads and another seven are seriously injured.</p> <p>2.2 Fire and Emergency NZ in Tāmaki Makaurau is part of the Auckland Transport Road Safety Governance Group. We support the primary focus areas of Road to Zero for Tāmaki Makaurau to improve our roads, reduce risk and keep people safe. It aligns with our goal to minimise the social, economic and environmental impacts from emergencies.</p> <p>2.3 We acknowledge that some research has found that slowing speeds in urban areas can smooth traffic flow and reduce congestion⁵ and that it has little impact on driver travel time ⁶</p> <p>2.4 We understand that at a collision speed of 30 km/h pedestrians have some chance of surviving a crash, but this rapidly decreases with higher speeds ⁷</p> <p>2.5 Fire and Emergency NZ supports the proposal of reduced speed limits on streets located across Tāmaki Makaurau that are close to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kōhanga reo and early childhood centres • Kura and schools • Marae • Places of worship. <p>3.0 An efficient road network is crucial to emergency response</p> <p>3.1 The road network is the primary mode of emergency response for Fire and Emergency NZ across Tāmaki Makaurau. Impediments in attending a fire or other emergencies may risk the safety of people, property, and the environment and increase the risk of death or serious injury within our communities.</p> <p>3.2 Community need for our services has been increasing, thereby increasing our presence on the roads and need for fast and efficient traversing across Tāmaki Makaurau. The rate of change per year, until 2020/21 COVID restrictions shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • structure fire incidents increasing by 2.36% • vegetation fire incidents increasing by 4.08% • medical incidents increasing by 1.99% • vehicle accidents increasing by 1.998 <p>.</p> <p>3.3 Response to fire, medical and other emergencies are time critical and delays experienced by</p>	<p>Supports the primary focus areas of Road to Zero</p> <p>Supports the proposal of reduced speed limits on streets located across Tāmaki Makaurau that are close to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kōhanga reo and early childhood centres • Kura and schools • Marae • Places of worship. <p>Impediments including time delays in attending a fire or other emergencies may risk the safety of people, property, and the environment and increase the risk of death or serious injury.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>emergency response can affect the outcome of incidents they attend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A House fire can become fatal within three minutes⁹ • For every minute that goes by without CPR or using an AED¹⁰, the chance of survival drops by 10-15 percent¹¹ • The number of people killed in traffic accidents increases with increasing emergency response time¹² <p>5 Fildes B, Langford J, Dale A, Scully J. Balance between harm reduction and mobility in setting speed limits: a feasibility study. Sydney: Austroads Inc, 2005.</p> <p>6 Taylor MAP. Network modelling of the traffic, environmental and energy effects of lower urban speed limits. Road and Transport Research. 2000;9(4):48-57</p> <p>7 Archer J, Fotheringham N, Symmons M, Corben B. The impact of lower speed limits in urban and metropolitan areas. Melbourne: Monash University Accident Research Centre, 2008</p> <p>8 FY 2017/18 to 2020/21</p> <p>9 www.fireanemergency.co.nz</p> <p>10 Automated external defibrillator</p> <p>11 https://www.stjohn.org.nz/news--info/news-articles/whats-your-chance-of-surviving-a-cardiac-arrest/</p> <p>12 Al-Haji G, Assessing Traffic Calming Measures for Safe and Accessible Emergency Routes in Norrkoping City in Sweden, International Journal of Transport and Vehicle Engineering Vol:12, No:9, 2018</p> <p>3.4 Studies have shown that the quicker the emergency response time, the lower the number of road accidents fatalities. A study of the city of Norrkopking Sweden showed that 12% of those who were killed in road accidents could have survived if they had been transported faster to a hospital and a further 32% could have survived if they had been transported more quickly to an advanced trauma centre¹³</p> <p>3.5 In suburb of Manurewa, where multiple traffic calming interventions (physical interventions and reduced speed limits) have been implement, emergency response has slowed. Data for the years 2019 and 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.1% overall increase in the time it is taking the first appliance to reach an incident • 7% increase in response times exceeding 8 minutes • 81 medical responses where response exceeded 8 minutes, increasing the risk of death or serious injury to 5.7 people¹⁴ <p>4.0 Proposed speed limit changes in some urban and rural areas could negatively impact emergency response time</p> <p>4.1 Fire and Emergency NZ is concerned, that speed limit changes in some parts of Tāmaki Makaurau could increase the risk of harm to people, property and the environment contributing to poor community outcomes. We are concerned that speed limit changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on urban streets, when coupled with physical traffic calming devices, will negatively impact 	<p>International research and local evidence supports that the faster the emergency response time, the lower the number of road accidents fatalities.</p> <p>Proposed speed limit changes in some urban and rural areas could negatively impact emergency response time</p> <p>Increase the risk of harm to people, property and the environment contributing to poor community outcomes.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>emergency response time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on roads close to fire stations, will slow volunteer travel from their homes or work to respond to incidents, thereby negatively impacting emergency response time. <p>4.2 Fire and Emergency NZ requests Auckland Transport does not implement speed limit changes, or reduces the severity of speed limit changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on streets where fire stations are located, thereby reducing the level of interface between traffic calming measures and emergency response • on primary response routes to optimise the efficiency of response • on road within 8-10 km radius of a volunteer fire station, to support volunteers to reach stations in a timely manner, therefore reducing impact on response times to emergencies in rural areas. <p>4.3 Multiple factors contributes to response time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appliance size and type • the nature of the road the appliance is travelling • the speed the appliance is travelling • the distance that the appliance is travelling • traffic calming interventions the appliance encounters on route. <p>Urban areas</p> <p>4.4 Multiple appliance types, from across the region may be sent to an emergency. Should primary routes of travel have reduced speed limits, this is likely to slow response time of appliances, particularly those travelling from across the region to large events.</p> <p>13 Ibid 14 Average response times (time taken for the first arriving relevant appliance to reach the incident) for all the events which occurred within the suburb of Manurewa 2019 and 2021</p> <p>4.5 Time increase for heavy vehicles to traverse speed humps can be 10.715 seconds per hump. A speed hump is the equivalent of an additional 0.08 km distance to the incident scene.¹⁶ When travelling a route with a lower speed limit and multiple speed humps, or other physical traffic calming interventions, the time to reach the incident would be greater than if only one intervention was in place.</p> <p>4.6 Reviews of good practice overseas¹⁷ has seen cities avoiding placing traffic calming interventions on emergency response routes as the cumulative effectiveness of interventions are likely to effect response time.</p>	<p>Request that Auckland Transport does not implement speed limit changes, or reduces the severity of speed limit changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on streets where fire stations are located, thereby reducing the level of interface between traffic calming measures and emergency response • on primary response routes to optimise the efficiency of response • on road within 8-10 km radius of a volunteer fire station, to support volunteers to reach stations in a timely manner, therefore reducing impact on response times to emergencies in rural areas.
--	--	--

