

Auckland Transport & Auckland Council
Time of Use Charging programme

Insights report

December 2024

Time of Use Charging programme

Insights report

Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Methodology	5
3. What we heard – key themes	8
4. What we heard – by partner and stakeholder group	10

Appendices

- i. Local Board feedback resolutions
- ii. Houkura/Independent Maori Statutory Board position paper July 2024
- iii. Northern Infrastructure Forum Community Panel feedback
- iv. Auckland Transport/Auckland Council Community Panel feedback

Executive Summary

Auckland Transport (AT) and Auckland Council are working towards the development and implementation of a Time of Use Charging (ToUC) scheme to manage travel demand on Auckland's roads to improve performance of the road network. Congestion is a significant issue with real life consequences; impacting commuters, business, productivity, environment and overall quality of life. ToUC is an important tool to help ease excessive traffic congestion and improve reliability the wider transport network.

Central Government is currently advancing legislation to set a national policy framework for ToUC. Alongside that work, AT and Auckland Council are investigating what a scheme could look like in Auckland, to be prepared once legislation is enabled. This direction has come from Council's Transport, Resilience and Infrastructure Committee who endorsed the establishment of the ToUC programme in November 2023 and the programme's primary objective (to manage travel demand) in June 2024.

As a new concept with multiple public implications, it's imperative to engage partners, key stakeholders and the broader public on the rationale and merits of implementing a scheme. Throughout 2024, AT and Auckland Council have undertaken early engagement with partners, stakeholders and public to understand viewpoints and help inform policy design and scheme design.

The programme team met with 35 stakeholder groups including representation from business, advocacy and community. The team also engaged with iwi and 20 Local Boards. Engagement was carried out through briefings, workshops, reference groups, and presentations. Two bespoke Community Panels were also convened representing a cross-section of Auckland residents.

Stakeholders affirmed that congestion contributes to a range of issues that impact Aucklanders' quality of life. This included impacts to mobility, productivity, business and environment. All of which are rooted in lost time, and the side effects and frustration that comes with it.

Broad stakeholder support was shared on the concept of ToUC as a tool to help ease excessive traffic congestion. At the same time, it was acknowledged that it is not a full solution to the congestion problem and needs to be part of a set of interventions implemented by local and central government.

In relation to the development and implementation of a scheme, stakeholder feedback largely fell into four central themes:

1. Congestion is a significant issue for Aucklanders and requires intervention
2. Time of Use Charging is a reasonable idea if designed and implemented properly
3. Time of Use Charging implementation requires better public transport access and other alternatives
4. Considerations are required to address user affordability, dependent road users, and necessary behaviour change.

Advice was also given on the necessity to build social license for the programme, with an acknowledgement of challenges that come with a potential new road user fee, coupled with necessary behaviour change.

1. Introduction

1.1. Engagement process

The programme team met with 35 stakeholder groups including representation from business, peak bodies, advocacy groups and community. The team also engaged with 12 iwi and 20 Local Boards. Engagement was carried out through briefings, workshops, reference groups, and presentations. Two bespoke Community Panels were also convened representing a cross-section of Auckland residents.

1.2. Key findings

Stakeholders affirmed that congestion contributes to a range of issues that impact Aucklanders' quality of life. This included impacts to mobility, productivity, business and environment. All of which are rooted in lost time, and the side effects and frustration that comes with it.

Broad stakeholder support was shared on the concept of Time of Use Charging (ToUC) as a tool to help ease excessive traffic congestion. At the same time, it was acknowledged that ToUC was not a full solution to the problem and needs to be part of a set of interventions implemented by local and central government.

Stakeholders noted that a scheme's success will be dependent on how it is developed and implemented. They stressed a scheme needs to be easy to understand, user-friendly and laser-focused on easing congestion – not ancillary goals. With some advocating for a smaller and manageable scheme at the onset, as opposed to a large and complex solution.

A common theme centred on the belief that Auckland's current public transport system is insufficient to support the effective introduction of ToUC charging. ToUC requires an adaptation of travel choices, and many stakeholders feel ToUC should not be implemented until public transport is further expanded and improved.

Stakeholders expressed concern about unintended consequences of a scheme and stressed that considerations are required to address user affordability, car dependent road users, as well as overarching equity, economic, social and cultural factors.

Advice was also given on the necessity to build social license for the programme, with an acknowledgement of challenges that come with a potential new road user fee, coupled with necessary behaviour change.

2. Methodology

To advance early stakeholder engagement and insight gathering, the team utilised a range of activities and forums to reach partners and key stakeholders. Conversations were structural consistent, educating on the congestion issue, explaining how ToUC could serve as an important tool to address the issue, and discussing the programme's directive to shape a scheme that is effective, fair, simple and feasible.

The following forums were used to engage:

2.1. Local Boards

Local boards are a direct connection to our communities. To gain a better understanding their views, the programme team attended workshops to provide local board members with an in-depth introduction to the programme and an opportunity to ask questions reflective of their community's needs. Attendance at these workshops were supplemented by briefing memos and attendance at Local Board Chair forums.

Through business meetings, the programme has been able to obtain formal feedback based on workshop presentations. Questions provided to local boards for formal feedback focussed on gaining a better understanding of the benefits and disbenefits of a scheme in their community to help inform policy and scheme development.

Twenty of the local boards chose to participate (Aotea/Great Barrier Island opted out of the process), with workshops in August/September and business meetings in October.

2.2. AT mana whenua operational hui

AT is committed to meeting its responsibilities under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and our obligation to engage with mana whenua as Treaty partners to support Māori wellbeing, outcomes and expectations.

The programme has attended six operational hui during June, July and October as part of its ongoing engagement with mana whenua to gain an understanding of the benefits and disbenefits of a proposed scheme on Māori.

In addition, the programme has met with Houkura / Independent Maori Statutory Board to discuss the position paper (appended) and to ensure their views are being heard.

2.3. AT stakeholder forums

As a means to build and strengthen relationships with key stakeholders, AT hosts several regular forums to discuss issues. The programme team introduced and discussed ToUC to:

- Strategic Business Reference Group (23 July & 27 November)
- Freight Reference Group (18 June & 23 October)
- Public Transport Accessibility Group (18 September)

- Capital Project Accessibility Group (20 November)
- Stakeholder Reference Group

A dedicated Stakeholder Reference Group was established for the ToUC programme to support insights gathering during the planning phase. The forum allows for information sharing from the Programme on workstreams, and an opportunity to hear viewpoints from a diverse group of stakeholders reflective of the communities and interests they represent.

The group was created in September 2024 and meets monthly.

2.4. Community Panels

Designed and facilitated by the University of Auckland's Koi Tū: Centre for Informed Futures, two community panels have been undertaken. The process is based on the principles of deliberative democracy, which draws on the democratic ideals of rational debate among citizens to solve complex problems and reach sound decisions. Each session allowed participants the opportunity to learn about the issue, ask questions of experts and stakeholders, and listen to each other's perspectives.

Northern Infrastructure Forum (NIF) Community Panel

A community panel on ToUC was convened by NIF with support of the Auckland Council and AT to obtain informed community views on principles and criteria that should guide the development of the ToUC scheme. From an initial pool of 730 people who expressed interest using sortition tools, a descriptively representative sample of 30 was invited to the panel and completed the process. The panel met four times, twice in person (18 April and 11 May) and twice online (23 and 30 April).

Auckland Transport/Auckland Council Community Panel

A second community panel was convened to build and expand on the initial principles developed in the previous session.

AT and Koi Tū re-engaged the majority of the previous NIF panel, as well as a handful of new participants to do a deep dive into project principles. Twenty-six panellists examined issues focused on how to effectively design a scheme that is effective, fair and simple.

This included discussion on fairness and equity, and what mitigations might make a time-of-use charging scheme acceptable to the broader Auckland public.

The panel met three times, twice in person (22 October and 9 November) and once online (29 October)

2.5. All parties engaged

AT Mana Whenua hui

Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki
 Ngāti Manuhiri
 Ngāti Maru
 Ngāti Pāoa Iwi Trust
 Ngāti Tamaoho
 Ngāti Tamaterā
 Ngāti Te Ata Waiohū
 Ngāti Whanaunga
 Te Ākitai Waiohū
 Te Patukirikiri
 Te Uri o Hau
 Waikato-Tainui

Local Boards

Albert-Eden Local Board
 Devonport-Takapuna Local Board
 Franklin Local Board
 Henderson-Massey Local Board
 Hibiscus and Bays Local Board
 Howick Local Board
 Kaipātiki Local Board
 Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board
 Manurewa Local Board
 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board
 Ōrākei Local Board
 Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board
 Papakura Local Board
 Puketāpapa Local Board
 Rodney Local Board
 Upper Harbour Local Board
 Waiheke Local Board
 Waitākere Ranges Local Board
 Waitematā Local Board
 Whau Local Board

AT Strategic Business Reference Group

Auckland Chamber of Commerce
 Business East
 Business North
 Employers and Manufacturers Association
 Heart of the City
 Northern Infrastructure Forum
 Property Council NZ

AT Freight Reference Group

Auckland International Airport

Automobile Association
 Bonney & Sons
 Carr & Haslam Ltd
 Fire and Emergency NZ
 NZ Heavy Haulage Association
 KiwiRail
 Mainfreight
 National Road Carriers Association
 NZ Couriers
 Ports of Auckland
 Transporting NZ

AT Public Transport Accessibility Group & Capital Project Accessibility Group

Blind Citizens NZ
 CCS Disability Action
 Deaf and Hard of Hearing Foundation
 Deaf Aotearoa
 Disabled Persons Assembly
 Halberg Foundation
 Independent Living Services
 Kaipātiki Community Facilities Trust
 Spinal Support NZ

ToU Stakeholder Reference Group

Auckland Chamber of Commerce
 Auckland Regional Public Health Services
 Automobile Association
 Bus and Coach Association
 Disability Action
 Employers and Manufacturers Association
 Greater Auckland
 Heart of the City
 Infrastructure NZ
 National Road Carriers Association
 Newmarket Business Association
 NZ Heavy Haulage Association
 Property Council NZ
 Small Passenger Service Association

Other stakeholders

Houkura / Independent Māori Statutory Board
 Auckland International Airport
 Council of Trade Unions
 E Tū

3. What we heard – key themes

Stakeholder feedback largely fell into four central themes:

5. Congestion is a significant issue for Aucklanders and requires intervention
6. Time of Use charging is a reasonable idea if designed and implemented properly
7. Time of Use charging implementation requires better public transport access and other alternatives
8. Considerations are required to address user affordability, dependent road users, and necessary behaviour change.

3.1. Congestion requires intervention

- Broad consensus of congestion's impact on business, productivity, and quality of life.
- Sense that the problem is getting worse and will be exacerbated by population growth.
- Feeling that government needs to address the issue with a range of interventions, understanding there is not one easy fix.

3.2. ToUC is reasonable if design and implemented properly

- Scheme design and implementation of ToUC should be guided primarily by the aim to reduce congestion.
- The implementation of a scheme should be adaptable to changing and emerging circumstances.
- Any ToUC scheme should be easy to understand, use and administer.
- Concern expressed about unintended consequences of a scheme, including pushing traffic to local roads and development of 'rat-runs'.
- Need for strong coordination and collaboration amongst central and local government.
- Support for studying TCQ recommendations as a baseline, including city centre cordon and central isthmus strategic corridors.
- Consideration required to mitigate adverse cultural and social impacts.
- ToUC requires public acceptance and buy-in to succeed.

3.3. Better public transport and alternatives

- In order to maximise its benefits, ToUC must be well integrated into a broader transport network that makes it intuitive and easy to make travel choices that can replace car trips.
- Perception that Auckland's current public transport system is insufficient to support the introduction of ToUC, with high levels of transport poverty in south and west Auckland.
- Suggestion that ToUC should not be implemented until public transport expansion and improvements are made.
- Feedback that any revenue from ToUC should be reinvested into public and local transport improvements.
- Acknowledgement that the city centre is best equipped with public transport options.

3.4. User affordability, dependent road users & behaviour change

- When developing of a ToUC scheme, it is critical to think about the impact on users disproportionality affected by a scheme with considerations to mitigate impact.
- The recent and existing economic environment should be acknowledged with considerations on the ongoing affordability of a time of use scheme for middle- and lower-income commuters.
- Affordability considerations should also be extended to those who are dependent of using the road network as part of their vocation or business.
- Consideration needed for disabled population with no public transport alternatives.
- ToUC is not ‘plug and play’ and requires work to shift perceptions and uptake of alternative travel options.
- Overall, ToUC should not contribute to community severance or limit Aucklanders' mobility and opportunity.

4. What we heard – by partner and stakeholder group

4.1. Local boards

See Appendix i for resolutions

Early engagement with local boards started in June and continued through the year with workshops and business meetings.

While some local boards recognised the need to further address the region's congestion issues, all expressed concerns related to accessible transport choices, impacts on low-income communities and those who have no choice but to drive at peak times.

The most common theme across all local boards related to the provision of viable alternative transport options and reinvestment of revenue back into continued improvements to public transport, especially in those areas of Auckland that currently experience deprivation. Many local boards noted that public transport must be addressed before any time of use scheme is introduced, as many in their communities do not have the flexibility to change work hours or need to travel outside their area to access employment.

Local boards also noted that a charge could be burdensome on households, so considerations need to be made for lower socio-economic communities by further exploring exemptions and daily caps.

Safety impacts related to people choosing to 'rat run' or take alternative routes to avoid charges was also a common theme.

Local board feedback was sought on the scheme principles of effective, fair and simple, as well as mitigations and revenue allocation.

The complete set of local board feedback and resolutions on ToUC from September/October are in the appendix.

a. Effective: Improves network performance

- Time of use charging is a much-needed mechanism for users to contribute to the development of an efficient roading network and improved transport system, the increased productivity, health and well-being benefits that improved transport options and efficient roading networks deliver to communities.
- An effective scheme would have fewer people driving on the roads in favour for other forms of transport. It would also reduce total traffic and not displace it around residential streets.
- An effective scheme needs to have viable alternative transport options that are desirable for people to use before it is implemented, including available capacity.
- Mitigations must also be implemented with scheme design to prevent unintended consequences such as rat running from people wanting to avoid charging areas.
- An effective scheme would result in a reduction in congestion.

b. Fair: Minimises/mitigates adverse social impacts, ensures benefits and costs are fairly distributed across

- A fair scheme factors in low socio-economic communities where work patterns are less versatile, and individuals have less disposable income to meet the cost incurred from a charge.

- Fair and equitable approach needs to be taken to minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- Pricing needs to be fair and minimal – enough to dissuade those who might take public transport options, but not enough to burden travellers economically.
- A fair scheme lessens the impact on lower socio-economic areas where work patterns are less versatile, individuals have less disposable income to meet the cost and communities suffer from transport deprivation.
- First tranche of implementation should focus on commercial/freight as they can adjust travel times and manage the cost as a business expense.
- Consideration and protection of centrally located residents, ensuring they aren't disproportionately disadvantaged, especially moving within their own community.
- Consideration needs to be made for those people who have personal requirements that require the use of a private vehicle. Vocations that require tools or goods to be transported cannot use public transport.
- People who work or learn on a fixed schedule and don't have the flexibility to shift their start/end time to avoid congestion.
- Scheme should not unduly penalize people who are forced to travel to other parts of Auckland for employment when there is inadequate public transport.

c. Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity

- A simple scheme would be transparent in its nature so that people understand where their money is going and that there will be a positive benefit in the future.
- Implementation needs to have minimal impact on the built environment and supports flexibility e.g. use of GPS technology.
- Simple to use and not take extra time to operate.
- Road users are clearly notified so they know what to expect and what charges they may be paying.
- Clear signage.
- System needs to be simple and easy to understand – connect to an existing system or tool.
- Pricing needs to be set to one charge per trip as multiple charges based on zones would overcomplicate the process.
- A simple scheme would be one that is readily understood by its users and readily enables appropriate behaviour change as a result.

d. Feasible: Is able to be implemented

- For a scheme to be feasible the City Rail Link project needs to be completed before commencing time of use charging, noting that this alternative transport network will enable travel choice for many.
- A feasible scheme is one that does not generate widespread continuing opposition and is readily able to be implemented and enforced.
- Scheme must be a low-cost implementation.

e. Revenue allocation

- Revenue collected needs to be reinvested into Auckland's public transport, including making it more affordable, investing in infrastructure and developing public transport options where none currently exists.

- Public transport is the best solution for decreasing congestion on Auckland's roads. The revenue generated by any form of congestion charging should be invested back into the public transport system so that people have affordable and easy alternatives to taking cars.
- Transparency is needed on how revenue is spent locally and on other transport projects receiving the funding.
- Revenue should be allocated to transport projects in the local board area to be agreed with the local board.

f. Scheme design

- A scheme needs to take into consideration those communities who have little or no transport choices.
- A scheme should only start in areas of Auckland where transport options are more readily available, with a phased roll out into other areas in conjunction with increased public transport options to enable a smoother transition.
- A clear plan needs to be in place to ensure that traffic is not diverted off state highways and arterials impacting residential roads, around schools, which could impact on traffic flow and community safety.

g. Mitigations

- Introduction of in-bound charging and daily caps on charging.
- Considerations need to be taken for exemptions, rebates or discounts for vulnerable road users such as low-income families or people with disabilities who are unable to use public transport.
- A system that allows discounts or exemptions based on personal circumstances.
- Exemptions for communities who do not have a reliable public transport choices.
- Exemptions for 2-wheeled vehicles as they do not have a direct impact on congestion.
- Weekly pricing caps should be investigated alongside discounts for community service cardholders.
- More affordable public transport
- Fare cap for industries and workers who are likely to pass on the cost incurred through business.
- Inbound charging and a daily cap on charges.
- Enable social subsidies for vulnerable groups such as low-income or people with disabilities through a vehicle registration process.

h. Complimentary measures

- Public transport is inadequate and not a viable option due to long journey times, unreliability and high costs. A lack of employment opportunities and integrated public transport network has created a dependency on private motor vehicles.
- Transport links need to be considered between local areas to encourage mode shift.
- Alternative transport options for people who work in industrial areas of Auckland that are not currently serviced by public transport.
- Improvement in park and ride facilities and keeping these facilities free.
- Further investment in complementary measures that encourage walking and cycling such as developing our network of local paths to improve connectivity.
- Network optimisation.

- New transport links may need to be introduced ahead of a scheme being implemented to ensure people have alternative travel choices.
- Affordable and reliable public transport.
- There would be measurable improvements in water and air quality.

4.2. Houkura / Independent Māori Statutory Board *See Appendix ii for full report*

Houkura's board noted a position paper in July 2024 outlining key themes:

- Any scheme needs to be designed with high levels of engagement with Māori, recognising and being responsive to Māori issues of significance and transport priorities.
- Assessments and performance metrics must be established to assess impacts on Māori, with qualified and suitable consultants undertaking any assessments.
- Mitigation measures should be considered, particularly to enable mobility of low-income whanau and access to sites of significance.
- Improvements to public transport are required, particularly in the west and south.
- Additional funding for the LTP Māori Outcomes Fund should be considered, to be used for scheme mitigation and transition.

4.3. Mana whenua

Mana whenua recognised the congestion issue Tāmaki Makaurau suffers from and understood the need for additional interventions. However, concern was expressed by mana whenua regarding the reliability of public transport across Tāmaki Makaurau, especially noted in areas within South Auckland. Conveying that better alternatives need to be in place before a scheme is introduced.

In addition, mana whenua expressed concern regarding access to areas of significance to Māori. Any scheme needs to consider travel patterns of mana whenua and Māori populations. The same notion applied when discussing the division of communities due to charges being applied within certain boundaries or cordons.

Equity was a common theme raised across all hui, highlighting that some whanau are car dependent and a ToUC scheme is simply not financially viable. Cost of living issues need to be considered before a scheme is implemented.

Also consistent was the message that a scheme must focus on travel demand management and not revenue generation. However, any revenue collected should flow back into the region and be invested into improvements to the transport system. Pricing of a scheme needs to factor in a cost-of-living crisis and therefore needs to be as low as possible.

Mana whenua also showed concern with 'rat running' and that any scheme must not encourage this by shifting traffic onto quieter, local roads.

a. **Effective: Improves network performance**

- Scheme must be designed so it doesn't shift traffic onto local roads, especially quiet streets.
- Programme understands the disproportionate representation Māori have in road-related DSIs.

b. Fair: Minimises/mitigates adverse social impacts and ensures benefits and costs are fairly distributed across user

- Public transport has to be more reliable and affordable. Needs to be improved before a charge is introduced.
- Whānau are car dependent and cannot use other modes of transport – it's not financially viable.
- Scheme needs to consider low-income families who will be adversely affected.
- Cost of living issues need to be taken into consideration in order to make a scheme fair.
- Scheme needs to be implemented in areas that have good access to public transport.
- Scheme needs to consider access to place of importance to mana whenua and Māori.
- A fair scheme is not designed to gather revenue as its primary objective and is used for demand management instead.
- A fair scheme avoids community severance.
- Pricing of a fair scheme ensures it is charged as low as possible to make a difference to traffic congestion reduction.

c. Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity

- Integrates with other payment technologies and nationally consistent.
- The benefits of a scheme are well understood.

d. Feasible: Is able to be implemented

- A feasible scheme is not seen as revenue gathering.

e. Mitigations

- Consider subsidies for Māori communities.
- Interested in caps – daily or weekly

f. Complimentary measures

- Taking heavy vehicles off roads in peak hours.
- Look at ways to ensure cycleways are used.
- Improvements need to be made to existing transport infrastructure before a scheme is implemented.
- Promotion of active modes especially during school pick up/drop off times.

g. Revenue allocation

- Needs to flow back into Auckland's transport system, especially where the charges have been applied.
- Mana whenua should be part of the decision process.

4.4. Stakeholder Reference Group

Overall, the Stakeholder Reference Group are in support of a time of use charging scheme and could see its benefits as a tool to address the congestion issue. They were appreciative of the level of engagement they were receiving from the programme.

However, stakeholders in this group expressed a strong interest in local government's alignment with Government and NZTA and emphasised that a charging scheme must be a joined-up initiative. They were also interested on the impacts to the city centre and an ensuring it remains attractive, given its significance as an economic hub.

The group were keen to understand what considerations would be made for people required to cross regions, for example those who travel from Northland, through Auckland to Waikato.

The group noted a concern about the breadth of reasonable travel alternatives in Auckland, explicitly relating to inconsistent access to public transport across the region. Mention was made about understanding what active mode alternatives are available within chosen scheme areas.

4.5. Public Transport Accessibility Group (PTAG) & Capital Projects Accessibility Group (CPAG)

Similar to other stakeholder groups, PTAG recognises Auckland has a congestion issue that needs to be addressed.

Equity and fairness were common concerns shared by all members of these groups who together work with AT to achieve an accessible transport network where people of all ages and abilities can access transport choices and infrastructure that suit their needs.

Feedback centred around Total Mobility users, and the impact a charge would have on this service, especially if taxi and transport operators of this service pass on the cost. Noting this would increase personal costs for users, especially when they do not have access to alternative transport options. CPAG members recommended a consideration for Total Mobility users to be exempt from a scheme.

The group also requested that the programme keeps in mind that differently abled school children have no choice but to be transported to/from school by vehicle.

4.6. NIF Community Panel

See Appendix iii for full report

The deep-dive sessions featured a diverse set of 30 Aucklanders and was facilitated by Koi Tu: Centre for Informed Futures.

The programme focused on educating participants of the issue, and deliberating on two core questions – 1. What should be the objective of a ToUC scheme in Auckland? and 2. What principles should underpin the design of a ToUC scheme in Auckland?

Over the sessions the panel agreed that a time of use charging scheme's primary objective should focus on reducing congestion.

Seven key principles were also ratified, including:

1. The scheme needs to mitigate the impact on disadvantaged people through strategic use of discounts and exceptions to address inequity.
2. Development of viable and reliable transport options needs to be prioritised to provide an alternative to driving.

3. Revenue should be managed and administered by Auckland local government and ring-fenced for Auckland, to improve accessible transport options, including public transport.
4. Time of use pricing should be simple and transparent.
5. The initial size/boundary of the scheme should be big enough to make a network-wide impact but avoid being too complex.
6. The payment system must be user-friendly and reliable.
7. Communication of the scheme should be clear, transparent, and unbiased, and should focus on the objective of reducing congestion.

4.7. Auckland Transport/Auckland Council Community Panel

See Appendix iv for full report

Following a similar programme to the previous NIF sessions, the returning panel of Aucklanders expanded their focus on a scheme's objective and principles. Sessions were built around affirming recommendations to the question – How do we design a ToUC scheme for Auckland that is simple, effective and fair?

Much of the discussion centred on the necessary trade-offs to consider in order to achieve a workable balance amongst the varying objectives. The panel ratified a set of set of recommendations, including:

1. Exemptions or discounts should be applied on a very limited basis.
2. All revenue raised through time of use charging should be ring-fenced for the region in which the funds were raised.
3. Prices should not frequently fluctuate and should be communicated and signposted clearly.
4. The boundaries and times for charging should be limited to what is needed for meaningful reduction of congestion.
5. The payment method should be simple, accessible and easy to use.
6. The scheme should be a reviewed at regular intervals (minimum every 12 months) and be adapted to ensure that it is effective, and that pricing is fair.

Consultation must take place at key milestones, including statutory consultation and community consultation.

Appendix i

Local Board feedback resolutions



LOCAL BOARD SERVICES

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

Local board resolutions on Time of use charging

September - October 2024



Contents

Albert-Eden Local Board	3
Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board.....	4
Devonport-Takapuna Local Board	5
Franklin Local Board	9
Henderson-Massey Local Board	10
Hibiscus and Bays Local Board	11
Howick Local Board	15
Kaipātiki Local Board	17
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board	25
Manurewa Local Board	27
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board	28
Ōrākei Local Board	32
Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board	36
Papakura Local Board.....	40
Puketāpapa Local Board.....	45
Rodney Local Board	47
Upper Harbour Local Board	50
Waiheke Local Board	54
Waitākere Ranges Local Board	56
Waitematā Local Board	59
Whau Local Board	63

Albert-Eden Local Board

Resolution number [AE/2024/121](#)

MOVED by Chairperson K Smith, seconded by Member J Fowler:

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024.
- b) does not fully support Time of Use Charges due to insufficient information on local impacts and lack of reliable, regular and accessible Public Transport Auckland-wide and notes the potential substantial benefits of reducing congestion, for example increased productivity and air quality, decreased carbon emissions and reduced time wasted.
- c) request evidence-based data on the effects of Time of Use Charges on local areas before implementation.
- d) request consideration and protection of centrally-located residents, ensuring they aren't disproportionately disadvantaged, especially moving within their own community.
- e) request involvement of significantly impacted local boards in the Time of Use Charge process.
- f) request measures to prevent unintended consequences, like rat running in central suburbs, from Time of Use Charges, for example zones have 'soft' boundaries, if technically possible, so that short trips at the edge of a zone are not charged (similar to zone overlaps for public transport fare zones) and/or a cordon approach rather than charge only motorways or certain roads.
- g) request that if Time of Use Charges are supported, revenue be allocated on road infrastructure and public transport improvements.
- h) request consideration of financial impacts on lower socio-economic residents.
- i) thank Bruce Thomas – Auckland Transport Elected Member Relationship Partner, for his attendance.

CARRIED

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board

Resolution number [GBI/2024/128](#)

MOVED by Member P O'Shea, seconded by Chairperson I Fordham:

That the Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the following feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development
 - i) Do not support Time of Use charging on motorways at this time
 - ii) Support more investment in alternatives such as public transport.

CARRIED

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

Resolution number DT/2024/162

MOVED by Chairperson T van Tonder, seconded by Deputy Chairperson T Harpur:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the following tabled feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging Feedback Form

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

1. Lake Road / Esmonde Road: Inconsistent travel times, lack of alternative and reliable options. **PT doesn't go any faster than single occupancy motor vehicles. No network wide approach (ie. Cycle lanes offered on routes to schools, dedicated bus lanes, connecting services between ferry & bus)**

2. Esmonde Road Onramp: Very slow and can take an hour to get onto the motorway network at morning peak.

3. Northern Motorway Onramps at Northcote Road & Tristram Avenue: severe congestion experienced during am peak impacting surrounding areas.

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

1. Commuters | trying to get to places of work as quickly as possible and being held up.

2. Businesses | courier services, freight etc not delivering appropriately to businesses because of well-known congestion issues.

3. Public transport users where there are no dedicated bus lanes or an inadequate number and frequency of feeder services. Bus stops too distanced from households. Also a lack of suitable bus shelters & digital timetables.

4. Children & Young People | getting to school for children can be unsafe because of congestion.

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance

Devonport-Takapuna Local Board

5

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
 - What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
 - What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?
1. Has to make sense: need viable alternatives (is Auckland ready?). Alternative transport choices have to be more desirable, so that the choice to pay a toll is a choice and not foisted upon people.
 2. Concern for lower socio-economic areas where work patterns are less versatile and individuals have less disposable income to meet the cost.
 3. First tranche should be for commercial/freight vehicles only as they can adjust their times and manage the levy as a business expense. Measure impact before implementing charges on private vehicles.
 4. License plate recognition cameras should be installed on motorway onramps and the charge be deducted during peak hours only.

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

1. Don't target Lake Road as there are no alternative routes and this impacts households going about their daily lives. Stick to motorway onramps.
2. Take a phased approach with annual reviews to ensure the scheme is actually impactful and don't raise cost or extend the cordons without executing a transparent system that sets targets for new change. I.e. Consistent congestion burden target.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

1. Enable social subsidies for the above groups through a vehicle registration process.
2. Only execute congestion charging where there are appropriate PT alternatives. If there are **none, then don't do it.**

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). **The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.**
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

1. Apply your Room to Move strategy where it's required.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland's transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

1. Strongly feel that locally collected revenue should be allocated to transport projects in that local area, to be agreed with the Local Board.
2. Needs transparency on how revenue is spent locally and on other transport projects funded through local revenue collection.
3. Express concern regarding potential price creep – price increases have to be well justified and require a social license.

4. Want to see that the primary driver for this work is congestion reduction and not revenue generation. How do you establish a system that ensures this is the case?

Please remember, setting a congestion charge in areas means Local Boards are less able to set a targeted rate for transport improvements. This is why the revenue captured must be spent locally. **You'll be more successful securing a social license if this is the case.**

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

1. Upgrade of Lake Road.
2. Francis-Esmonde shared path.
3. Bayswater ferry terminal upgrade.
4. More regular feeder services.

Franklin Local Board

Resolution number FR/2024/176

MOVED by Chairperson A Fulljames, seconded by Deputy Chairperson A Cole:

That the Franklin Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the following feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024.
 - i) tautoko / support time of use charging as a much needed mechanism for users to contribute to the development of an efficient roading network and improved transport system, the increased productivity, health and well-being benefits that improved transport options and efficient roading networks deliver to communities.
 - ii) tuhi-ā-taipitopito / note that roads support the distribution of food from farm to market and building materials to site. The impact of any additional charges will have an impact on food and infrastructure development costs. This should be considered in terms of any concessions, particularly when considering future cost of living. The Franklin Local Board area supplies significant amounts of aggregate from quarries and food to market, and on that basis does not consider that time of use charging in the outer areas that accommodate freight (food and aggregate) movement would be appropriate.
 - iii) tautoko / support the use of revenues raised from time of use charges into public transport, particularly in terms of developing options where none currently exist. The board would recommend this also include fit for purpose ferry infrastructure at Pine Harbour to enable **increased ferry services (and development of the ‘blue highway’)** and accommodate the significant development in the south-east.
 - iv) tautoko / support the use of time of use revenue being used to accelerate the planned four-tracking of the southern rail corridor, noting that this will be needed to both offset freight on the roading network and to support efficient passenger rail services.
 - v) tono / request that any assumptions that might inform the approach, including the reinvestment approach, use current and accurate growth projections. This is particularly important to the south noting the recent unanticipated growth in Papakura and Franklin i.e. higher than previous projections.
 - vi) tautoko /support the approach whereby the City Rail Link project is completed before **commencing ‘Time of Use’ charging noting that this alternative transport network will enable choice for many.**
 - vii) tautoko /support the notion of an in-bound charging and a daily cap on charges.
 - viii) tautoko / support an implementation that has minimal impact on the built environment and supports flexibility eg use of GPS technology

CARRIED

Henderson-Massey Local Board

Resolution number [HM/2024/149](#)

MOVED by Member D Collins, seconded by Member B Loader:

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

- a) acknowledge the adverse social and economic impacts that congestion causes for people living in the Henderson-Massey rohe. A high proportion of people living in the Henderson-Massey area travel outside of the area to access employment and education opportunities. While some improvements have been made recently, public transport remains inadequate and not a viable option due to long journey times, unreliability and high cost. A lack of employment opportunities and integrated transport/public transport options has created a dependency on private motor vehicles for people living in West Auckland.
- b) although not specifically mentioned in material supplied to date, the Henderson-Massey Local Board does not support Time of Use Charging on State Highway 16 (SH16). Without efficient and reliable public transport options as an alternative, time of use charging will be a cost that is forced on commuters. However, the Henderson-Massey Local Board would consider supporting Time of Use Charging on SH16 once the City Rail Link (CRL) and Northwestern Rapid Transit programmes have been completed and are operational.
- c) recommend a city cordon model like that in London is used for time of use charging.
- d) **tuhi ā-taipitopito** / note its concern that an entry/exit model like that used in Stockholm would likely disadvantage people living in outlying areas (such as Henderson-Massey), that are:
- e) typically experiencing higher levels of population growth
- f) often lower socio-economic communities.
- g) **tuhi ā-taipitopito** / note its concern that fee evasion could lead to increased congestion on local residential streets and arterial roads.
- h) recommend that if implemented, revenue collected from Time of Use Charging be ringfenced to improving transport efficiency and accessibility across a range of transport initiatives in areas of greatest need e.g. West Auckland. (Source: Auckland Transport Future Connect data).
- i) **tono** / request that the social and environmental impact reports that are referenced in The Congestion Question study (second phase), and any other relevant data pertaining to, be shared publicly.
- j) recommend that consideration be given to exemptions, rebates or discounts for vulnerable road users e.g. low-income families, people with disabilities that may prevent them from using public transport, school excursions etc.
- k) recommend that Time of Use Charging if implemented, should cover its own capital and ongoing operational costs.
- l) **tuhi ā-taipitopito** / note that while the Henderson-Massey Local Board is committed to encouraging mode shift and emissions reduction, this is not supported by current central government policy, with cuts to important transport funding, including budgets for local buses and cycleways.