	<p>Areas outside the Urban Rural Boundary</p> <p>4.7 Volunteer brigades provide Fire and Emergency NZ response in many rural and semi-rural areas. They travel from home or work to a station to respond to an incident.</p> <p>4.8 In rural areas, the speed at which volunteers can travel to a station in order to respond to an incident will impact overall response time. If the speed limit is reduced from 100km/h to 80km/h a 10km trip will require an additional 3 minutes, if the speed is reduced 60km/h it will take an additional 7 minutes.</p> <p>5.0 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau would like to work with Auckland Transport in reassessing the speed limit changes in locations that are most likely to negatively affect emergency response</p> <p>5.1 Fire and Emergency NZ welcomes the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport on information sharing on primary routes and the location of fire stations to support the reassessment of speed limits that are likely to have the greatest impact on emergency response.</p> <p>5.2 We further welcome the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport to assess the cumulative effects of multiple traffic calming treatments on emergency response time in an effort to mitigate negative community outcomes in event of fire, medical, road accident or other emergencies.</p> <p>Ngā mihi,</p> <p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand, Region Manager – Te Hiku</p> <p>15 Al-Haji G, Assessing Traffic Calming Measures for Safe and Accessible Emergency Routes in Norrkoping City in Sweden, International Journal of Transport and Vehicle Engineering Vol:12, No:9, 2018 16 Traffic Calming Benefits, Costs and Equity Impacts, T. Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 1999, Traffic Calming and Emergency Response, Local Government Commission, Sacramento California 17 Ewing, Reid;Brown, Steven J;Hoyt, Aaron Traffic Calming Practice Revisited Institute of Transportation Engineers. ITE Journal; Nov 2005; 75 Ryan Snyder R, Siegman P, Huff H, McCormick C, Best Practices, Emergency Access Healthy Streets, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health March 23, 2013</p> <p>---</p>	<p>Request to work with Auckland Transport in reassessing the speed limit changes in locations that are most likely to negatively affect emergency response</p> <p>Welcomes the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport on information sharing on primary routes and the location of fire stations to support the reassessment of speed limits that are likely to have the greatest impact on emergency response. Also, to assess the cumulative effects of multiple traffic calming treatments on emergency response time in an effort to mitigate negative community outcomes in event of fire, medical, road accident or other emergencies.</p>
--	--	--