CARRIED

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

Resolution number HB/2024/138

MOVED by Member J Law, seconded by Member G Walden:

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide local board feedback on the attached feedback and insights form on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging Feedback Form

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

Serious congestion is experienced along Whangaparaoa Road and Hibiscus Coast Highway around Silverdale. This is caused by the peninsula only having one arterial route access.

The impacts caused by this congestion are economic and productivity harms, caused by business transport delays, and commuter delays. This congestion also causes increased emissions caused by cars idling.

There is also a risk that people would not choose to travel to our business centres or tourist destinations due to experiencing lengthy delays in travel, which also has flow on economic harm effects.

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

Commuters, students, and travellers are all impacted by congestion. It impacts people trying to get to work, school, and visit Auckland's beautiful places.

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

We would expect an effective scheme to be easy to understand, simple to use, and not take extra time to operate.

We would expect pricing to be fair and minimal. (enough to dissuade those who might take public transport options, but not enough to burden travellers economically)

We would expect the scheme to be implemented at a low cost.

We would expect the scheme to be clearly notified so that all road users know what to expect and what charges they may be paying (issues with lack of clear signage - this has caused frustration in Queen Street due to small or unnoticeable signs)

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

Our residents have experienced lack of efficient and reliable public transport options, and have been impacted by changing bus schedules, ferry cancellations, and bus driver shortages which significantly affected the East Coast Bays subdivision.

If implementing time of use charging, Auckland council must consider that there are viable alternatives. If public transport schedules are cancelled or unreliable, it is not fair that commuters should be paying for using private cars to travel to work and school.

We believe that gold card holders, students, and people on government support should be receiving a heavy discount or should be exempt from ToUC.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

Have a system that allows for ToUC discounts, or exemptions based on personal circumstances.

Provide free or discounted public transport for those with disabilities or receiving government support. This should also be considered for young people and students.

Rural commuters with no viable public transport alternatives should be exempt.

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). **The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.**
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

Improving parking availability at park and rides, and keeping park and rides free.

Our Local Board areas are not likely to have ToUC implemented so no recommended road layout changes.

Ensuring that public transport schedules are operating regardless of bus driver shortages, illness, or mechanical failure, by having better contingency and replacement plans.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland’s transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

We believe that revenue should be reinvested fairly into the areas that commuters and those

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

paying ToUC come from.

Recommend Auckland Transport identify the main areas commuters paying ToUC travel from so that revenue can be reinvested in those specific areas.

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

Improving bus schedules and reliability.

Extending the northern busway to Silverdale.

Developing a well designed and user friendly bus turnaround and station at the Whangaparaoa end of O Mahurangi Penlink.

Investing in future resilient public transport options with a focus on Auckland's needed light rail network.

Howick Local Board

Resolution number [HW/2024/190](#)

MOVED by Chairperson D Light, seconded by Member P Young:

That the Howick Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August 2024.
 - i) in regard to the impacts of congestion, the Board:
 - A) provide the following as examples of the most serious impacts of congestion felt in our local board area:
 - 1) loss of time or unreliable transit times.
 - 2) road rage / frustration with other drivers.
 - 3) extra emissions / air pollution due to cars running and not moving far.
 - 4) general costs increase due to the extra driver time cost and fuel costs.
 - B) provide the following as examples of residents most impacted by congestion:
 - 1) people who have no or limited transport choice, such as those living rurally or with jobs/family arrangements that require the use of private vehicle. Vocations that require tools or goods to be transported cannot take public transport.
 - 2) **people who work/learn on a fixed schedule and don't have the flexibility to shift their start/end time to avoid congestion.**
 - 3) everyone due to extra costs and restricted services and inefficiencies for mobile services such as white ware device repair, goods transport.
 - ii) in regard to core principles, the Board:
 - A) provide the following key elements that we would expect to see in a simple scheme:
 - 1) measurable improvement that achieves the outcomes of reducing congestion – if it just collects revenue with no positive impact on **congestion, it's not working.**
 - 2) **transparency of information regarding it's negative and positive impacts** to ensure the public has confidence in the scheme.
 - 3) implementation must be in areas where there are practical, reliable transport alternatives – do not punish people where there is no alternative.
 - 4) system must be simple and easy to understand – connecting it to an existing system/tool like AT Park would help with ease of use.

- 5) **system must be reviewed to confirm if it's working as intended**, acknowledging the initial change impact and seasonal shifts in traffic demand.
 - 6) public transport travel times must be predictable and pick up times in an accurate timetable.
 - 7) public transport must be affordable and time efficient compared to private vehicle use, (including parking) or the public will be less likely to adopt.
 - 8) sufficient capacity and good locations for Park and ride facilities so those with poor public transport options where they live can access public transport in an efficient way.
- iii) in regard to addressing the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups, the Board:
 - A) note that, without complicating the scheme, groups with no transport choice may **need exemptions so they're not unfairly punished**.
- iv) in regard to complementary measures that could be suitable to put in place, the Board:
 - A) support the idea of charging for park and ride that is then offset by public transport charges, (such as including in \$50 weekly cap), discouraging people using them as general parking.
- v) in regard to revenue, the Board:
 - A) **provide the following feedback on which parts of Auckland's transport network net revenue should be applied to:**
 - 1) improving public transport, especially reliability and frequency.
 - 2) providing safer and efficient alternative routes for independent small transport options such as e-scooters and e-bikes.

CARRIED

Kaipātiki Local Board

Resolution number KT/2024/214

MOVED by Member P Gillon, seconded by Member M Kenrick:

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the tabled feedback on the development of Time of Use Charging policy, noting that the feedback may be included in advice to the Auckland Council Transport, Resilience and Infrastructure Committee (TRIC) in late 2024 or early 2025, and may also be included in the Auckland Council Group submission to Select Committee.
- b) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that the local board will have a further opportunity to provide feedback on Time of Use Charging following public consultation in 2025.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging Local Board Feedback form – September 2024

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

Within the Kaipātiki Local Board area we are geographically impacted by having a large coastal border on our Eastern boundary and the Northern Motorway on the Eastern boundary. This results in traffic heading north and south being funnelled into three motorway onramps which tend to get congested.

We are concerned about the impact of community severance as we share communities of interest with Devonport Takapuna as well as Upper Harbour. In many cases we have students travelling between local board areas for school and also people are travelling for work across the North Shore. **We are also concerned about severance from Kaipātiki Local Board residents from access to North Shore Hospital.** We consider journeys across the North Shore to be local journeys and people should not be charged for these.

While we are aware of large amounts of congestion on and surrounding Onewa Road, backed up from the Southbound motorway onramp, local board members are unsure of the destination of all of the **traffic. It's also important to note that Onewa Road contains three schools** along the route along with a number of Early Learning Centres. Many journeys using Onewa Road are local journeys and we would be concerned with residents being adversely affected by a congestion charge along this route as for many this is a **local connector road. Kaipātiki Local Board members have repeatedly** requested comprehensive information on the destinations of people in single occupancy vehicles. Anecdotally we are aware of many people travelling to destinations other than the CBD however comprehensive research is lacking.

Kaipātiki Local Board members also feel that there is a lack of information regarding other congestion points within the Local Board area.

We have the following questions:

1. What are the main causes behind the congestion points within the Kaipātiki Local Board area according to Auckland Transport data?
2. What are the destinations of the cars using the single occupancy lane on Onewa Road during peak times?

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

The Kaipātiki Local Board believes that congestion disproportionately impacts low and middle income earners in Auckland. These are people who due to their type of employment or power imbalances within their employment have no say over start and finish times and are generally unable to work from home. Often they are unable to have much choice over where they work due to high levels of unemployment and the need to take employment where possible without being able to choose the location of that employment.

We are concerned that the proposed policy assumes that the majority of workers are in a position to negotiate earlier or later working hours in order to avoid the time of use charge and reduce congestion at peak times. However, many low- and middle-income earners are in employment situations where they cannot negotiate their hours due to needing to be at work at a certain time. Examples include, but are not limited to teachers, nurses, carers, retail workers, hospitality workers and construction workers. There are not only forces outside of their control (for example, school start times for teachers, and business operating hours for retail workers) but power imbalances within the workforce that do not allow flexibility, for example young people just starting out in their careers.

There is also an assumption that people can work from home when that is virtually impossible in many industries, for example manufacturing, construction, engineering, mechanics etc. There are also issues where parents need to drop small children off at daycare or school and may be unable to use public transport or active modes of transport for this (due to distance, locations of bus stops, mobility issues and / or needing to get to work soon after).

Conversely it is highly likely that those who are able to adjust their travel times or able to work from home are also the people who are more likely to be able to afford to pay a charge. It is not clear whether this policy will have the impact intended. We have the following questions:

1. What research has been undertaken amongst city workers to ascertain how many will change their travel behaviour as a result of this proposed policy?
2. What research has been undertaken with businesses based in the CBD to understand how many companies will absorb the cost of the time of use charge?
3. What policies have been implemented in the CBD to encourage businesses and large organisations such as our Universities to reduce commuting by private car?
4. What are the main reasons why businesses continue to have private car parks?

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

An effective scheme would result in a reduction in congestion.

There would be viable public transport options for Kaipātiki residents who work within the wider Auckland area.

There would be measurable improvements in water and air quality.

An effective scheme would redistribute any funds raised into providing public transport alternatives so that people do not need to drive their cars. We are advocating that any revenue raised should be directed towards public transport options. Local Boards should have decision-making abilities to determine the use of funds raised in their areas. Funds may also be allocated to mobility investments, such as cycle paths and pedestrian improvements.

Kaipātiki Local Board members would like to know:

1. What is the projected revenue raised through the implementation of this policy?
2. Will Local Boards have a say in how the funding is used and what public transport options will be improved?

A fair scheme would look to minimise the impact on people who have to take their car when there are no public transport alternatives nor would it penalise people who have no choice but to work at the set times they are given (i.e. they cannot work from home or negotiate start and end times):

What are the proposals for improving public transport options? Are they costed and would the projected revenue from this policy cover those costs?

1. Will Auckland Transport undertake more research into car destinations in order to implement targeted public transport to reduce congestion and provide alternatives to private vehicle use?
2. Will Auckland Transport consider implementing more direct suburb to suburb bus services to minimise the need for transfers and to save time? i.e. move away from a complete reliance on the 'spoke and wheel' model.
3. Is AT looking at providing Congestion charging exemptions to residents living on strategic corridors, motorbikes, beneficiaries or low-income workers?

A simple scheme would be transparent in its nature so that people understand where their money is going and that there will be a positive benefit in the future. It would also not try to catch people out by changing the times or locations in which the charge was implemented on a frequent basis. We are **concerned that the maps used in the presentation show congestion within the Kaipātiki Local Board area, particularly along routes used to get kids to school.** It also shows many suburban roads that are not affected by congestion but which local residents would presumably have to pay to travel along during congestion charging times.

We still have questions about this as it does not reflect a simple scheme:

Where will the time of use charge be implemented? Will it only be on motorways or will it also be implemented in suburbs or feeder roads (as shown in the maps in presentations to local boards)?

1. How will the public know whether a road is covered by the charge or not?
2. Will the time of use charge change throughout the day?
3. Will there be a tiered charge depending on the level of congestion?
4. Will the time of use charge be the same times and locations each day?
5. Will there be congestion charging on the weekends and public holidays?
6. If there is no congestion on a particular day will people still need to pay?

The Kaipātiki Local Board understands that 11,412 infringements were issued to vehicles travelling through the T3 enforcement zones along Onewa Road associated with the offence ‘Unauthorised use of a Special Vehicle Lane’ in the year from May 2022 – June 2023. This is with 99.2% compliance with the T3 lane rules.

Unfortunately, even with nearly 100% compliance some people are still caught out. As such we are concerned about the financial impact on local residents who are confused by the proposed rules for the Time of Use Charge or make an honest mistake, despite attempting to be compliant. We are concerned that some people, who may not be able to afford the corresponding fine from not paying a time of use charge, could end up facing court action and as such the affordability issue could spiral out of control. Please **refer to our point 4 under section 3 ‘What we’ve heard from you’.**

3. What we’ve heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

1. Outer suburb to outer suburb travel is extremely difficult via public transport with limited direct routes and limited times for traveling. Public transport options need to be substantially increased in order for time of use charging to work.
2. **Under the new Auckland Council 'fairer funding' formula Kaipātiki Local Board has a 15% deprivation index however, this doesn't demonstrate the large number of 'working poor' who have been affected by rising mortgage interest rates, increasing rents, increases in cost of living such as food and electricity prices, and the large number of redundancies that have taken place over the past few years. Adding a time of use charge will have a negative impact on a number of individuals and families. There are individuals and families struggling to get by who wouldn't necessarily qualify for special assistance, for example through having a community services card. Adding an extra cost to our locals in order for them to get to work or take kids to school could have a wider detrimental impact. Therefore, charging should only be implemented when there are viable and affordable alternatives.**
3. Many low and middle income workers cannot afford to live close to their area of employment and must travel across Auckland. For example, many healthcare workers travel from South and West Auckland to jobs in North and East Auckland. If Time of Use Charging is in effect, people will effectively be financially punished for not being able to live in more affluent suburb.
4. We have seen through the policy of issuing fines for incorrect use of bus lanes and transit lanes, that many people are being financially penalised for driving in the wrong lane, sometimes by mistake. In some cases these fines are being followed up by bailiffs and expensive court actions (there have been cases reported in the media, see below). Individuals who find themselves unable to afford the Time of Use Charge, and are unable to change their work times, may find themselves in situations where bailiffs are knocking at the door due to this policy. If bus lane times and signage are confusing for some drivers then Time of Use Charges could be even more so. Some examples of people finding current fines (and current rules) unfair are below:
 - a. <https://www.stuff.co.nz/nz-news/350388123/auckland-music-buff-battling-over-bus-lane-fines>
 - b. <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/auckland-transport-collects-56m-fines-from-queen-st-car-ban-in-16-months/BDC6AY5KMVDS7CAT7II7ANT6Z4/>
 - c. <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2022/04/auckland-s-newmarket-bus-lane-cameras-dishing-out-massive-12-000-in-fines-each-day.html>
 - d. <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/auckland-transport-backtracks-on-k-rd-bus-lanes-operating-hours-will-be-cut-back/FJXXHVT6EZA7BACUVIMPZ3PZFY/>
 - e. <https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/aa-hits-out-at-high-number-of-bus-lane-tickets-doled-out-to-auckland-motorists/JGTLAWQWQR6VBFDLPEX57J2N6M/?ref=readmore>

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

1. Research where people are travelling to and then implement public transport solutions so people don't need to drive;
2. Consider charging businesses for where their employees are coming from rather than the employee/person driving the car;
3. Implement solutions to ensure that public transport is as safe as possible for passengers.

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around the charged areas). The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of "rat running".
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

Park and Ride facilities should be investigated within the Kaipātiki Local Board area. Previously there had been plans to have such a facility in Birkenhead, as part of a large proposed development there. While that development may no longer be going ahead there could be other areas within the local board area which would be suitable for such a facility.

Additionally further investment and support should be provided for walking school buses to encourage more children to walk to school.

Safety of passengers is an issue that has been raised with Kaipātiki Local Board members. This particularly relates to two demographics: women and young people. We have heard that women feel unsafe transferring buses, particularly at night. While there is supposed to be smooth transitions between buses sometimes there are delays which result in women waiting at bus stops at night with other passengers who they feel unsafe around. This was raised in particular when the direct late night bus routes from the city to Birkenhead and Beach Haven were stopped and instead passengers now have to transfer at Akoranga Station.

We are also particularly concerned about the increase in incidents where young people are being attacked on buses or while waiting at bus stops. This has resulted in parents not wanting their children to take public transport and has meant that parents are driving young people to school or to after school employment and activities.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland's transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

While the report suggests that the Time of Use Charge policy development is not being driven by revenue generation, public transport mode shift or public health through emissions reduction, we believe that these should be considered as drivers of transport policies such as this, and that congestion may decrease as a result:

1. Revenue generation should be used purely to invest into public transport solutions such as direct bus routes across the city at peak times. We are concerned that the revenue generated - while not the sole focus of this policy - is a definite by-product, and will merely be absorbed by AT **bureaucracy with no discernible public benefit. This has happened in the Kaipātiki Local Board area where the T3 lane on Onewa Road (for example) is collecting over \$1million per annum from Kaipātiki residents, yet that investment is not going directly back into the local community.**
2. Public transport is the best solution for decreasing congestion on our roads. Public transport across the city is woefully inadequate with many people being forced to take their cars as, anecdotally, in some cases it takes three times longer to catch public transport than it does to drive. Without a massive investment in public transport in Auckland congestion will continue to increase. The revenue generated by any form of time of use or congestion charge should be invested back into our public transport system so that people have affordable and easy alternatives to taking their cars.
3. Emissions reduction should absolutely be a priority for our city. We are sceptical that there will be any real reduction in emissions resulting from this policy as car travel will continue for those with no alternatives or be forced to other times of the day rather than stopped. People who need to get to work will continue to drive and either pay the charge or change the time when they are driving. Without any corresponding investment in public transport this is highly unlikely to have any meaningful impact on emissions. People will still be reliant on private vehicle use as a main mode of transport.