ATTACHMENT 2

Thursday, 10 June 2021

Ref: Feedback on Auckland Transport's Safer Speeds Programme from Fire and Emergency New Zealand in Tāmaki Makaurau

1.0 Summary

1.1 The primary objective of Fire and Emergency New Zealand is to reduce the incidence of unwanted fire and the associated risk to life and property.

1.2 Through a Memorandum of Understanding with St John, Fire and Emergency also responds to medical emergencies.

1.3 In 2020 Fire and Emergency attended 82,460 fire, medical and vehicle accident callouts, of which 19,316 were in Tāmaki Makaurau¹

1.4 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau would like to work with Auckland Transport in early planning of traffic calming interventions to ensure positive community outcomes and an overall reduction of fatalities and injuries in Tāmaki Makaurau.

1.5 The road network is the primary mode of emergency response, particularly in the urban environment. Delays in attending a fire or other emergencies may risk the safety of people and their property.

1.6 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau is concerned that changes to speed limits and physical traffic calming devices proposed by Auckland Transport through the Safer Speeds Programme will negatively impact emergency response time, which may result in loss of life and/or property.

2.0 Fire and medical emergency call outs are increasing across Tāmaki Makaurau

Note: significant duplication of feedback received on 28 Marh 2022

Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau would like to work with Auckland Transport in early planning of traffic calming interventions to ensure positive community outcomes and an overall reduction of fatalities and injuries in Tāmaki Makaurau.

The road network is the primary mode of emergency response, particularly in the urban environment. Delays in attending a fire or other emergencies may risk the safety of people and their property.

Concern that changes to speed limits and physical traffic calming devices proposed by Auckland Transport through the Safer Speeds Programme will negatively impact emergency response time, which may result in loss of life and/or property.

	<p>2.1 The primary objective of Fire and Emergency is to reduce the incidence of unwanted fire and the associated risk to life and property. We seek:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to protect and preserve life • prevent or limit injury • prevent or limit damage to property and land, and; • prevent or limit damage to the environment² <p>.</p> <p>2.2 The main functions of Fire and Emergency are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promote safety and provide fire prevention response and fire suppression services • stabilise or render safety incidents involving hazardous substances • rescue persons who are trapped as a result of transport accidents or other incidents • provide urban search and rescues services³ <p>1 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2020 2 Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 section 10(a)(b) 3 Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 section 11</p> <p>2.3 In addition to the above core functions, Fire and Emergency also supports St John in medical emergencies through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-response to all immediate or life threatening calls • first response to: • immediate or life threatening calls • potentially life threatening or time-critical calls, and; • urgent or potentially serious calls.⁴ <p>2.4 Between 2016 to 2020 there has been a 6.51% increase in incident rates across Tāmaki Makaurau. Medical and fire incidents have increased faster than vehicle accidents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.91% increase in medical incidents • 5.89% increase in fire incidents • 5.28% increase in vehicle accidents. <p>2.5 Response to fire and medical incidents are time critical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A house fire can become fatal within three minutes⁵ • For every minute that goes by without CPR or using an AED⁶, the chance of survival drops by 10-15 percent⁷ <p>2.6 In 2020 Fire and Emergency in Tamaki Makaurau attended 875 incidents where there were one or more fatalities.</p>	<p>Supports Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero, to reach zero road deaths or serious injuries by 2050 and</p>
--	--	---

	<p>3.0 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau supports Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero approach</p> <p>3.1 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau acknowledges that on average, one person is killed every day on New Zealand roads and another seven are seriously injured.</p> <p>3.2 We further acknowledge that in Tāmaki Makaurau in 2019, 40 people died on our roads and an additional 567 were seriously injured.</p> <p>3.3 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau supports Auckland Transport’s Vision Zero, to reach zero road deaths or serious injuries by 2050 and its associated Safe Speed Programme.</p> <p>3.4 We further support the principal of traffic calming to reduce the risk of road accidents and associated fatalities on road in Tāmaki Makaurau.</p> <p>3.5 However, during an emergency, Fire and Emergency is most efficient and effective when fire appliances have fast and clear access. Delays getting to and dealing with a fire may risk the safety of people and their property. Because of the functions performed by Fire and Emergency appliances, they are larger and heavier than those used by other emergency services⁸</p> <p>4 Fire and Emergency New Zealand and St John New Zealand, Interagency Support Memorandum of Understand 28 September 2020 5 www.fireanemergency.co.nz 6 Automated external defibrillator 7 https://www.stjohn.org.nz/news--info/news-articles/whats-your-chance-of-surviving-a-cardiac-arrest/ 8 Fire and Emergency Vehicle Access Guide</p> <p>3.6 Traffic calming strategies can impact fast and clear access. Active strategies, which prevent or reduce movement of traffic through such things as volume control devices⁹ or physical barriers¹⁰, have the greatest potential impact on emergency service response time.</p> <p>4.0 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau would like to work with Auckland Transport in the planning of traffic calming interventions to mitigate impact on emergency response</p> <p>4.1 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau welcomes the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport on information sharing and early planning of traffic calming interventions to ensure positive community outcomes and overall reduction of fatalities and injuries across Auckland.</p>	<p>its associated Safe Speed Programme</p> <p>During an emergency, Fire and Emergency is most efficient and effective when fire appliances have fast and clear access. Delays getting to and dealing with a fire may risk the safety of people and their property.</p> <p>Traffic calming strategies can impact fast and clear access. Active strategies, which prevent or reduce movement of traffic through such things as volume control devices or physical barriers, have the greatest potential impact on emergency service response time.</p> <p>Would like to work with Auckland Transport in the planning of traffic calming interventions to mitigate impact on emergency response</p> <p>Welcomes the opportunity to work with Auckland Transport on information sharing and early planning of traffic calming interventions to ensure positive community</p>
--	---	--