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

We believe that Local Boards should have a say over revenue generated by their communities. Each local board area would have different priorities, initiatives or projects which would help to reduce

congestion and therefore a tailored approach is necessary. For example, some of the initiatives the Kaipātiki Local Board may consider include:

- Increasing bus frequency;
- Implementing new bus routes and destinations;
- Subsidising public transport fares;
- Increasing ferry frequencies;
- Creating new walkway and cycleway routes;
- Improving the safety of street-to-street walkways;
- Improving bus stop shelters; and
- Improving safety around bus stops and on public transport.

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board

Resolution number MO/2024/143

MOVED by Chairperson N Bakulich, seconded by Member C O'Brien:

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024
- b) acknowledge the time-of-use charging offers benefits in reducing congestion and funding transport improvements however, attention to equity, public transport availability, fare affordability, and clear communication will be key to its success
- c) **tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that the local community's views will inform the local board's final** feedback, which will be reserved until the formal engagement results are released in 2025. Provide feedback to help local engagement achieve success and highlight its initial views to the time-in-use charging proposal
- d) whakarite / provide the following requests to help local engagement achieve success and highlight its initial views to the time-in-use charging proposal.

Engagement

- i) the importance of ensuring that communication is simple, clear, and not too wordy, to make information accessible to the public is supported. To add further value is that the time-of-use charging is promoted and communicated using familiar platforms and local networks, to assist feedback this includes, translated messages into local languages
- ii) actively engage with local communities, including schools, businesses (like Auckland Airport staff and Māngere Bridge residents), and community groups to reach those most affected by the policy. By engaging directly with schools, businesses, and community groups, outreach efforts can focus on those who are most impacted by the policy, ensuring their voices are heard
- iii) request that appropriate budget is allocated for engagement, as this requires time, staff and resources which can be costly. As the local board fear that despite efforts, some groups may still be missed, especially if the outreach doesn't account for all demographics or harder-to-reach populations.

Initial Feedback

- i) **the median personal income in Māngere-Ōtāhuhu is still significantly below the national median (2023 Census).** The local board area consists of people on lower incomes, and are disproportionately affected to any applied fiscal pressure by local or central government policies, such as time-of-use charging, worsening household budgets
- ii) advocate to the transport authorities to improve local public transport. Locals may have no choice but to pay the charge, making it unfair for those who depend on private vehicles to travel to work or perform caregiving duties
- iii) note the airport is a significant freight hub, and any delays or additional costs on these routes could increase the cost of goods and services. These additional costs will trickle down to consumers

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- iv) note that drivers may attempt to find alternative routes around charged areas, potentially **leading to congestion on secondary roads leading to or from the airport, and the Māngere Bridge area**. This will be problematic for residents and frequent users of local eateries, especially during peak travel times for flights compounded by morning and afternoon peak hour traffic
- v) the New Manawa Bay airport shopping complex has compounded the congestion in this area. The local board request mitigation on how this programme may reduce this issue i.e. encourage Off-Peak travel, by offering lower or no charges during off-peak periods; another resolution is for a bus service, stopping outside Manawa Bay
- vi) support revenue generated from this programme to be directed towards the following objectives:
 - A) local safety programmes like road safety education, Bike Safety Education for Kids, to fill the transport budget gap due to cuts in government funding. Auckland expected to receive \$25 million for road safety programmes and only received 44% of that budget with a \$12 million gap. Noting that the alternative in funding this gap, is the unpopular rates increases
 - B) reducing environmental risks
 - C) subsidising public transport use, and a free bus service, around our town centres
 - D) and incentivise non-motorised modes of transport.

This ensures a fairer system that benefits both the community and the environment.

CARRIED

Manurewa Local Board

Resolution number [MR/2024/160](#)

MOVED by Chairperson M Winiata, seconded by Member A Cunningham-Marino:

That the Manurewa Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the following feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024
 - i) the rollout of this scheme should start in the central areas of Auckland where public transport is more readily available, and then slowly roll out to other areas in conjunction with increased public transport options, to enable a smoother transition
 - ii) note there is a concern about the affordability and the financial impacts on residents, given high levels of deprivation and that many residents travel outside the area for work and university
 - iii) note there needs to be a clear plan in place to ensure that traffic is not diverted off state highways, impacting residential roads, in particular around schools, which could impact on traffic flow and community safety
 - iv) request assurance is provided to public transport users that the reliability and efficiency of public transport services will be maintained and there is increased frequency and expanded services to ensure there are greater public transport options
 - v) note there will be a need to ensure public transport services can handle the increased demand. This will require looking at what the introduction of charge means for the number of users of public transport
 - vi) request that there is only one charge per trip as creating multiple charges based on zones would be overcomplicating this process
 - vii) support the revenue from the charge to be reinvested into public transport
 - viii) request mandatory consultation with local boards throughout the ongoing development and implementation of this policy, given that local context will be vital to ensuring the roll out of this proposal is as successful and undisruptive as possible, if implemented
 - ix) note that further local board feedback on the proposal will be provided in 2025 following public consultation.

CARRIED

Maungakiekie-**Tāmaki** Local Board

Resolution number MT/2024/170

MOVED by Chairperson M Meredith, seconded by Member T Woodcock:

That the Maungakiekie-**Tāmaki Local Board:**

- a) whakarite / provide the attached feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging Local Board Feedback form – September 2024

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

Penrose and Mt Wellington are large industrial areas, where congestion is already impacting businesses and residents in this area, in particular:

- Mount Wellington Highway – on/off ramps to SH1
- Neilson St – on/off ramps to SH20

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

- Residents who live on side streets that are used for rat running instead of the congested main routes
- Households who may have one car for multiple trips throughout a given day

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?
- Effective public transport links will be required to provide alternative transport methods when congestion charging comes into effect, noting:
 - Transport routes may need to be introduced / reinstated ahead of time to meet the need
 - If we want people to consider mode shift, transport links are needed between local town centres and key locations such as community centres and large employment locations (not just to and from the city)
- Public transport safety for young people
- Two wheeled vehicles should be exempt from the scheme as they do not have a direct impact on congestion.

All road users, heavy freight and transport companies

- Time cost
- Lost opportunity
- Anyone who's ordering goods that may be affected by freight costs and transit times

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

- Transport routes may need to be introduced / reinstated ahead of time to meet the need, connecting:
 - neighbourhood roads with main transport stations such as
 - Onehunga and Oranga to Penrose Train Station
 - Riverside to Sylvia Park Interchange
 - Industrial areas like Penrose and Mt Wellington to create alternative transport options for workers

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- Retaining the current park and ride facilities and investigate these being paid:
 - Panmure
 - Glen Innes
 - Onehunga
 - Pakuranga / Llyod Elsmore
- Establishing new paid park and rides at Penrose train station to enable Onehunga commuters to easily access
- Safer access to Glen Innes Train Station

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

- Any area not covered by a regular public transport system should not be included in this scheme due to having no alternative transport option.
- The disability community that utilise vehicles to commute should also be exempt from the proposed scheme
- Discounts for Community Service Card holders
- Investigate a weekly cap for congestion charging

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

- Transport routes may need to be introduced / reinstated ahead of time to meet the need, connecting:
 - neighbourhood roads with main transport stations such as
 - Onehunga and Oranga to Penrose Train Station

- Riverside to Sylvia Park Interchange
 - Industrial areas like Penrose and Mt Wellington to create alternative transport options for workers
- Retaining the current park and ride facilities and investigate these being paid:
 - Panmure
 - Glen Innes
 - Onehunga
 - Pakuranga / Llyod Elsmore
- Establishing new paid park and rides at Penrose train station to enable Onehunga commuters to easily access
- Safer access to Glen Innes Train Station
- From experience, creating dead end roads is not the best solution and any interventions must not have impact on residential and commercial property access & emergency vehicles

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland's transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

- Paid park and rides
- Residential parking permits
- Charging for car users with single passengers to pay to use High Occupancy Vehicles lanes
- Fixed camera speeding ticket revenue to be council collected

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

- Public transport routes
- Infrastructure upgrades for train stations, level crossings and park and rides etc.
 - Penrose station
 - GI underpass
- Free public transport for under 16-year-olds, encouraging mode shift from a young age

Ōrākei Local Board

Resolution number OR/2024/134

MOVED by Member T Churton, seconded by Member M Voyce:

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

- a) provide the tabled feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging feedback
October 2024

Ōrākei Local Board (OLB) feedback

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

OLB believe the most serious impacts occur when the local board area is used as a conduit to other parts of Auckland. For example, Shore Road is used to access the central city, Parnell and motorway on-ramps to the North Shore.

Ngāpipi/Kepa/St Johns Road is a freight route from the port to industrial areas around Glenn Innes and Penrose. Greenlane is one of the main access points to the motorway system for our area which is becoming heavily congested. School traffic also accounts for congestion, particularly around the morning drop off.

Consider charging ports of Auckland Trucks that use the Kepa Road corridor. This could be done electronically.

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

The people most affected by congestion are localised communities who suffer the nuisances from congestion which, in turn are exacerbated by the absence of affordable or incentivised use of public transport. People living on outer perimeters of the city who need to travel to the centre for work should be incentivised to not congest road networks by having more subsidised public transport opportunities.

Services and delivery of goods across Auckland are also impacted.

OLB think the motorways are the most heavily congested, including access points, the most notable being around the harbour bridge.

A second harbour crossing, which includes dedicated bus lanes, walking/cycling options is needed to cope with congestion.

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

The links between City & Airport need to be vastly improved. Ideally, it should be quick, seamless, and cost effective to get to and from to domestic/international.

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

Elements could include subsidies for public transport, increasing the frequency and routes for public transport, free Park and Ride options (or an increase in the options for feeder routes). Using technology to create a more adaptable/flexible public transport option.

In other words, OLB do not believe time of use charging can happen in isolation, it must be coordinated with other options on the transport network.

Better public information on track maintenance. Rail links are only good if they are reliable and work. Council should monitor, and penalise non-performance (should apply to major AT bus routes too)

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

We should look at developing our network of local paths to improve walking/cycling options, improve the quality and connectivity of safe cycling and give kids and parents options to get to and from school safely

For example, a walking/cycling link through Colin Maiden Park, the north/south connection to Te Ara ki Uta ki Tai as it travels through Pourewa Valley via Gowing Drive.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

The impacts are difficult to assess, as there are a broad range of issues, as, for example, public transport alternatives are almost non-existent in rural areas.

Subsidies would be a good start, along with trailing options of smaller buses with the **technological capability to be more adaptable to people's needs.**

Recognise that not everyone is able bodied. The cross-city travel (link buses) are very successful. Suggest an extension to them from suburbs like Stonefields to Glen Innes station. Compact vans are reliable and could be a cost-effective system.

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). **The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.**
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

We should look at developing our network of local paths to improve walking/cycling options, improve the quality and connectivity of safe cycling and give kids and parents options to get to and from school safely.

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

For example, a walking/cycling link through Colin Maiden Park, the north/south connection to Te Ara ki Uta ki Tai as it travels through Pourewa Valley via Gowing Drive.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland’s transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?
Public transport, walking/cycling options, a new harbour crossing.
What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?
North/south connection to Te Ara ki Uta ki Tai as it travels through Pourewa Valley via Gowing drive. This will create a safe connection across the valley for access to schools.

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

Resolution number OP/2024/155

MOVED by Chairperson AR Autagavaia, seconded by Deputy Chairperson V Hausia:

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, as set out in Attachment A, tabled at the meeting.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging feedback September 2024

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The overarching adverse impacts of congestion are economic costs, environmental and social.• A combination of direct and indirect impacts are experienced by local communities of Ōtara-Papatoetoe, majority of who are living on low income and conditions of vulnerability.• People in the area are reliant on private vehicles to for day-to-day needs, employment, or health and community services.• About 68 percent of workers need to commute to other parts of the city, (only 26 per cent work within the local board area) – which would indirectly affect productivity, health and wellbeing.• Labour force participation is lower in the board area compared to the city average.• The area’s economy is driven by the healthcare sector and manufacturing and it is expected that congestion impacts these sectors. The local retail trade and construction sector, that has grown in Ōtara-Papatoetoe in recent years, are also likely to be impacted by congestion• The adverse environmental stemming from increased vehicle emissions, especially in an area with no coastline is likely to be worse, worsening the quality of life of its people – comprising largely of Pacific, Māori and a growing Asian community
Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The communities living with low income, for example, majority of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe communities.• The parts of the city, such as South Auckland and in areas of the city with poor public transport network connections, with people heavily reliant on cars (of poor quality) will place a big challenge on families, and young people with less ability to pay the charges. These are

communities with fewer alternatives to driving, living in an area with comparatively poorer public transport network services.

- Equity concerns: Congestion charging can be a regressive move as it places a higher burden on low-income households as a percentage of their income compared to higher-income households
- Access to jobs and services: congestion charges will make driving more expensive, and limit access to employment opportunities and essential services for low-income families who rely on personal vehicles

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

- i. **The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board** key point of advocacy for equity
- ii. Minimising and mitigating the adverse social impact remains a serious concern, given the plans that communities will be left to live with.
- iii. Congestion charging carries a risk of being a regressive move as it will place a higher burden of costs on low-income groups.
- iv. Fair and equitable approach is the top priority for the board: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board advocate for improved public transport services in South Auckland and Ōtara-Papatoetoe area in particular. There is research evidence showing the **inequity of access to public transport in Ōtara-Papatoetoe area** and this needs to be mitigated before exacerbating inequities by introducing Time of Use Charge.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

The potential financial impacts on low-income groups must need to be carefully considered and mitigated through measures such as discounts, exemptions, or investments in free and affordable public transport alternative. The board continues to advocate for trialling free or subsidised public transport in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe area and south Auckland.

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). The purpose of this is to **reduce the likelihood of “rat running”**.
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board would like to see investment in complementary measures of

- Public transport improvements, including trialling free public transport in selected routes in the local area
- Park and ride facilities
- Active mode improvements and

- Network optimisation

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland’s transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

Papakura Local Board

Resolution number PPK/2024/1

MOVED by Chairperson B Catchpole, seconded by Deputy Chairperson J Robinson:

That the Papakura Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024 as outlined in the attachment tabled, and delegate to the chair the ability to make minor amendments to the attachment.
- b) **tuhi ā-taipitopito**/ note there should be exemptions for courier or freight trucks

Support the Manurewa Local Board feedback as follows :

- c) the rollout of this scheme should start in the central areas of Auckland where public transport is more readily available, and then slowly roll out to other areas to enable a smoother transition
- d) **tuhi ā-taipitopito**/ note concern about community safety, especially children travelling to school, as more vehicles may use the residential roads to avoid the charge
- e) **tuhi ā-taipitopito**/ note there needs to be a clear plan in place to ensure that traffic is not diverted off state highways, impacting residential roads, in particular around schools
- f) **tono**/ request assurance is provided to public transport users that the reliability and efficiency of public transport services will be maintained
- g) **tuhi ā-taipitopito**/ note there will be a need to ensure public transport services can handle the increased demand. This will require looking at what the introduction of charge means for the number of users of public transport
- h) **tono**/ request that there is only one charge per trip as creating multiple charges based on zones would be overcomplicating this process
- i) support the revenue from the charge to be reinvested into public transport.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging feedback September 2024

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

- The rail level crossings in Takaanini impact significantly on the immediate business area and the wider area from Manukau through Papakura to Drury. This is daily. It often takes an hour to travel from Manukau anytime after 2pm, south to Papakura (this is normally a 20 minute journey).

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- When the City Rail Link begins operating with more regular trains, congestion will be exacerbated
- Increased volume of traffic due to new housing developments
- Decreased productivity
- Decreased family-time
- Decreased active community

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

- Everyone is impacted by congestion.
- Congestion impacts on workers being able to get to work on time
- There are significant issues in being able to get to appointments or commitment in a specified time
- An impact on the business community – a cost to the business while people are sitting in traffic
- Increased incidents of road rage as people get frustrated
- Risk taking - there is always “that person” who wants to get one car ahead
- The environment - with emissions from vehicles sitting in grid-locked traffic.

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network) (Effective: Improve network performance)?

- Reliable, effective, regular and fast public transport system that doesn't get caught up in the grid-lock
- A fit for purpose roading network with quality road surfaces and no potholes
- A roading network that can cope with unexpected main route closures.

What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme? (Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users)

- Many people reside in Papakura due to the cost of housing being cheaper than the inner suburbs. This means often Papakura residents have lengthy travel distances.
- Our residents (often lower income residents) are forced to travel to other parts of Auckland to work. Public transport does not work for their travel requirements or their location of employment. The scheme should not unduly penalise these people.

What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme? (Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity)

- An easy-to-use system that is convenient to use and can be easily topped up
- Public transport cards:
 - The ability to use an eftpos or debit card rather than having to purchase a specific public transport card
 - If a public transport card is an option – it should be a universal public transport card that can be

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

The Papakura Local Board agrees with points 1 – 5 as follows:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the Auckland roading networks

5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

- People apply for a special discount that caps their travel costs whether it be a toll or public transport. This could be means tested.
- This could be an automated process of some sort.

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). **The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.**
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

- More on demand AT Local services to encourage public transport usage
- On demand AT Local services should be introduced in new residential developments at an early **stage to mitigate people’s reliance on personal vehicles. This would encourage the normalisation** of the use of public transport.
- There could be opportunities for collaborations with developers who could provide/fund the service initially with view to Auckland Transport taking over the on demands service as the housing development progresses.
- A prime development for a collaboration for an on demand AT Local service would be the Park Green Development in Papakura
- The on demand AT Local service would potentially reduce the number of vehicles people park on narrow roads and berms.

- Increase and inter-connect off-road shared pathways to encourage alternative modes of travel.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland's transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

- Improving public transport
- Improving road network infrastructure, such as:
 - road surface quality
 - installation of dedicated bus lanes
 - off-road shared pathways and
 - a wider network of on demand AT Local services with the associated management system to manage the demand.

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

- Improving public transport
- Improving road network infrastructure, such as:
 - road surface quality
 - installation of dedicated bus lanes
 - off-road shared pathways and
 - a wider network of on demand AT Local services with the associated management system to manage the demand.

Puketāpapa Local Board

Resolution number PKTPP/2024/194

MOVED by Chairperson E Kumar, seconded by Member M Pervan:

That the Puketāpapa Local Board

- a) do not support the Time of Use Charging (ToUC) scheme as proposed, noting there is work to be done.
- b) provide the following feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development:

Impacts of Congestion

- i) **the most serious impacts of congestion felt in the Puketāpapa Local Board area are** motorway congestion, school areas, and the Denbigh Ave and Dominion Road roundabout with impacts dependent on peak travel times.
- ii) Auckland-wide, those most affected by congestion are commuters traveling to work or school during peak times, motorway users, those commuting via the Harbour Bridge, and those traveling through or around school areas. Noting that off-peak congestion is exacerbated by accidents, traffic management events, road works, and pinch points such as the Auckland Harbour Bridge and poorly timed traffic signals.

Core Principles

- iii) the key elements in an effective ToUC scheme are options for alternative transport that is reliable, the development of a consistent public transport system, better utilisation of Dominion Road and State Highway 20 to connect west to south and the airport.
- iv) a key element in a fair scheme would be a daily cap on charges for tradespeople/sales staff/operations workers to prevent increased business costs being passed on to consumers.
- v) key elements in a fair congestion charging scheme is the need to consider and avoid unintended consequences, such as the economic impact caused by increased commercial investment outside the congestion zone, which can strain businesses in the city centre in addition to traffic shifting to alternative routes like the Northwestern Motorway (State Highway 16) to bypass the city centre. Secondly, ensuring fairness by aligning congestion charges with public transport costs and improving the public transport system to be a viable alternative.

Targeted measures for mitigation and unintended effects

- vi) a key measure to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the **benefits of a charging scheme is ensuring the ToUC is investigated fully, the Puketāpapa Local Board is a low socioeconomic community with high deprivation and a high blue-collar working community.**
- vii) impacts on specific groups of people and communities with transport deprivation can be best addressed by:
 - advocating for more accessible, regular, and reliable public transport services that provide affordable alternatives for vulnerable users, including investment in public transport infrastructure and road networks.

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- offering alternative travel options to avoid motorway charges
- implementing a rebate system for areas where motorway use is unavoidable
- introducing a cap on congestion charges based on vehicle license plates and offering a monthly charge option
- noting a ToUC scheme would be difficult if it is a blanket charge.

Complementary Measures

viii) complementary measures suitable for the **Puketāpapa Local Board area** are:

- limiting parking outside the chargeable zone could significantly impact residential property owners in the area, as they would be heavily affected by such restrictions
- expanding the chargeable parking zone around Auckland may negatively affect businesses in the local board area that lie just outside of the chargeable zone
- propose the introduction of bus lanes that can also be used by T3 vehicles to improve traffic flow
- improve public transport services to make them more reliable and extensive.

Revenue

- ix) net revenue should be applied to prioritising improvements to high-traffic areas such as motorway entries and exits, and ensuring the funds are placed into the Auckland Future Fund for long-term projects.
- x) the transport initiatives or projects collected net revenue should be reinvested into the Denbigh Ave and Dominion Road roundabout as a priority for infrastructure investment, given its high vehicle volume and significance as a route for both large vehicles and school foot traffic. In addition to any roads that address the commute to major business, airport, health areas needing the best accessibility.

CARRIED

Rodney Local Board

Resolution number RD/2024/177

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson L Johnston, seconded by Member M Dennis:

That the Rodney Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development as outlined in the attached submission form.

CARRIED

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?

Congestion on the state highways (SH1 and SH16) during rush hour commuting in the mornings (South) and the afternoons (North) relating to places of employment on the North Shore, the West and Central Auckland contribute to longer travel times from within the Rodney Local Board area, increased safety risks and negative environmental impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions.

In addition, the state highways traversing the Rodney Local Board area are congested over long weekends and the start and end of holiday periods.

Feeder roads including both ends of Dairy Flat Highway during rush hour

Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?

Commuters, freight operators and tradespersons who cannot use public transport during rush hour to reach places of employment or place of businesses are the most affected.

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the **local board's perspective:**

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

The charges have to be high enough to change behaviour, but subsidies/rebates need to be available for vulnerable users and those without public transport options.

For fairness frequent and reliable public transport options need to be available, this will also encourage mode shift.

Time of use charging to only cover areas where there are frequent and reliable public transport options available.

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

1. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
2. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
3. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
4. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
5. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

All the above.

Avoid imposing boundaries that separate integrated communities, e.g disabling/discouraging residents to reach local infrastructure such as shops, malls, churches etc.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

Consider subsidizing fees for the use of public transport for vulnerable groups to ensure equity.

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). **The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.**
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

If the time of use charging is going to be widened outside of the Central Auckland, then these issues need to be addressed.

- Enabling infrastructure such as Park and Ride Facilities at key public transport facilities are needed to incentivize the use of public transport
- Increased frequency and availability of feeder bus services in Rodney
- Increase the capacity of the carparks at the Park n Rides at Hibiscus Bays and Albany, as these are full by 7.30am and not a viable option for many working parents.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland’s transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

Improve public transport.

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

- Loop buses providing services to town centres within the Rodney Local Board area
- Increased frequency of Rodney feeder buses to transport hubs
- Increasing parking capacity at Albany and Silverdale Park n Ride
- Provide Park and Ride options at Westgate and Kumeu

Upper Harbour Local Board

Resolution number UH/2024/152

MOVED by Chairperson A Atkinson, seconded by Deputy Chairperson U Casuri Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development as outlined in the local board feedback form tabled to the minutes.

CARRIED

Time of Use Charging feedback October 2024

1. Impacts of congestion

What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• State Highway 16 and the roads leading to it are severely congested (often called the SH16 parking lot) as there is no feasible regular alternative for many people living in the Northwest. Rapid Transit and transit options cannot come soon enough for these residents.• Congestion is felt severely around the onramps and offramps to motorways, of which Upper Harbour Local Board has many. There is congestion around Albany and Constellation Drive for State Highway 1. There is severe congestion in Whenuapai (which would be alleviated if the SH16 / SH18 link was built.) There is also severe congestion around State Highway 18.• Areas around schools face severe congestion. E.g. Traffic starts building up around Rangitoto College around 2:30 every afternoon, blocking Rosedale Road, Graham Collins Drive and other local roads.• There are many students who travel from the Western side of our board to the North Shore.• Albany faces severe congestion every day due to the narrow bridge on Dairy Flat highway which acts as a constriction point.
Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• People with no other choice are disproportionately impacted, and these tend to be low and middle income earners.• Many people are not able to change their hours of work, so allowances must be made if these people are unable to afford the congestion charge.• In terms of where actual congestion is, we would like to see advice on delays by area. However, we suspect that the CBD, roads to CBD and West Auckland are both severely impacted by congestion• A second harbour crossing that includes public and active transport modes is needed ASAP

2. Core principals

Auckland Transport and Auckland Council propose designing a scheme that follows these core principals to create a system that is:

- a) Effective: Improve network performance
- b) Fair: Minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users.
- c) Simple: Be understandable and avoid complexity
- d) Feasible: Able to be implemented.

From the local board's perspective:

- What are the key elements you would expect to see in an effective scheme (on the transport network)?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme?
- What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?

Any funds raised should be put into public transport and active transport alternatives. Then people can truly have a choice.

The profit derived from the system needs to be ringfenced so people can see it, and then see where it is being spent. We need to say things like “the congestion charge is adding busses on these routes”

The system needs to be automated and simple, something like “e Road”, or a card in cars that automatically deducts the money.

People who live in areas with no access to PT should not have to pay the congestion charge regardless of where they are going. This impacts areas like e.g. Scott Point, Herald Island and Paremoremo

3. What we've heard from you

During the local board workshops, the local board raised the need for targeted measures to mitigate any potential unintended effects of a time of use charging scheme for local communities. Some suggestions included:

6. The need for more accessible, regular and reliable public transport services
7. Ensuring public transport services provide adequate alternatives to access essential amenities and services
8. Ensuring public transport services are more affordable for vulnerable users
9. Investing the net revenue from the scheme into public transport infrastructure and in the roading networks
10. Ensuring the impacts on specific groups of people with transport deprivation (e.g. rural communities, people with disabilities, low-income groups) are adequately addressed.

Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

Consider more use of the dynamic PT systems in areas with no bus network (such as On Demand) so that residents can get to places with public transport.

The frequency of feeder busses needs to improve a lot. There are many residents from the North Shore who will not catch the bus from home as the frequency of feeder busses is so poor and they **often don't turn up on time**.

Ferries not being synced with bus timetables is also an issue with residents.

Costs for using PT should be put down when congestion charging is introduced. That way there is an effective choice, as currently PT is relatively expensive.

The charging scheme should not extend outside the CBD, as was originally proposed. People living and working locally (e.g. in Hobsonville or Rosedale) are not contributing to the main congestion (Auckland CBD) and should be rewarded for it. We should aim to make it more attractive to work outside the CBD, hence the charging should not extend outside the CBD.

Increase the number of parks at the Park and Ride stations in Constellation and Albany. Have some of these parks set for opening from say 9:00 am onwards, such that more people can use the Park and Ride, not just those who arrive before 7:30 am.

How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?

4. Complementary measures

Complementary measures are the wider settings that can enhance the benefits of a scheme or support the mitigations of the negative impacts. These can relate to:

1. On-street parking management (regulation of on-street parking in key locations or routes adjacent to the charged area). The purpose is to minimise the impacts of individuals attempting to avoid the charge by driving to the edge of a charged area.
2. Road space layout alterations (temporary or permanent changes to the local road layout around **the charged areas**). **The purpose of this is to reduce the likelihood of “rat running”.**
3. Network optimisation (traffic management interventions). The purpose is to enhance the objectives and outcomes of the scheme by improving the efficiency and reliability of public, active and higher occupancy modes.
4. Kerb zone management (Park and Ride, shared mobility hubs, and loading/delivery zone management). The purpose of Kerb Zone Management is to optimise the benefits experienced within the charged area by ensuring the kerb zone is used for the most appropriate purpose, at the appropriate time.
5. Other measures include public transport improvements, Park and Ride facilities and active mode improvements.

Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?

- Trialling ‘on demand’ options for areas that have no public transport e.g. Paremoremo, Scott Point, Herald Island

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- Increasing Pop Up Bike Lanes, especially around schools where there is already an unprotected ‘bike lane’. E.g. East Coast Road for Rangitoto College, Rosedale Road for Albany Junior, Albany Senior, Kristin and Pinehurst.
- Speeding up the Sh16 Rapid Transit that NZTA is planning on doing. When it starts, ensuring there is adequate and effective Public Transport to it.
- There needs to be more emphasis on walking and active transport paths to enable people to travel in different manners. E.g. the cycling path along Hobsonville Road (which is just a road space reallocation) needs to proceed to give actual transport choice.
- Rosedale Road Bus Station needs to be reprioritised so that the thousands of workers who work in the Rosedale Industrial area have options to catch a bus.
- The busses in Hobsonville and West Harbour need to be integrated into the ferry timetable, such that people don’t have to wait.

5. Revenue

The Government has indicated in its cabinet paper that net revenue generated will be used for land transport activities within the region in which the charges apply in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system.

During workshops we heard from many local boards that it was important that revenue is reinvested into the public transport system to maximise the benefits of a scheme and to help mitigate accessibility issues.

What parts of Auckland’s transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?

Public and Active Transport in the region in which the costs were generated. This revenue needs to be ringfenced so that the public can see exactly where it is being spent.

What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected net revenue reinvested into?

- Trialling the ‘on demand’ transport system in areas without busses, but which are close to public transport. E.g. Paremoremo is about 13km from the Albany Park and Ride, but there is no bus. Scott Point is very close to the West Harbour Ferry but there is no bus. Herald Island is just a few km from Public Transport in Whenuapai, yet there is no bus.
- Education and training for children to and from school using public or active transport.
- Reduction in public transport costs for youth. Ideally free bus trips for those under 18.

Waiheke Local Board

Resolution number [WHK/2024/110](#)

MOVED by Member R Tucker, seconded by Deputy Chairperson K Matthews:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

- a) note that:
 - i) the Waiheke Local Board Plan explicitly supports some of the intentions of the Time of Use Charging policy which are to move away from fossil fuels and their emissions, and it supports enhancing public transport accessibility.
 - ii) the Waiheke community is dependent on transiting the city centre because
 - A) both passenger ferry operators disembark in the city centre.
 - B) the sole vehicular ferry operator for Waiheke is building its base within the proposed cordon at the Wynyard Quarter and increasingly Waiheke vehicular ferries will disembark and load within the proposed cordon.
 - C) Waiheke-based commuters who work out of the proposed city cordon area but must access their cars garaged downtown to get to work, have no choice but to exit the city through the proposed cordon.
 - iii) therefore, should Time of Use Charging be implemented, the board asks that Waiheke residents be provided with the same dispensations as may be considered for residents living **within the Waitematā cordon area.**
- b) note that:
 - i) the research for The Congestion Question (TCQ) report released in November 2020 commenced well before COVID and does not take into account the significant changes in the transport and economic landscape post COVID, including continuation of flexible working, the reduction in public transport patronage, and the lack of recovery for businesses in the CBD.
 - ii) the social harm findings are similarly very outdated in light of the post-COVID cost of living crisis and that the interviews of vulnerable households was limited to 50 households across Auckland.
 - iii) the cities that were used as examples of where congestion charging has worked (Singapore, London, Stockholm and Gothenburg) are generally more circular in nature compared to the **topographical challenges of Auckland's isthmus, have higher density and have significantly more public transport.**
 - iv) the TCQ report states that a City Centre cordon will have a limited impact on overall **network performance, mainly targeting commuting trips. The board questions the report's** conclusion that equity impacts of the City Centre cordon are likely to be modest because of the small number of trips impacted and the wide availability of public transport

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

alternatives, given that many of the furthest suburbs have the least access to public transport options.

- c) support congestion charging as a mechanism generally, but does not support the implementation of Phase 1 of Time of Use Charging as recommended (City Centre Cordon) at this time.
- d) recommend that Auckland Council delays any implementation of Time of Use Charging in order to understand the impact on traffic patterns and congestion once the CRL is operational, with more up to data supporting the main conclusions of the report, and until substantially more public transport options are available to current users of transport in and out of the proposed cordoned area .
- e) recommend that any Time of Use Charging to be implemented targets the worst congested areas, i.e. the Strategic Transport corridors.
- f) recommends that robust and up to date research be undertaken to address the equity issues and their mitigations, particularly for low-income households who tend to live the furthest from their workplaces, and to determine whether using Community Services card holders as a means of identifying those with equity issues is sufficient.
- g) recommends an exempt status for the disability and mobility users from Time of Use Charging.
- h) if Time of Use Charging is implemented, supports the net revenue be used solely for reinvestment in public transport and mitigation measures.
- i) delegate to the Chairperson C Handley and Member R Tucker the responsibility of finalising the submission.