	<p>4.2 The Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide provides guidance to ensure appliances can access sites, buildings and structures in an emergency¹¹. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimum widths for carriageways • minimum widths for curved carriageways or corners • requirements for turning areas (i.e. dead ends) • kerb dimensions on carriageways • maximum gradients for ramps/ inclines. <p>4.3 Ensuring speed calming interventions align with the specifications outlined in the Access Guide is likely to mitigate negative impacts on emergency services.</p> <p>4.4 We appreciate that Auckland Transport’s document Traffic Calming, as part of the Engineering Design Code, references slower response time as a potential disadvantage to traffic calming. It identifies that careful planning, local public involvement and the right devices in the right spots should minimise potential disadvantages.</p> <p>4.5 The need to work with or consider the effects of traffic calming on emergency service response time is also referenced by Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Authority in their practice guidelines.¹²</p> <p>5.0 Speed limit changes in town centre and rural areas could negatively impact emergency response time</p> <p>5.1 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau is concerned that speed limit changes, such as those proposed in Ōtara Manurewa, Freemans Bay South and Franklin East will negatively impact emergency response time.</p> <p>5.2 As the flow of traffic slows, the speed that fire appliances can achieve in reaching emergencies also slows.</p> <p>5.3 In rural areas, where distance from stations to emergencies can be greater, or require volunteer response, travel speed is an important factor.</p> <p>5.4 In previous feedback to Waka Kotahi NZTA, Fire and Emergency has recommended a 70 km/hr speed limit as an appropriate balance between traffic calming and emergency response.</p> <p>6.0 Speed calming devices planned in Manurewa are likely to negatively impact emergency response time</p>	<p>outcomes and overall reduction of fatalities and injuries across Auckland.</p> <p>Impact of speed limit changes in specific areas of Auckland.</p> <p>Traffic calming strategies can impact fast and clear access. Active strategies, which prevent or reduce movement of traffic through such things as volume control devices or physical barriers, have the greatest potential impact on emergency service response time.</p> <p>Recommended a 70 km/hr speed limit as an appropriate balance between traffic calming and emergency response.</p> <p>Risk that physical speed calming devices, specifically speed humps, could result in delayed emergency response time.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>6.1 Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau is concerned that some physical traffic calming devices, specifically speed humps, could result in delayed emergency response time.</p> <p>9 Examples include full street closures, half street closures, diagonal diverters and semi-diverters. 10 Vertical, horizontal and narrowing type devices Vertical, horizontal and narrowing type devices, including such things a speed humps, high kerbing, medium barriers, and raised crossings 11 F5-02 GD FFO Emergency vehicle access DRAFT 13 June 2018 12 Speed Management Guide, Volume 2: Toolbox – how to implement treatments and activies, NZTA Waka Kotahi, 2016</p> <p>6.2 In Manurewa where speed calming devices have been installed, as part of Safer Speeds Tranche 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire and Emergency attended 39 incidents within the last 12 months¹³. • 14 of the incidents had one or more fatalities, a 10% increase from the previous year. <p>6.3 In Manurewa where speed calming devices have been proposed, as part of Safer Speeds Tranche 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire and Emergency attended 31 incidents within the last 12 months¹⁴. • Six of the incidents had one or more fatalities. <p>6.4 Multiple appliances types may be sent to an emergency. Response delays will vary due to appliance size and type, and the nature of the road they are travelling. Research has found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the more a driver intensifies his/her efforts to traverse the speed humps, the greater the impact delay. • time increases to traverse speed humps were approximately 2–10 seconds per hump. (Studies indicate the heavier the vehicle the greater the time it will take over physical barriers)¹⁵ • that every speed hump an appliance crosses, while maintaining a 25 m/h (40 km/h) cruising speed, is equivalent to being .05 mile or 0.08 km further from the incident scene.¹⁶ (Fire and Emergency appliances tend to slow well below 40km/h to traverse a speed hump). <p>6.5 In general, Fire and Emergency in Tāmaki Makaurau recommends that primary response routes and protected routes¹⁷ should remain free of physical impediments (vertical or horizontal devices), such as speed humps, speed cushions, traffic circles and chicanes, or narrowing of roads.</p> <p>Ngā mihi,</p> <p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand, Region Manager – Te Hiku</p> <p>13 1 April 2020-21 March 2021 14 1 April 2020-21 March 2021</p>	<p>Evidence of potential increased negative impact on response time in Manurewa.</p> <p>General recommendation that primary response routes and protected routes should remain free of physical impediments (vertical or horizontal devices), such as speed humps, speed cushions, traffic circles and chicanes, or narrowing of roads.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>15 The Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Traffic Calming Devices in Reducing Speeds on Local Urban Roads in New Zealand, R. Minnema, Department of Engineering, University of Canterbury, 2006</p> <p>16 Traffic Calming Benefits, Costs and Equity Impacts, T. Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, 1999, Traffic Calming and Emergency Response, Local Government Commission, Sacramento California</p> <p>17 Protected routes including lifeline routes, over dimension routes and overweight routes</p>	
<p>3. New Zealand Automobile Association received by email 10 June 2022</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Thanks for engaging with us and for the opportunity to provide feedback. We're confident that AT is aware of our views on speed management in Auckland, but just to avoid any doubt, we'd like to take this opportunity to re-submit the submission that we sent through back in April on Tranche 3 of the speed management programme, which provides a good summary of our views.</p> <p>Based on the material circulated by AT on the approach being taken to developing the speed management plan, we'd just like to highlight our view that we think public agreement with, and buy-in to, road safety initiatives is central to achieving AT's desired outcomes. We believe it needs to be incorporated into the 'working principles' and be given more than the 10% weighting currently identified in the 'draft problem statements'.</p> <p>Consistent with this, when it comes to the 10 longlist areas identified, we see benefits in focusing on speed management around schools (noting our comments in the attached about further work being needed to better understand public acceptability around variable versus permanent reductions, along with what people view to be 'around' a school), as well as the options which focus on infrastructure alongside speed limits – as ensuring speed limits suit the 'look and feel' of the road environment is central to achieving compliance, which in turn is central to securing improved road safety outcomes.</p> <p>- - -</p> <p>1 April 2022</p> <p>Auckland Transport Speed Programme Auckland Transport Private Bag 92250 AUCKLAND 1142</p> <p>ATSpeedProgramme@at.govt.nz</p>	<p>Note submission (pdf attachment) dated 1 April 2022.</p> <p>Draft Problem Statement 3 - Give more than the 10% weighting to public agreement with, and buy-in to, road safety initiatives.</p> <p>Focus on speed management around school settings.</p> <p>Consider options for infrastructure with speed limits that suits 'look and feel'.</p>

	<p>SUBMISSION FROM NZAA ON AUCKLAND TRANSPORT'S PROPOSED SPEED LIMIT CHANGES – PHASE THREE</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The NZ Automobile Association (NZAA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on Phase Three of Auckland Transport's speed limit changes. 2. The NZAA represents the interests of its 1.8 million Members, including over 330,000 Aucklanders. The NZAA's advocacy role is focussed on articulating the voice of the reasonable motorist on transport issues. 3. The NZAA agrees with speed management, including speed limit reductions, as a road safety tool. Lower limits have been consistently proven to result in reductions in trauma from crashes. At the same time, speed limit reductions can be a contentious issue. Best results will be achieved when speed limits are informed by a strong evidence base, make sense to the vast majority of people, and approached in a way that's going to result in good levels of compliance without the need for heavy enforcement. 4. Consistent with the feedback we provided on Phases One and Two of Auckland Transport's speed limit changes, we continue to be of the view that the approach being taken to speed limit reductions in Auckland is not ticking all of these boxes. 5. We do not dispute that AT has secured some good wins from the changes made to date – including good levels of post project support in some town centres and residential areas, and initial analysis is indicating improved road safety outcomes across roads where speed limits have reduced. However, where changes have been made where the new speed limit does not suit the look and feel of the road – Hobson St, Nelson St and Fanshawe St being prime examples of these – compliance with the new limits is proving to be an issue. 6. This is consistent with a 2018 evaluation of 20mph [32kmph] limits in the UK (where new limits were not complemented by any other interventions such as road calming treatments). The evaluation concluded that “the results suggest that road characteristics have a much larger impact on the speeds that drivers chose to adopt than whether the road has a 30mph [48kmph] or 20mph [32kmph] limit.” 7. We are concerned that as Auckland Transport increasingly moves beyond roads where the proposed speed limits are ‘self-explaining’, we’re going to see more instances where compliance 	<p>Support for speed management focus with clear evidence base supported by education and enforcement to achieve compliance.</p> <p>Progress has been achieved and further change is required.</p> <p>Consider options for infrastructure with speed limits that suits ‘look and feel’ – road characteristics to achieve compliance.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>with the new limits is low. If a speed limit feels unreasonably slow to people, then it is very difficult to get the majority of people to comply with it.</p> <p>8. The AA is also concerned that Auckland Transport is going further and faster with speed limit reductions than the majority of Aucklanders support. Waka Kotahi’s recent Public Attitudes to Road Safety report indicates that the vast majority of people are not supportive of the idea of large scale reductions to open road or urban speed limits. Our surveys of AA Members have shown similar results, with a proportion supportive of speed limit reductions, a similar proportion opposed and the majority keen on a case-by-case approach if roads have particular risks.</p> <p>9. Speed around schools is an area where the majority of people agree with lower limits and the AA supports this general principle. There are still some challenges in terms of the real world practicalities of this, as it is not clear from the research what people consider to be ‘around’ a school and this could be interpreted quite differently by different people. It may be that in many locations, the public would be of the view that variable speed zones – where lower speed limits are in place at specific times of the day – would be most appropriate. We encourage Auckland Transport to undertake further work to understand the public’s views on these matters.</p> <p>10. We are strongly of the view that public agreement with and buy-in to road safety initiatives is central to achieving Auckland Transport’s desired outcomes. However we do not believe the public are on board with – or are even aware of – the scale and extent of the changes that we believe are coming. If Auckland Transport’s vision is for most urban roads in the city to have 30km/h limits then that should be clearly stated and we’re again calling on Auckland Transport to have a conversation with Aucklanders about its long-term vision for speed limits, encouraging feedback and debate on the wider strategy for speed limits across the region – and ultimately rolling out an approach that has buy-in from the public. The best results for road safety will come from an approach that has widespread public support.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Senior Policy Advisor</p>	<p>Must take the public on this speed reduction journey.</p> <p>Focus on speed management around school settings.</p> <p>Clarify what a school setting is (urban and rural context).</p> <p>Clear communication needed to inform public of AT vision and likely impact.</p>
--	--	---