CARRIED

Waitākere Ranges Local Board

Resolution number [WTK/2024/173](#)

MOVED by Chairperson G Presland, seconded by Member M Allen:

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the following feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024:

Current impacts of congestion in the Waitākere Ranges

- i) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that local residential streets are being used as rat runs due to congested routes
- ii) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note safety concerns for local residents living on urban streets being used as rat runs
- iii) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that congestion can cause longer and/or unpredictable journey times
- iv) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note the impact of the City Rail Link activation on western line level crossings and consequent additional congestion impacts
- v) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note the disproportionate impacts of congestion charging on parents/caregivers taking children to and from school or to after school activities, residents who commute to and from their local area for work during peak times and people for whom public transport or alternative modes are not currently a realistic option due to a lack of public transport availability or inconvenient and/or indirect public transport routes

Feedback on core principals underpinning the Time of Use Charging policy proposal

Effective: improve network performance

- vi) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note its concerns with the effectiveness of the scheme if it is introduced in the form of congestion charging only on specific highly congested corridors (motorways and arterial roads), as this will only transfer motorway congestion onto the city's surrounding streets
- vii) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that improvements to the transport network and a reduction in traffic congestion is often not a direct result of continuous investment into new road infrastructure because of the effect of induced demand
- viii) do not support use of Time of Use Charging revenue being used to construct more roads and motorways
- ix) tautoko / support prioritising the greening of Auckland's car fleet before introducing road user charges, such as congestion charges
- x) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that effectively addressing congestion requires aligning the Time of Use Charging scheme with significant improvements to public transport

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

Fair: minimise and mitigate adverse social impacts and ensure benefits and costs are fairly distributed across users

- xi)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note its concerns around economic equity in a user pays approach, as it is likely to disproportionately benefit wealthier drivers who will find charges less of a burden and will have a lesser effect on inner city residents as well as a disproportionately greater effect on residents of the South and the West
- xii)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that the proposed road user charge system has less impact on those with a single destination journey
- xiii)** tono / request that consideration be given to charging commuters travelling at both peak times rather than one. This would reduce the burden on people who work shifts and at times not served by public transport
- xiv)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that West Auckland residents commuting from outlying suburbs may be disproportionately affected by this scheme due to a lack of viable alternative transport options such as public transport and cycleways
- xv)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that in addressing congestion, consideration must also be given to a plan to reduce school traffic, including the provision of safe ways for children to walk and cycle
- xvi)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note its concerns around the disproportionate impact on vulnerable residents and people for whom public transport or alternative modes are not currently a realistic option, such as people with disabilities, parents and caregivers taking children to and from school or to after-school activities, and people and businesses moving goods and services at peak travel times
- xvii)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that public transport fares need to be affordable to ensure it is an affordable alternative to the use of private vehicles, especially for vulnerable communities

Simple: be understandable and avoid complexity and Feasible: is able to be implemented

- xviii)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that in giving this feedback the board has not yet been provided access to the social impact assessment for consideration
- xix)** tono / request a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed scheme incorporating an analysis of the social impacts of a time of use charging scheme be provided
- xx)** tono / request further clarification as to how the scheme may be implemented
- xxi)** tautoko / support Auckland Council retaining governance over the pricing policy of any proposed Time of Use Charging scheme

Other measures that should be taken into consideration as part of the development of a Time of Use Charging scheme

- xxii)** tono / request clarification regarding next steps if most commuters choose to pay the charge and congestion remains the same

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- xxiii)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that effectively addressing congestion requires a fully integrated transport system, with public transport, ride-share, walking and cycling all working together, supported by safe, accessible, connected, well-designed and maintained infrastructure, including feeder buses, cycleways, better street lighting for pedestrians, park-and-rides, and smart technology such as dynamic lanes and bus priority at traffic lights
- xxiv)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that it is unclear as to whether number of people in a vehicle will be **taken into consideration as part of the scheme's pricing policy**
- xxv)** tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that further information on how the revenue raised from Time of Use Charging will be distributed is required
- xxvi)** tautoko / support revenue raised from Time of Use Charging being invested in public transport, as well as walking and cycling infrastructure
- xxvii)** tautoko / support revenue raised from Time of use Charging through West Auckland residents and road users being reinvested in West Auckland.

CARRIED

Waitematā Local Board

Resolution number [WTM/2024/168](#)

MOVED by Chairperson G Sage, seconded by Member R Northey:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

- a) whakarite / provide the following views on the Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August / September 2024, also attached as attachment A:
 - i) Impacts of congestion:
 - A) What are currently the most serious impacts of congestion felt in your local board area?
 - 1) Local board feedback:
 - Wasted time and frustration for drivers and car passengers. Substantial emissions.
 - Getting in and out of the city seems to have eased for residents of Waitemata as roadworks, COVID and working from home have put a downward pressure on travel demand. The greatest amount of congestion is of commuters to the city, and on some of the arterial roads during peak times. West End Road is very busy with commuters from Point Chevalier and beyond that makes it slower to get around locally.
 - Issues are exacerbated in bad weather, when more people choose to use their cars to commute over PT or active modes. During heavy rains it can become very difficult to get out of the city, which is a concern in emergencies.
 - B) Thinking about Auckland as a whole, who do you feel is most impacted by congestion?
 - 1) Local board feedback:
 - People who choose to drive at peak times rather than taking other transport options.
 - Those who can only afford, or choose, to live further out of the city and away from transport alternatives.
 - Workers, tradespeople and students. This is because the hours of lower paid workers and of students are often inflexibly tied to peak travelling hours and tradespeople are often obliged to deal with emergency plumbing, electrical work etc. even if this is in peak travel hours.
 - However, for 9-5 workers and students there are often transport alternatives that would mean they could avoid congestion. However, there have been some issues to reliability as rail has undergone necessary upgrades, ferries are sometimes held up by cruise ships, and some buses get stuck in traffic.
 - Other people affected by congestion are those living near or on arterial

roads who have to cope with unsafe roads, rat running, air pollution and restrictions to getting around on foot.

ii) Core principles:

A) **from the local board's perspective: what are the key elements you would expect to see in an affective scheme (on the transport network)? What are the key elements you would expect to see in a fair scheme? What are the key elements you would expect to see in a simple scheme?**

1) Local board feedback: the four principles seem entirely appropriate:

- An effective scheme would have fewer people driving on the roads in favour of other forms of getting around and remaining car users spending less time travelling. It would also reduce total traffic and not displace it around residential streets.
- A fair scheme would have equitable impacts related to location- residents from the central city, inner and outer suburbs and satellite towns and rural areas. However, it must also incentivize housing choices close to centres, employment and public and active transport options. A fair scheme would be fair to different types of users- workers, tradespeople, students, carriers, and those using public transport and active transport. A fair scheme would appreciate that those living within a cordon, if one were to be applied to the whole isthmus area, should be charged differently to those coming into it.
- A simple scheme would be one that is readily understood by its users and readily enables appropriate behaviour change as a result. A simple scheme should be easy for customers to use and be highly automated with charges being taken automatically to avoid adding considerable administrative costs and time for drivers.
- A feasible scheme is one that does not generate widespread continuing opposition and is readily able to be implemented and enforced.

iii) What we've heard from you:

A) Thinking about your local board area, what other measures do we need to take into consideration when designing a scheme in order to maximise the benefits of a charging scheme?

1) Local board feedback:

- We need to ensure there is appropriate public transport during peak hours and whose work hours and other obligations currently give them little option but to travel by a vehicle on roads in peak hours.
- The needs of those with transport deprivation are equally important.
- Waitemata is well served by public transport to the city centre and moderately served to go to other destinations. Ideally, for Waitemata, the scheme will discourage driving where there are practicable alternatives.
- It would be a worse outcome if congestion charges encourage usage of residential streets instead of arterials or motorways. There might be an inner cordon of the city centre and an outer cordon of the isthmus (applied

when leaving the motorway) with a fee to move into a cordoned area.

- A set price to enter the cordoned area that is low, and broadly applied is likely to be fairest and would nudge those with alternatives to use those alternatives.
- B) How do we best address the impacts on specific groups of people/communities with transport deprivation such as rural, people with disabilities, low-income groups?
- 1) Local board feedback: a combination of additional public transport provision that is appropriate for members of such groups; maintaining indefinitely the \$50 maximum weekly public transport charge, which is crucial for low-income workers and students, and setting lower or no Time of Use Charging for those with disabilities.
- iv) Complementary measures:
- A) Thinking about your local board area, what type of complementary measures could be suitable to put in place, and do you have specific examples of where?
- 1) Local board feedback:
- Note point 3 should also include commercial vehicles.
 - For the Waitemata Local Board area a relatively high proportion of people travel by active or public transport to make their journeys, and we would want such travel opportunities to be enhanced. For this reason, better provision for walking, cycling, micromobility vehicles and public transport-including buses, ferries, rail and general and disability taxis are particularly important complementary measures. The Board supports kerbside management, particularly dynamic lanes and greater usage of automated payments to ensure they are free when they need to be. See point 5 Revenue for initiatives the local board would like to see the revenue reinvested.
 - While there have been discourses around the need for all day public transport, in some rural areas, a limited service at the beginning and end of the working day to a transport hub, plus a later service for those going out in centres, particularly the city centre, could be very helpful.
 - We would also support proactive, rather than reactive, Residents Parking management across the whole board area, ensures space for business users, services, tradespeople, deliveries and visitors, and discourages **commuter informal kerbside “park-n-ride”**. The inner suburbs have very little in the way of visitor off street parking, so kerbside needs to be managed better to support residents, tradespeople, and business.
- v) Revenue
- A) **What parts of Auckland’s transport network do you believe net revenue should be applied to?**
- 1) Local board feedback: Buses, robust road treatments on busy bus corridors, ferries, passenger rail, cycle network, cycle paths busways, and footpaths.
- B) **What transport initiatives or projects would the local board like to see the collected**

net revenue reinvested into?

- 1) Local board feedback: the below initiatives and projects could be considered when funds become available:
 - Speeding up the implementation of the Waitemata Local Board's Greenways Plan
 - Footpath improvements
 - Active transport provision
 - Transport elements of the City Centre Masterplan and Access for Everyone.
 - Electrification of buses and ferries
 - Dynamic lanes
 - Subsidy for e-bikes

CARRIED

Whau Local Board

Resolution number WH/2024/137

MOVED by Chairperson K Thomas, seconded by Deputy Chairperson F Amosa:

That the Whau Local Board:

- a) welcome the opportunity to provide feedback and insights on issues related to Time of Use Charging policy development, based on discussions held at local board workshops during August 2024.
- b) whakarite / provide the following feedback on the current impacts of congestion in the Whau local board area:
 - i) note that local residential streets are being used as rat runs due to congested routes.
 - ii) note disruption and safety concerns for local residents living on urban streets being used as rat runs at times of congestion.
 - iii) note the difficulty of maintaining scheduled public transport (bus) timetables.
 - iv) note that congestion can cause longer and/or unpredictable journey times.
 - v) note the disproportionate impacts of congestion on parents/caregivers taking children to and from school or to after school activities, people and businesses moving goods and services during peak travel times, and people for whom public transport or alternative modes are not currently a realistic option due to a lack of safe and accessible infrastructure or due to inconvenient and/or indirect public transport routes.
 - vi) further note that high levels of traffic, including rat-running, and general issues arising from a lack of transport choice, are increased by parents and caregivers feeling unsafe allowing their children to walk or bike to and from school and therefore making the decision to drive. This in turn increases the traffic issues, compounding safety, congestion, carbon emission, and physical health and wellbeing issues
- c) whakarite / provide the following feedback on the core principles underpinning the Time of Use Charging policy proposal (effectiveness, fairness, simplicity and feasibility):
 - i) i) note that time of use charging is a tool to encourage habit changes, but not the entire answer to congestion issues.
 - ii) note its concerns with the effectiveness of the scheme if it is introduced in the form of congestion charging only on specific highly congested corridors (motorways and arterial roads), as this will only transfer motorway congestion onto the city's already badly congested surrounding streets and undermine one of the main purposes of urban motorways.
 - iii) note its concern that if congestion charges are applied only to specific corridors such as State Highway 16, charge avoidance will lead to more congestion on already busy corridors in the Whau local board area, for example Great North Road, Ash Street and New North Road.

- iv) request greater clarity around which corridors would be charged if the scheme is introduced in this form, and what mitigations would be put in place to make these already busy corridors safer for vulnerable road users.
- v) note that effectively addressing congestion requires a fully integrated transport system, with public transport, ride-share, walking and cycling all working together, supported by safe, accessible, connected, well-designed and maintained infrastructure, including feeder buses, cycleways, better street lighting for pedestrians, park-and-rides, and smart technology such as dynamic lanes and bus priority at traffic lights.
- vi) recommend that a time of use scheme should not be implemented before the City Rail Link is operational, and a fully funded plan for infrastructure development to support alternative (and connected) modes of transport is committed to.
- vii) note that many Whau residents travel to work in South Auckland and the broader Penrose industrial area, and will not have a viable, efficient cross suburb travel alternative to driving until completion and consistent operation of the City Rail Link.
- viii) note the potential impact on plans for the north-west busway if State Highway 16 congestion is improved by time of use charging as expected, and that consideration should be given to progressing light rail as an alternative instead.
- ix) note that public transport must be monitored and scaled up quickly if higher demand is observed once time of use charging is in place.
- x) note that while the Whau Local Board is committed to encouraging mode shift and emissions reduction, this is not supported by current central government policy, with cuts to important transport funding, including budgets for local buses and cycleways.
- xi) note that if too many subsidies and concessions are provided it will reduce the effectiveness of the project and that a more consistent approach would ensure fairness.
- xii) note its concerns around economic equity in a user pays approach, as it is likely to disproportionately benefit wealthier drivers who will find charges less of a burden.
- xiii) note its concerns around spatial equity given that people commuting from outlying suburbs, such as the west and south of Auckland, will be disproportionately affected due to a lack of viable alternative transport options such as public transport and cycleways, and note the tendency for more deprived communities to be located in these outlying suburbs, further entrenching the geographical distribution of poverty.
- xiv) do not support the use of an entry / exit model of charging as seen in the Stockholm model due to its disproportionate effect on those living in outlying suburbs, and note the inequity of this model due to the tendency for more deprived communities to be located in these outlying suburbs.
- xv) recommend that if time of use charging is implemented, it is applied to all private vehicle use within a specific area, as seen in the London model.
- xvi) note its concerns around the disproportionate impact on vulnerable residents and people for whom public transport or alternative modes are not currently a realistic option, such as people with disabilities, parents and caregivers taking children to and from school or to after-school activities, and people and businesses moving goods and services at peak travel times.
- xvii) request that consideration be given to charging only commuters travelling at both peak times rather than one, to reduce the burden on shift workers who often work at times not served by public transport.

E mahi ana mātou i te mahi mō Tāmaki Makaurau

- xviii) note that in addressing congestion, consideration must also be given to a plan to reduce school traffic, including safe ways for children to walk and cycle.
- xix) note that public transport fares need to be affordable to ensure it is a realistic alternative to the use of private vehicles, especially for vulnerable communities.
- d) whakarite / provide the following feedback on other measures that should be taken into consideration as part of the development of a Time of Use Charging scheme:
 - i) **request that all revenue collected be invested back into Auckland’s transport infrastructure,** preferably towards making alternatives modes of transport more accessible, including reinvestment into budgets for local buses, cycleways and other services that have been subject to cuts, and subsidising of public transport for targeted communities, rather than improving the charged corridors themselves.
 - ii) support funds raised from Time of Use Charging being invested into local transport projects including a multistorey park and ride in New Lynn and grade separation of railway crossings.
 - iii) request clarity as to the next steps if most commuters choose to pay the charge and congestion remains the same.
 - iv) note that in giving this feedback the board has not yet been provided access to the social impact assessment for consideration.

CARRIED

Appendix ii

Houkura/Independent Māori Statutory Board position paper July 2024

Cover Report: Time of Use Congestion Charging

Ngā tūtohunga:

Recommendations:

That Houkura:

- a) receive the Time of Use Congestion Charging - Position Paper.

Whakarōpopototanga:

Executive Summary:

1. The purpose of this position paper is to provide the Independent Māori Statutory Board (Houkura) with positions relating to the introduction of a Time of Use Congestion Charging (TUCC) scheme by Auckland Council (Council).
2. Council staff are in the early stages of developing options on implementing a TUCC scheme.
3. The position paper will consider five key areas for Houkura advocacy to ensure equity matters are addressed in the TUCC scheme. These are:
 - early planning
 - engagement with Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau
 - assessment of equity impacts
 - mitigation measures and
 - ongoing monitoring.

Ngā koringa ā-muri:

Next steps:

4. The Secretariat will continue to support Houkura in its advocacy approach and provide regular updates to Houkura on this matter.

Author	Kelvin Norgrove – Contractor
Authoriser	Taff Wikaira – Poutuarā

Report: Positions Paper - Time of Use Congestion Charging

Houkura Positions

1. **Advocate** for coordination between the Council and Auckland Transport to ensure planning and design of a TUCC scheme is **responsive to Māori issues of significance** and **priorities pertaining to transport**.
2. **Advocate** for Council to design a TUCC scheme that has a **'just transition'**: recognising that better managing congestion will involve both opportunities and costs and that transitioning to a more efficient transport system will require these costs and opportunities to be **distributed fairly between different groups of people**.
3. **Advocate** that **prior to any engagement with mana whenua or mātāwaka** entities, the TUCC project should **articulate how it has considered information previously provided to Auckland Transport or other organisations** about the impacts of congestion charging and related policy initiatives.
4. **Agree** that the **substantial work previously undertaken** to assess the impacts of congestion charging on Māori **provides a good evidence base** to input to the TUCC project that **does not need to be duplicated**, but there are **elements that require updating or validating** and that should be a focus for analysis by the TUCC project **prior to engagement with Māori**.
5. **Advocate** for **performance measures be established to assist monitoring of impacts on Māori**.
6. **Monitor** delivery of the RLTP and updates to the location and timing of Auckland Transport, Kiwirail, and Waka Kotahi planned investment in roading and public transport to identify the extent to which areas subject to congestion charges will benefit from alternative transport options.
7. **Advocate** that significant improvements to public transport services in outer urban areas in the south and west of Auckland should be in place prior to the introduction of congestion charges in those areas.
8. **Advocate** for equity mitigation measures to be incorporated in the design of the TUCC scheme (e.g. maximum daily caps; exemptions for specified road user groups).
9. **Seek** increased funding support in the event that significant negative impacts on Māori cannot be practically avoided or mitigated within the design of the TUCC scheme through the LTP Māori Outcomes Fund (MOF) to assist mana whenua and mātāwaka entities in building capability, capacity, and implementing Māori-led mitigation plans for transport dependent whānau (e.g. by offering 'mobility as a service' to access marae and papakāinga and social, health, and education facilities).
10. **Acknowledge** that if a TUCC scheme 'goes live' in 2026, it would require bringing forward the LTP 2024-34's planned increase in the MOF from 'year 4' (i.e. earlier than FY28).
11. **Advise** Council on the views of Houkura prior to Council positions being finalised in the Transport and Infrastructure Committee meetings.
12. **Monitor** Government policy and legislative proposals relating to long term funding of New Zealand's transport system, including congestion charging.
13. **Advocate** to ensure impacts, both negative and positive, on mana whenua and mātāwaka are properly assessed and considered before final decisions are made.