Appendix 9 - Late Submission from Transporting NZ

Received from	Submission text	Key themes
<p>4. Transporting NZ</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Some primary feedback prior to the specifics of this workshop .</p> <p>I think this is certainly a beneficial way to get feedback from key stakeholders, and other interested parties. It was difficult to first get registered to be included in the list to attend the workshops and near on impossible to get rebooked when I was unable to attend my planned workshop on the Saturday morning.</p> <p>I eventually got in by ringing and emailing a number of contacts at AT. Although as a result I was only able to access from around 10.20am</p> <p>My responses to the questions are below and in Red underneath the question asked.</p> <p>I thought that there was also going to be the possibility to go on line and review the comments etc posted both during and after the other Micro workshops.</p> <p>I thought this was like a shared drive type resource or space.</p> <p>I don't believe I got the link or password to do so .</p> <p>If there is a summary of that feedback as well that would be good to see and review.</p> <p>I pretty much stayed in the one primary workshop that I thought would be of most benefit to our organisation and the interest of our members.</p> <p>As a late starter in this consultation I am unsure of the work completed previously .</p>	

I can only presume that the broad draft problem statements we're significantly challenged and tested in the earlier parts of the process.

In other words... That the CAS data fully supports the problem statements with specific data regarding DSI's on Auckland roads.

Speed may be a factor in a number of DSI's but does the data specifically back this up. Were the drivers of the vehicles involved in the DSI incidents driving within the specified speed limit and appropriately to the existing conditions at the time?

(Do you have the summary analysis of this information from earlier consultation/ or workshops ?) Again if you do it would be good to get a copy of it.

Regards

Regional & Sector Advisor

W: www.transporting.nz

W: www.roadtosuccess.nz

Kia ora,

My apologies but you were not included in the emails sent out to remind our attendees to leave feedback. I was working from a previous version of the lists so this is my mistake.

Please see the email that was sent out to attendees below. If you have feedback to give, reply directly to me as soon as you are able, and I will ensure your feedback is included into the post workshop reports.

The survey asking for a brief comment on the process of the workshops is now closed. But these are the questions we asked, so please reply directly to me and your comments will be included.