Communication of Position

14. The below channels are the best forms of communicating the positions of Houkura:
 - Time of Use Charging Political Reference Group (TUCC PRG)
 - Budget Committee – Annual Budgets and Long-Term Plans
 - Transport and Infrastructure Committee – Reporting from the TUCC PRG; Auckland Transport Statements of Intent; Regional Land Transport Plan.
15. The Secretariat will support the Houkura positions through advocacy in its daily business activities relating to this matter.

Auckland Council

16. Houkura seeks strong leadership by Council to ensure the TUCC scheme is subject to:
 - **early engagement with Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau in the planning and design stage**, with a focus on updating and validating findings from previous assessments of impacts on mana whenua and mātāwaka,
 - **rigorous assessment of equity impacts at the planning stage** (prior to detailed design and implementation),
 - **mitigation measures assessed at the planning stage** and included at the implementation stage to address impacts on: access to places of importance to mana whenua, and equity impacts on low-income/highly transport-dependent whānau,
 - monitoring of actual impacts of congestion charges on travel patterns in areas with high Māori populations, to inform consideration of the planned location and timing of improvements in alternative transport options as part of the Council's future Long-term plan (LTP) and Auckland Transport's Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) cycle.

Te Tūāpapa:

Background:

17. While decisions on congestion charging have yet to be made by the government, the topic has been subject to extensive investigation over the past decade by central government agencies in conjunction with Council and Auckland Transport.
18. Congestion charging as a form of 'transport demand management' has been referred to in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) since 2016 and The Congestion Question (TCQ) project since 2017.
19. The TCQ terms of reference was signed by participating agencies' representatives and the Ministers of Transport and Finance. Central Government and Council worked together for several years on TCQ to investigate whether to proceed with introducing congestion pricing in Tāmaki Makaurau.
20. The TCQ project concluded in July 2020 and determined that there was a strong case for implementing congestion pricing in Tāmaki Makaurau for demand management purposes (NB. various reports are available on the Ministry of Transport website).
21. Following completion of the project, a Transport Select Committee inquiry into congestion pricing in 2021 made the following two main recommendations:
 - progress legislation to enable New Zealand cities to use congestion pricing as a tool in transport planning,
 - implement a congestion pricing scheme in Tāmaki Makaurau as described in the TCQ technical report.

22. TCQ concluded that a congestion pricing scheme in Tāmaki Makaurau should be introduced in stages that are generally linked to the delivery of additional public transport services and infrastructure investment over the next ten years.
23. The first stage, based around the city centre area, could be introduced to coincide with the opening of the City Rail Link (CRL). Then, over time, the congestion pricing scheme should be introduced along the most congested corridors, with the implementation timetable informed by the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).
24. TCQ also produced assessments of potential impacts of congestion charging on Māori. The main findings are summarised in Attachment A.
25. At its meeting of 6 May 2021, the Planning Committee supported implementation of congestion charging in principle, subject to certain conditions being fulfilled: including equity issues being addressed, adequate public transport, and available funding to offset the Regional Fuel Tax (Resolution number PLA/2021/37).
26. These views were represented in a joint Council /AT submission, including input from Houkura, to the Transport and Infrastructure Select Committee on 20 May 2021.
27. Houkura advocated for a Te Ao Māori values-based approach and sought next steps to be agreed by the committee to:
 - engage directly with mana whenua and mātāwaka representatives in Tāmaki Makaurau in the course of designing significant policy changes,
 - understand the impact of proposed policy changes on Māori cultural, economic, and social well-being, and
 - address equity considerations in the design of proposed policy changes by avoiding or mitigating negative or unintended effects for Māori.
28. In February 2024, the government announced the Auckland fuel tax would discontinue from July 2024. At the same time, it indicated support for alternative funding mechanisms for transport, including time of use charging, public-private partnerships, and value capture tools¹.
29. While the TUCC project is underway, the Government is expected to consider long-term funding options for New Zealand's transport system. Consideration will need to address the role, locations, and relative contribution to be made by congestion charges and tolls in all parts of the country, including the on-going settings for nation-wide fuel excise taxes and road user charges. Both the TUCC project and the central government work will need to revisit the purpose of congestion charging and confirm if congestion reduction is the primary objective, compared to other drivers (e.g. emissions reduction or revenue generation).

Horopaki:

Context:

30. The TUCC scheme is directly relevant to three of the values of Houkura: whanaungatanga, rangatiratanga, and manaakitanga, and to specific issues of significance for Māori, as shown in Attachment B.
31. The Houkura Governance Road Map - Te Pae Whakatere identifies the following actions relevant to this kaupapa:
 - Council and CCOs to address cultural, social and economic impacts on Māori and Māori businesses in the designing and implementing of new funding and rating tools,

¹ <https://www.thepost.co.nz/politics/350173210/govt-eyes-congestion-charges-fill-fuel-tax-revenue-gap>

e.g. regional petrol tax, road pricing and targeted levies - Develop a Board Position to inform the implementation of Congestion Charging

- Advocate for robust Māori engagement in the development and implementation of novel rating tools including congestion charging.
- Monitor the impact of the cessation of the Auckland Regional Fuel Tax on Māori
- Advocate equity and behavioural changes to the transport system to ensure Māori communities are reached and addressed.
- Advocate and monitor the findings of the Māori transport inequity dataset, to ensure Māori Transport inequities in Tāmaki Makaurau are addressed and responded to.

32. Any form of demand management congestion charging has potential to provide a range of benefits (e.g. less traffic congestion, lower transport emissions, and increased revenue for improving transport options). However, it also needs to be designed to improve (and not reduce) equitable access for Māori to transport services across Tāmaki Makaurau.
33. In November 2023, Council's Transport and Infrastructure Committee resolved (refer Item 10, November 2023):
- a) ohia / endorse the Time of Use Charging - Indicative Work Programme, and the creation of a joint Auckland Transport / Auckland Council programme team to progress Time of Use Charging as soon as practicable
 - b) tuhi ā-taipitopito / note that officers will report back on progress to the Transport and Infrastructure Committee on the planning and design of Time of Use Charging including the benefits and disbenefits on communities and wider issues of equity
 - c) pōwhiri / invite Waka Kotahi to contribute to relevant workstreams as appropriate
 - d) ohia / endorse formation of a political reference group comprising of the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Chair and Deputy Chair of the Transport and Infrastructure Committee, the appointed councilors on the Auckland Transport board, Chair of the Planning, Environment and Parks Committee, Chair of the Revenue, Expenditure and Value Committee and an Independent Māori Statutory Board member to provide political oversight of work undertaken to progress Time of Use Charging.
34. Governance arrangements for the TUCC project confirmed to date include a TUCC Political Reference Group (PRG) and a Project Control Group (PCG). Houkura is represented by Member Brown on the PRG.
35. At this stage the PRG is being convened monthly to oversee the work being led by the Council and Auckland Transport on "pre-implementation workstreams" over 2024-25, as outlined in Attachment C: Table 1.

36. The Māori Impact Statement in the above mentioned report states: “Mana whenua and mātāwaka will be engaged early during workstream 2. Some early work has been done on equity to assess impact of such a scheme on Māori, equity work will need to be further refined when a final scheme location is known”.
37. The TUCC project will be reporting to Auckland Transport’s Board and the Transport and Infrastructure Committee. The Council will also need to discuss the outcomes of the TUCC project with Te Manatū Waka (MOT), Waka Kotahi (NZTA) and government ministers.
38. While the previous TCQ project was undertaken jointly with central government agencies, the TUCC project does not currently have central government representatives on the PRG. Waka Kotahi will be represented on the PCG (along with Council and AT senior managers) and, as noted in Workstream 11 (refer Attachment C, Table 1), engagement with Te Manatū Waka will be required in order to progress legislative change.
39. Legislation will be necessary to clarify the powers of local government to implement any charging scheme and what conditions will apply to it.
40. Compared to the TCQ project there is arguably greater uncertainty as to whether the TUCC recommended scheme will align with government policy, both in terms of where and when congestion charges are applied, how revenue might be shared between local and central government, and what mitigation measures may be agreed to.
41. Central government work on transport funding will need to be monitored by the Board in parallel to the TUCC project as it will potentially have additional or different impacts on Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau compared to the TUCC scheme. Board advocacy may need to be directed through submissions to central government policy and legislative processes over the next 1-2 years.

Ngā tāpirihanga:

Attachments:

Attachment A: Overview of previous work to assess impacts of congestion charging on Māori

Attachment B: Issues of Significance relating to transport infrastructure, services and funding

Attachment C: Table 1 – Pre-Implementation Work Streams 2024-2025

ATTACHMENT A: Overview of previous work to assess impacts of congestion charging on Māori

The Congestion Question

1. The [Social Evaluation](#) by MRCagney and Covec (2019) looked at the potential financial impact of a specific form of congestion pricing on households². The study found that across Tāmaki Makarau as a whole, cost increases in both absolute terms and as a percentage of household income, were not significantly different between Māori and non-Māori households.
2. Lower income households, irrespective of ethnicity, were found to be disproportionately impacted by congestion pricing. Households with school aged children, particularly solo parents, and bigger households with greater travel needs, were more likely to be especially affected. The study therefore recommended that a mitigation package be implemented to offset the financial impact on vulnerable households.
3. The [Mana Whenua Analysis](#) by Kristy Hill (2020) provides an initial assessment of the impact of the two recommended congestion pricing options on places of importance to mana whenua including places:
 - that define mana whenua identity;
 - where tikanga determines behaviour and conduct;
 - where cultural obligations and benefits are fulfilled; and
 - where Treaty redress obligations including collective commercial interests are fulfilled.
4. The analysis found that the proposed options were both likely to have some negative impact on mana whenua in the sense that they would add an additional (financial) barrier for Māori to access places of importance. The analysis also noted that further work is required to determine the extent to which this is offset by any access improvements for Māori resulting from the reduced movement of others along the corridors that provide access to these places of importance.
5. The degree to which which congestion charges will impact on Mana Whenua well-being and identity is determined by three factors:
 - a. Location—the proximity of places of importance to the ‘charging’ area
 - b. Accessway—their requirement to use the area to access places of importance
 - c. Time—the need to access places of importance during times subject to congestion pricing
6. The impact will be greater for those who have to deal with this restriction on a daily basis e.g. papakāinga communities or for places that support regular traditional practices that cannot easily be rescheduled such as tangi. For Mana Whenua, whose context is based on the significant loss of lands and the displacement of their communities, such decisions act as another impediment.

² The study examined the impacts of a corridor charge of \$0.20 per km on main arterial routes during AM and PM peaks. In contrast, the tariff structure recommended by the TCQ was access-based, whereby a fixed charge of \$1.5-\$3.50 was proposed to be levied regardless of location, varying during the travel period.


7. The report emphasised that its findings are preliminary and that further engagement with mana whenua is required to verify the accuracy of the sites of interest that were assessed.


Houkura Sapere report


8. The Board commissioned a report from Sapere³ in April 2021 (prior to the Select Committee process), which made several recommendations on the need to better understand equity impacts and explore mitigation options. The report identified weaknesses with the social evaluation report in terms of the way losses in wellbeing from trip suppression (i.e. the reduction in wellbeing from households changing trips to a less preferred option) are estimated, particularly for lower income households which tend to live further away from public transport stations, have fewer transport alternatives and are more sensitive to PT fare increases.

³ Assessment of the treatment of Māori impacts from proposed congestion charge in Auckland: the equity perspective.

ATTACHMENT B: Issues of Significance relating to transport infrastructure, services and funding

Values	Issue of Significance	Actions by Auckland Council Group	Outcomes Indicator*
 Whanaungatanga (Develop vibrant communities)	1 Social Access to Infrastructure Services/Development - Māori receive ongoing access to safe, operational, and reasonably priced infrastructure services. Māori are enabled to contribute to the decision-making process of future infrastructure projects actively and meaningfully.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enable a meaningful and timely process for Māori to be informed and engaged on infrastructure plans and services (this includes but is not limited to the Infrastructure Strategy and the Future Development Strategy). Monitor any Auckland Transport initiatives within transport funding, fuel tax and pricing, to ensure equitable access for Māori to transport services across Tāmaki Makaurau. Delivery of Te Ara Haepapa programme for mana whenua and mātāwaka to increase road safety and reduce Māori road injuries and fatalities. 	
	2 Cultural Marae Development - Māori are enabled to have existing marae developed by a Council that respects and genuinely considers the importance of marae to Māori.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that design and construction of transport infrastructure supports marae development (e.g. entry and exits onto State Highways or arterial roads). 	

Values	Issue of Significance	Actions by Auckland Council Group	Outcomes Indicator*
 Rangatiratanga (Enhance Leadership & Participation)	3 Social - Engagement / Consultation / Inclusion in Decision-making - Māori are empowered to actively and meaningfully contribute to the development of Auckland through consultation and inclusion in decision-making processes and future plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen Māori participation by finalizing Te Hoanga and Relationship Agreements between Council and mana whenua and report quarterly on this to the Board. Identify and put in place best practice engagement protocols to build working relationships with mana whenua and mātāwaka to seek their input on the development of Council policy and budgets (including Long-term Plans, regional strategies/plans, and Annual Budgets). 	036. Percentage of Māori residents who feel they can participate in Auckland Council decision-making
	4 Economic - Economic Development - Māori are a critical and active part in the economic development of a more productive, high value economy for Auckland.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council Group's Economic Development Strategy and plans substantively address the interests and priorities of both mana whenua and mātāwaka, particularly skills development and progression to future jobs. Council to recognise the need of place-based initiatives due to existing inequities in conditions for growing local prosperity in different parts of Tāmaki Makaurau, mainly in the South and West. 	*064. Percentage of Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau employed in skilled and unskilled occupations

Values	Issue of Significance		Actions by Auckland Council Group	Outcomes Indicator*
 Manaakitanga (Satisfaction with our environments & standard of living)	5	Economic Rates - Māori require a fair and just rating system that recognises and reflects the status of tangata whenua.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council and CCOs to address cultural, social and economic impacts on Māori and Māori businesses in the designing and implementing of new funding and rating tools, e.g. regional petrol tax, road pricing and targeted levies. 	

Notes:

*A headline Indicator, as identified within the Board's "The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau Outcome Indicators".

Attachment C: Table 1 – Pre-Implementation Workstreams 2024-2025

Workstream	Description
1	Pre-Implementation workstreams scheme purpose and objectives – the critical first step to (re)establish the purpose(s) of the Time of Use Charging scheme.
2	Public and stakeholder engagement – critical to the decision-making process. Involving both the planning for, and undertaking of, the engagement activities prior to implementation to establish and build social licence.
3	Physical scheme design – workstream 3 and 4 are primarily technical workstreams that are concerned with the development and definition of the preferred Time of Use Charging scheme and its components.
4	Functional specifications.
5	Governance / ownership – workstreams 5 and 6 are somewhat interrelated and relate to who and how the scheme would be implemented and operated on an ongoing basis.
6	Procurement, delivery and operations.
7	Mitigation mechanisms – workstreams 7 – 10 are primarily related to policies and initiatives that are directly related to the Time of Use Charging scheme.
8	Complementary policies and initiatives.
9	Revenue policy.
10	Privacy.
11	Legislation – relates to the legislative process that is needed to enable Time of Use Charging to be implemented. Te Manatu Waka have progressed draft legislation since the Select Committee recommendation, so it would be expected that it would be responsible for this workstream. There will need to be a need for discussion between Te Manatu Waka and this work programme to shape the draft legislation in the right way to support successful implementation and operation of Time of Use Charging.
12	Implementation and Procurement plan – this prepares the implementation plan for the scheme and would consider the detailed design and procurement and delivery of the physical assets, digital systems and processes and scheme commissioning to get to go live.

Appendix iii

Northern Infrastructure Forum Community Panel feedback

Community Panel on Time-of-Use Charging in Auckland

Community Panel Report
11 MAY 2024

INTRODUCTION

Community Panel establishment and remit

The community panel on time-of-use charging was convened by the Northern Infrastructure Forum with support of the Auckland Council and Auckland Transport, to obtain informed community views on principles and criteria that should guide the development of the time-of-use charging scheme.

Participants of the panel were recruited by the team from Koi Tū: Centre for Informed Futures, Waipapa Taumata Rau, University of Auckland. From an initial pool of 730 people who expressed interest using sortition tools, a descriptively representative sample of 30 was invited to the panel and completed the process.

The panel met four times, twice in person (18 April and 11 May) and twice online (23 and 30 April). During these sessions, participants heard from experts (Daniel Firth, Scott Wilson, Shane Martin) and stakeholders, asked questions, and engaged in discussion. Between 30 April and 11 May, the panel worked together using the Consider.It platform to vote on the outcomes of the planned scheme, and to draft a set of principles and criteria guiding the scheme's design. On the final day, the principles and criteria from Consider.It were further revised and condensed. The final outcome of this work is presented on the following pages.

Voice of the Community Panel about the process

We as the panel agree with the above statements. We also appreciate the opportunity to be involved and voice our opinions.

PART 1: OBJECTIVES of Time-of-Use Charging in Auckland

The panel agreed that a Time-of-Use Charging scheme for Auckland should have the following objective/outcome:

OBJECTIVE	The scheme will reduce congestion.
Rationale	The problem that we are solving is congestion, therefore the key objective of any solution must be the reduction of congestion.
Considerations	<p>The reduction in congestion must be measurable, and congestion in 'off-target' areas should be monitored to identify increases in congestion.</p> <p>Outcomes must be communicated to the Auckland public, in clear and simple terms.</p> <p>The implementation of the scheme must be sufficiently flexible to adapt to the future.</p>

PART 2: PRINCIPLES of Time-of-Use Charging scheme design

The panel agreed that the following principles should underpin the design of a Time-of-Use Charging scheme for Auckland:

PRINCIPLE 1	The scheme needs to mitigate the impact on disadvantaged people through strategic use of discounts and exceptions to address inequity. (TOPIC: Equity)
Rationale	Minimising the negative impact on those least able to bear the brunt of the charges who have the least alternative viable options.
Considerations	Too many discounts weaken the scheme. Equity is key. Application of enforcement/penalties need to be equitable.

PRINCIPLE 2	Development of viable and reliable transport options needs to be prioritized to provide an alternative to driving. (TOPIC: Transport options)
Rationale	Without viable and reliable transport alternatives, the implementation of charging becomes a non-choice fee.
Considerations	We should not wait until public transport is perfect to implement the scheme. There needs to be visible action on the improvement of public transport before the scheme is implemented.

PRINCIPLE 3	Revenue should be managed and administered by Auckland local government and ring-fenced for Auckland, to improve accessible transport options, including public transport
Rationale	<p>Aucklanders are paying so Aucklanders should benefit. Auckland has the highest population and projected growth, so further funding is essential.</p> <p>The purpose of congestion charging is to reduce congestion, not to collect revenue, so revenue should be spent to further reduce congestion by providing more transport options and accessibility.</p>
Considerations	<p>Congestion charging will cost money, so revenue will be needed to cover the infrastructure and administration costs of the scheme. Efforts must be made to minimise administration costs.</p> <p>There are known gaps in public transport, access/options that align with low socio-economic levels, so revenue can be used to address this. Low socio-economic level areas need more investment in alternative transport options.</p> <p>The spending of the revenue should be transparent. Aucklanders should know where the money from the time-of-use charging is being spent. Aucklanders (both local government and the public) should lead the decision-making about where the money is spent.</p>

PRINCIPLE 4	Time of use pricing should be simple and transparent.
Rationale	<p>Keeping it simple is important for public opinion.</p> <p>People need to know what they are paying and when, regardless of the model.</p>

Considerations	<p>Timing and pricing should be up for review at appropriate regular intervals.</p> <p>Both methods of fixed or variable pricing should be considered to create an understandable but practical and user-friendly system.</p>
-----------------------	---

PRINCIPLE 5	The initial size/boundary of the scheme should be big enough to make a network-wide impact, but avoid being too complex.
Rationale	<p>Keep it simple.</p> <p>The introduction of the scheme must be understandable to the wider public.</p> <p>The scheme can be adapted in future, as needed.</p>
Considerations	<p>If it is too small it may seem targeted and it may not create meaningful congestion ease, deeming it unpopular in public opinion.</p> <p>A large scheme can be complex in terms of public acceptance, cost, infrastructure requirements and understanding.</p>

PRINCIPLE 6	The payment system must be user-friendly and reliable
Rationale	A simple way to pay will reduce administrative costs and prevent unnecessary late fees.
Considerations	<p>Different groups of people may be more familiar with online systems or in-person systems. Both should be available.</p> <p>Up-to-date technologies should be used.</p>

PRINCIPLE 7	The communication of the time-of-use charging scheme should be clear, transparent, and unbiased, and should focus on the objective of reducing congestion.
Rationale	Confusion can allow space for misinformation, leading to rejection. Therefore, good communication is key for acceptance of the scheme and public perception.
Considerations	<p>If the scheme is not communicated clearly, this could increase administration costs (for example, calls and emails).</p> <p>The communication should focus on improving congestion primarily.</p> <p>Multimedia forms of communication must be adopted to ensure widespread reach.</p>

Appendix iv

Auckland

Transport/Auckland

**Council Community Panel
feedback**

Community Panel on Time-of-Use Charging in Auckland

21 NOVEMBER 2024 – Final report of the panel

INTRODUCTION

The Community Panel was asked to provide recommendations on the question:

How do we design a time of use charging scheme for Auckland that is simple, effective and fair?

The work of this panel followed on from the work of the Community Panel on principles and criteria that should guide the development of the time-of-use charging scheme. That panel agreed on the following principles:

PRINCIPLE 1. The scheme needs to mitigate the impact on disadvantaged people through strategic use of discounts and exceptions to address inequity.

PRINCIPLE 2. Development of viable and reliable transport options needs to be prioritized to provide an alternative to driving.

PRINCIPLE 3. Revenue should be managed and administered by Auckland local government and ring-fenced for Auckland, to improve accessible transport options, including public transport.

PRINCIPLE 4. Time of use pricing should be simple and transparent.

PRINCIPLE 5. The initial size/boundary of the scheme should be big enough to make a network-wide impact but avoid being too complex.

PRINCIPLE 6. The payment system must be user friendly and reliable.

PRINCIPLE 7. The communication of the time-of-use charging scheme should be clear, transparent and unbiased, and should focus on the objective of reducing congestion.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Exemptions or discounts should be applied on a very limited basis.

Socioeconomically disadvantaged and/or mobility challenged people may require support for increased travel costs, but where possible this should be administered through other supporting agencies.

2. All revenue raised through time of use charging should be ring-fenced for the region in which the funds were raised. This should be legislated accordingly, and spending should be transparent to the public.

Transparency on where revenue from the scheme is spent is needed to ensure that money raised in Auckland is spent in Auckland and goes towards improving the transport system, particularly public transport in areas where it is most needed.

3. Prices should not frequently fluctuate and should be communicated and signposted clearly.

People should be able to know ahead of time what charges they may face if driving at certain times and places. Changes to this should be communicated well ahead of time to allow people to adjust their travel accordingly.

4. The boundaries and times for charging should be limited to what is needed for meaningful reduction of congestion.

5. The payment method should be simple, accessible and easy to use.

6. The scheme should be reviewed at regular intervals (minimum every 12 months) and be adapted to ensure that it is effective, and that pricing is fair.

Clear metrics measuring effectiveness should be established and adhered to; the scheme must be able to pivot where effectiveness gaps are found, to ensure the scheme is consistently meeting its objectives.

7. Consultation must take place at key milestones, including statutory consultation and community consultation.

The community must be brought on the journey to acceptance.

COMMUNITY PANEL COMMENTS ON THEIR APPROACH TO THE QUESTION

How do we design a time of use charging scheme for Auckland that is simple, effective and fair?

The Recommendations made here in the main reinforce the initial Principles articulated by the Community Panel in phase 1. Public acceptance of time of use charging was a key consideration, and drove much of the discussion around the scheme being straightforward and fair, and the need for revenue raised to be ring-fenced and spent transparently. We believe that the recommendations are an accurate representation of our consensus view.

We brought our diverse experiences to the question, while also thinking about what might be considered simple, effective, and fair for others in our community. We deeply considered the "pros" and "cons" to each idea, including the wider context and existing systems. We also accepted that each of these aims - simple, effective, and fair - were, at times, pulling us in different directions.

While robust discussion was held, there are a number of sticking points where further recommendations are impractical for this group to provide (e.g. any recommendation for how and where to implement time of use charging requires more data and identification of feasible options for analysis, rather than a blank slate as we have been given).

Similarly, for discounts for disadvantaged people, clear data is required on particular groupings and intersectionality that may apply. We recognise that cross-agency co-operation would be required to implement some discounts/exemptions, and specific information on how this might work was not available to us at the level required for producing detailed recommendations

With that in mind, we have done the best we can to compromise where compromise is available. We recommend further and more detailed-data-supported deliberations before any final decisions are made, to ensure the scheme is thoughtfully implemented for the best chance of success.

RECOMMENDATION 1

Exemptions or discounts should be applied on a very limited basis.

Socioeconomically disadvantaged and/or mobility challenged people may require support for increased travel costs, but where possible this should be administered through other supporting agencies.

This recommendation speaks to principle 1:

The scheme needs to mitigate the impact on disadvantaged people through strategic use of discounts and exemptions to address inequity.

Rationale

The scheme should avoid penalising people who are already disadvantaged, but also avoid increasing complexity in administering the system.

Adding exemptions (people/vehicles who are not subject to the charge) or discounts (reduced charge rates for specific groups) will increase the cost to administer and increase complexities in the system. However, the panel recognises that people who are socioeconomically disadvantaged and/or mobility challenged people may struggle to change travel behaviour. Agencies other than AT should support/compensate them. If this is not possible, then exemptions or discounts should be considered.

Exemptions should apply to emergency vehicles - police, ambulance, fire, Defence and Civil Defence - as well as public transport vehicles (buses). Business vehicles (including delivery vehicles, ride share, taxis, private buses, etc,) should not be exempt or receive discounts.

Considerations

There is a need to ensure not to duplicate discounts that another government agency could easily administer. Anyone who is already claiming a benefit should claim from that provider for additional costs of travel, if appropriate.

The system for applying charging should be based on the vehicle registration, not the person driving the vehicle. Vehicles can be easily identified, but drivers cannot.

	<p>If the registered owners of vehicles are eligible for discounts or exemptions, this would be recorded within the system, but responsibility for authorising those discounts would rest with separate organisations, such as the Ministry for Social Development. However, acceptance of these costs by other agencies is not a given and may be difficult/complex to achieve.</p> <p>The panel also considered groups who would need to come in for medical appointments in the zone, but recognised that it would be too complex to include them this scheme. A suggestion was that hospital shuttle services could be considered for exemptions or discounts. This would reduce their running costs and keep the free services free. For some rural and/or elderly residents, these may be the only affordable and accessible method of travel to hospitals or clinics for appointments.</p>
--	---

Note on recommendation 1:

- The panel suggested further deliberation may be needed to consider access by mana whenua to culturally significant sites (for tangis to Pa sites, Marae). This did not gain consensus in the discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 2

All revenue raised through time of use Charging should be ring-fenced for the region in which the funds were raised. This should be legislated accordingly, and spending should be transparent to the public.

Transparency on where revenue is spent is needed to ensure that money raised in Auckland is spent in Auckland and goes towards improving the transport system, particularly public transport in areas where it is most needed.

This recommendation speaks to **Principle 3:**

Revenue should be managed and administered by Auckland local government and ring-fenced for Auckland, to improve accessible transport options, including public transport.

Rationale	<p>Financial transparency and accountability must be mandatory.</p> <p>In order to maintain social license for the time of use charging scheme, the public needs to know where the revenue is spent and understand the benefits they are receiving through this spend (e.g. 75% on public transport improvements for a 20% decrease in average travel time).</p> <p>A clear communications plan must be established to ensure the communication gets to where it needs to be, that includes channels and methods and recipients of the communications without creating an overly large burden.</p>
Considerations	<p>Retrospective reporting means that money could be spent somewhere with minimal benefit, and not identified until later. This issue can be avoided by ring-fencing of funds and clear project planning (eg. improvement of public transport routes and connections where they are lacking).</p> <p>Consideration is to be made to ensure we avoid over-communication or spending too much money on communications.</p>

RECOMMENDATION 3

Prices should not frequently fluctuate and should be communicated and signposted clearly.

People should be able to know ahead of time what charges they may face if driving at certain times and places. Changes to this should be communicated well ahead of time to allow people to adjust their travel accordingly.

This recommendation speaks to **Principle 4:**

Time of use pricing should be simple and transparent.

Rationale	<p>Pricing should be clearly communicated, and any change in charging levels and times should be communicated with adequate warning, so that people can choose when/if to drive to meet their budget. People should not be subject to unpredictably fluctuating prices.</p> <p>Pricing should be signposted clearly, and well ahead of the charging zone. Bus lanes as an example of signage (direction and time of day). Signs should be very simple to read and understand at a glance.</p> <p>Clear signage well ahead of the TOUC zone allows drivers to choose another route to avoid the charge. This would be similar to toll roads.</p> <p>Effective signage improves compliance and reduces complexity in soliciting payment.</p>
Considerations	<p>Consider development of an additional function in the AT app to show drivers projected TOUC for a given route at different times of day. This would possibly be very expensive. Easy to share info on AT/Auckland Council/NZTA websites as well. Google maps and other popular gps/directions apps already flag tolls on routes.</p> <p>If possible, dynamic electronic signage would be helpful for many drivers.</p> <p>See recommendation 6 around reviews of the scheme and making changes to pricing and boundaries.</p>

RECOMMENDATION 4

The boundaries, times for charging, and price should be limited to what is needed for meaningful reduction of congestion.

This recommendation speaks to **Principle 5**:

The initial size/boundary of the scheme should be big enough to make a network-wide impact but avoid being too complex.

Rationale	<p>The panel recommends that the physical boundaries, times that fees are charged, and the amount charge be limited to what is necessary to meaningfully reduce congestion/enable the free flow of traffic, rather than a focus on revenue.</p> <p>This should carefully consider traffic flows (including time of day and direction of travel) while also minimising charging in areas where alternate transport modes are limited or unavailable.</p> <p>A small charge should be sufficient to influence behaviour.</p> <p>There should be a variation in cost based on time of day and day of the week - times with more congestion should cost more. A tiered approach rather than on/off should be used to avoid people speeding up or slowing down to avoid a cut-off time. There should be no charge at times that are consistently free flowing.</p>
Considerations	<p>Time periods need to be wide enough that people don't all travel immediately after the charged period.</p> <p>See recommendation 6 regarding review and adaptability of the scheme</p>

RECOMMENDATION 5

The payment method should be simple, accessible and easy to use.

This recommendation speaks to **Principle 6:**

The payment system must be user friendly and reliable.

Rationale	<p>The system should run through a single (personal) account but people should be able to pay or credit their account using different methods (digital or in person). Simple may mean piggybacking off an existing system/app (AT mobile or NZTA toll).</p> <p>Toll payments can be pay-as-you-go and put through without an account, OR personal accounts created. Payment options include credit/debit, monthly billing, auto top-ups, and top-up reminders.</p>
Considerations	<p>Post shops, Auckland Council service centres or AT service centres could do in-person payments (possibly also AA centres and VTNZ, if feasible).</p> <p>There may be an increase in running costs for expanding these existing services.</p> <p>Allow enough time in the lead up to the scheme coming into effect for people to test payment systems & ways to pay.</p>

RECOMMENDATION 6

The scheme should be reviewed at regular intervals (minimum every 12 months) and be adapted to ensure that it is effective, and that pricing is fair.

Clear metrics measuring effectiveness should be established and adhered to; the scheme must be able to pivot where effectiveness gaps are found, to ensure the scheme is consistently meeting its objectives.

Rationale	<p>The scheme must prove its worth, so it is not seen as a revenue-grab and shows a benefit for the cost to users travelling in Auckland.</p> <p>Regular evaluations are needed to assess effectiveness, identify areas for improvement, and adapt to changing circumstances. The charges and boundaries should be reviewed at least annually, with changes in pricing or location driven by the data received.</p> <p>The review should include assessment of public transport costs (and use) relative to time of use pricing to ensure the balance is fair and the scheme is effective.</p> <p>Metrics to include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cost of travel, i.e. time saved per dollar spent• Time to travel, e.g. time savings with reduced congestion• Social benefits, e.g. environmental impacts• Measurement of benefits to all travellers, regardless of mode of transport
Considerations	<p>There is potential for increased administration costs. However, this would be less than persisting with something that isn't working, and there is a risk of losing the social license by not being perceived as delivering a positive outcome.</p> <p>It may take time to land on the finalised product that strikes the right balance, and some flexibility will be required.</p> <p>The established metrics must be publicly available. Quarterly outcomes should be published and made available to the public.</p>

RECOMMENDATION 7

Consultation must take place at key milestones, including statutory consultation and community consultation.

The community must be brought on the journey to acceptance.

This recommendation speaks to **Principle 7**:

The communication of the time-of-use charging scheme should be clear, transparent and unbiased, and should focus on the objective of reducing congestion.

Rationale

There is some mandatory or legislative consultation required, and additionally the community must be brought on the journey to acceptance.

Considerations

Consultation must be genuine and not a tick-box exercise.

The consultation should consider the panel's recommendations, rationale and considerations herein expressed, which have been developed through careful deliberation on the issues. Some of the points raised here signal aspects of scheme design that may require more information and deeper engagement with some sectors of the public to avoid imposing undue hardship upon those least likely to be able to bear that hardship.