	<p>Which Speed Management Plan Technical Workshop did you attend? Monday 30th May at 10:00 Hours</p> <p>What is the one key 'takeaway' you have from the workshop you attended? The projects and plans must find the balance between what is practical to achieve given the timeframes and mechanisms available currently. Many of the goals and targets are highly aspirational and would require a significant step change in behaviour of all road users to achieve the stated goals.</p> <p>Auckland Transport is trialling different ways to involve our stakeholders. Please share your views on these technical workshops, as a way to contribute feedback before the Draft Auckland Speed Management Plan is shared with Auckland.</p> <p>I think the concept of this on line option allows a higher degree of attendance and therefore involvement by key stakeholders. There seemed to be a genuine interest in peoples point of view despite their specific area of interest / expertise and I think everyone had the chance to be heard .</p> <p>Did you attend an online workshop? If "Yes", how did you find it? What suggestions do you have that might improve the experience? Yes as above Mon 30th May. Note my earlier feedback about trying to book on a later workshop when my plans changed at short notice on the Saturday I think as I was a late addition I believe I may have been left off some of the distribution lists if they were recirculated based on the original groups or attendees invited</p> <p>Do you have any other comments or observations? In principle we would generally support the lowering of speed limits outside of schools etc to lower the risk at the time that would be applicable on congested</p>	<p>Finding balance between what is practical to achieve, timeframes, mechanisms and behaviour change.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>parts of the corridor. I believe there is a very strong case to explore further - locations where vulnerable road users should be encouraged to use safer and more practical environments for them.</p> <p>There are significant space constraints and limitations on some corridors, and it is totally impractical to try and squeeze in Cycle lanes, especially where far more suitable environments are nearby or adjacent. In particular primary on dedicated freight and Passenger service vehicle / volume and usage is high. There needs to be clear correlation between DSI statistics and locations that clearly state the causative factors in the crashes and DSI's being recorded, particularly where this data is being relied upon to implement a revised (lower speed)</p> <p>The most significant factors contributing to Congestion and high emissions are due to private vehicle usage in the Greater Auckland region.</p> <p>Freight (In all of its forms) is a primary driver of Auckland's and indeed NZ's overall economy. Unfortunately there is more and more vehicles involved in delivering on the freight task, due to ever increasing amounts of small purchase, on line sales and small businesses delivering direct to consumers.</p> <p>Urban renewals require vehicles to deliver demolition vehicles and waste byproducts along with all of the supplies and materials to then complete the rebuild and urban intensification required .</p> <p>Micro mobility transport options and infrastructure needs to also be fit for purpose, so as to not cause other safety and congestions issues.</p> <p>Active shift mode focus in town centers are also areas where a high number of delivery vehicles are required to deliver products and services to office locations , Retail and Hospitality venues, therefore require priority access to complete those deliveries .</p> <p>The reality of relying too heavily on Survey data of the wider public is that the data is often peoples expression of what they feel they should do, not specifically what they will do in a real and practical sense.</p> <p>Auckland's continued Urban sprawl is not helping with the issues of congestion/ emissions etc .</p>	<p>Support for lowering limits outside schools</p> <p>Focus on locations used by more vulnerable road users.</p> <p>Consider space constraints for cycle lanes especially where freight and passenger service volume is high.</p> <p>Clear data / evidence needed.</p> <p>Impact of growing trend for more smaller service and trade related vehicles</p> <p>Micro mobility considerations</p> <p>Town center focus on active mode shift.</p> <p>Prioritise urban centre access to delivery vehicles.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Is there any data on how the Auckland Regional Fuel tax is going – How much has been collected and spent on the identified projects? Are they on time and on target for delivery and within budget? Any information regarding this would be helpful</p> <p>Would you be willing to be contacted to share your ideas? Yes that is fine</p> <p>Again, my apologies. I will process your feedback as soon as you send it to me.</p> <p>Ngā mihi Kind regards</p>	<p>Data must reflect real behaviour of drivers.</p> <p>Request for further information on Auckland Regional Fuel tax.</p>
--	--	---